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Abstract

This thesis sought to establish the existence of participative reassurance among residents who were radio link users in three areas, here called Westville – a high crime inner-city estate, Eastville – a Black Minority Ethnic (BME) community located in an inner-city area and Northville – a village community. The theoretical position, that participants are reassured through their involvement, in particular talking to and listening out for others, in supportive social networks was tested using three methods, secondary analysis of a realistic evaluation, free association narrative interviews with users and focus groups. It is suggested that some evidence was found to support the theory of participative reassurance. The study found that there is a need for further consideration to be given by social research as to the nature and effects of communication between individuals in communities.
‘There is little new under the sun, no new “silver bullets” of interpersonal technologies available to slay the great ogre of crime.’
(Buerger, 1994: 412)

‘We must replace a culture of congratulation with one of scepticism.’
(Young, 1998: 76)
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Part One

History, Theory and Method
Chapter One

Introduction: Radio Links

Background and Context: An Understanding

The inspiration for this study came from a telephone conversation with Professor Ken Pease, who suggested the author apply for an Association of British Insurers (ABI) doctoral scholarship. The reason for this suggestion was due to the fact the author had been bemoaning the lack of research into radio links and Professor Pease very politely made the author realise that if he wanted such work to be undertaken he was probably the only person at that time who was going to do it. This study therefore, is basically concerned with the effects of people talking.

Radio links, for the author, began with an incident in Wolverhampton some 14 years ago when a violent shop thief assaulted a store detective. The author’s involvement in that offence and subsequent development of a radio link for shop staff has shaped his approach to these schemes, which can best be summarised as an interest in helping to safeguard people. For the author that personal and professional involvement in the development of radio links means that he has been closely associated with both promoting and researching the schemes, arguably not an ideal situation. The author would be the first person to accept therefore, that his involvement in the schemes development and his being a serving police officer needs to be explicitly stated at the beginning of this study, for not to do so would place any research undertaken by him under suspicion. People would be rightly justified in questioning the author’s independence should he wish to claim it – he does not – but he has sought throughout to avoid bias. The past 14 years experience has provided the author with a fairly unique insight into the schemes’ strengths and weaknesses. In addition to having developed a number of radio links and spoken at length to users, police officers and equipment suppliers the author would suggest he has gained a useful degree of knowledge, which perhaps has been of benefit when undertaking this research. The author does though accept that there is a very real need for others, particularly those not so involved in the schemes, to undertake work in this field and hopes that this research acts as an encouragement to them to do so.
Radio links are never static creations, for as with any social network they are constantly undergoing change, not just because communications technology is evolving but more importantly because the schemes themselves involve individuals who are constantly changing. In addition, just as people engage in an unlimited variety of conversations so too there are multi-variable networks, which can be established within a radio link. This work is by implication therefore, a time limited understanding of the current nature of residential radio links and research to test the theory of participative reassurance (Wright, 1999: Wright, 2000).

This thesis is comprised of five chapters with a bibliography and appendices. This, the first chapter, is intended to introduce the theory of participative reassurance, explain its relevance to current sociological thinking and detail the development of radio links as an emerging approach within the fields of crime prevention and community safety. The second chapter provides an explanation for and definition of participative reassurance and reviews the literature relating to the subject areas of fear of crime, community, electronically mediated communication and Neighbourhood Watch. The third chapter is concerned with explaining the social theories and methodological approaches utilised in this study, while the fourth chapter details the research findings. The fifth and final chapter draws conclusions from the research and preceding chapters and discusses whether there is evidence to support the theory of participative reassurance.

This thesis will further argue that it is necessary to consider the nature of interpersonal communication when seeking to understand the implications of crime prevention and community safety activity at a local level. Levels of communication between individuals within a community are a key determinant of factors, such as social integration, cohesion, support and control. It is further suggested that those charged with developing and researching crime prevention interventions should give sufficient thought to the existence, extent and nature of communication between individuals. For example, any research undertaken to determine the effectiveness of a capable guardianship scheme may be limited without consideration being given to the extent and nature of inter-personal communication between that individual and the communities they serve.
Research should be able to determine if a guardian in regular and supportive communication with their residents is more or less capable than another without such systems of communication. In summary, the theory of participative reassurance is premised upon the concept that individuals engaging with trusted others to address issues of concern, particularly at a neighbourhood level, will feel less anxious than individuals operating without such collective support. For individuals able to participate in and contribute to such social networks they will enjoy a sense of participative reassurance that is facilitated by improved inter-personal communication, in this case provided by a radio link.

**Radio Links: An Explanation**

There are a range of different radio link schemes, from retail to community systems. This study is concerned with a relatively unknown system, which the author had initially called Community Action Tackling Crime & Harassment (CATCH). There were two main reasons for this study being concerned with a residential based radio link. Firstly, it had been hoped to better understand the nature of such schemes before they became more widely adopted, as has now happened with retail schemes and secondly, because they involved people and the communities within which they lived. The rapid adoption of Closed Circuit Television systems (CCTV) had occurred within the context of limited understanding of their effectiveness. The dearth of in-depth research into CCTV prior to its national adoption had influenced the author’s desire to undertake this work. He was concerned to learn if there was any evidence of radio link systems having changed the relationships between people, particularly before such schemes became more widely accepted, a situation he had experienced with retail radio links. The second point above was of very real importance to the author and probably more importantly to the people involved. The need for people to feel safe when at home is of very real relevance to them, their families and society at large. That importance made the subject of the research real and it is hoped of value and interest. This study of reassurance and communication began in October 1999. The research focused on the experiences of residents from three, very different areas when using simple two-way radios. It studied the personal feelings of safety of individual radio users, participants, and explored their concerns, fears and levels of reassurance.
The study involved a three-stage evaluation process. Firstly, a series of focus groups involving participants explored the general group processes involved in the radio links. Secondly, free association narrative interviews (Jefferson and Hollway, 1997, 2000a, b) were held with participants to evaluate their feelings of safety and levels of reassurance. Finally, a secondary analysis was undertaken of a realistic evaluation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997) of the radio link in the three areas and of three control sites. The identities of the three communities chosen for the evaluation have been withheld, for reasons of safeguarding the privacy of the participants, suffice to say they have been given names for the purpose of the study and comprise: Westville – residents living in a high crime inner-city housing area; Eastville – a Black Minority Ethnic (BME) community living in a medium sized city; and Northville – a rural community.

As a method of crime prevention, radio links remain relatively unknown and are certainly under researched and yet they exist within every town and city throughout the United Kingdom. To have an understanding of residential radio links and their current operation it is necessary to trace the history and development of such systems. It is proposed, therefore, to provide a case study of the radio links schemes – to tell the story of radio links – thereby placing residential based radio links in their historical context.

**Radio Links: A Case Study**

There exist a number of different radio links. These have been classified in general terms and their titles are associated with the location of the system and the nature of the radio user’s crime risk. For example, retail radio link is predominately located in a town or city centre and is used to address crime aimed at the retail sector. This case study will explain the development of four separate systems, retail, community and business radio link and CATCH.

**Retail Radio Link**

This case study of radio links began with an incident during the autumn of 1991, when a violent thief travelled from Birmingham to Wolverhampton, West Midlands and stole clothing from a store. The thief, confronted by the store detective assaulted him and ran off from the shop.
The store detective pursued the thief but in doing so was now on his own and operating without the knowledge of any of his colleagues, other retail security staff or the police. The thief was eventually cornered by the store detective on a bus and again assaulted him. As a result of telephone calls from local shops and a message from the bus company the police were informed and following a further violent struggle the thief was overpowered and arrested by the author. The inability of the store detective to communicate with anyone was in stark contrast to the communication systems used by police officers, for should a similar incident have occurred involving the police they would have used their personal radio to summon help. It was clear that there was no good reason why retailers should not enjoy such similar benefits.

Following representations by the author, the Wolverhampton Chamber of Commerce secured funding from the Home Office Safer Cities Project to purchase a radio base station and aerial. Individual stores purchased their own radios with the system, entitled Retail Radio Link, being launched by the then Chief Constable of the West Midlands Police in December 1992. A radio link has been defined as ‘a radio communication system linking members together, ideally with the police’ (Gibson and Wright, 1995). Initially, the system was used exclusively to tackle incidents of intimidation of retail staff by thieves and their associates. It quickly became obvious that the ability to forewarn retail staff and security personnel of the exact location and description of thieves in the town centre was a major factor in achieving joint staff and police responses to disrupt any criminal activity. The Christmas trading period of 1992, also led to an unforeseen expansion in the use of the retail radio. A number of lost children were being quickly found and reunited with their parents. The full impact of the use of retail radio for this purpose was not appreciated until 1993 with the tragic case of the abduction and murder of a young boy named Jamie Bulger in Liverpool.

By the early part of 1993 the benefits reported by retail staff of being involved in the radio link were being widely publicised, with Coventry then Birmingham introducing the same system. In the Metropolitan Police area some of the earliest schemes were introduced in Ilford, Croydon and Woolwich. It was reported in December 1994 that in Ilford one major store, over a three-month period, had saved over £10,000 per week, after having purchased one radio at a cost of £300 (O’Brien, 1994).
In Wolverhampton the number of users of retail radio continued to increase and a number of changes were apparent. It was perceived that the reporting of crime incidents became more proficient, possibly through both the increased familiarity of users with the system and also post incident debriefing by the police. This increased proficiency was evidenced by stores calling for the support of other security staff, CCTV systems and police in affecting arrests or deterring criminals. An additional benefit was that retail staff gained precise intelligence about thieves, for example what clothing they had on that day and with whom they were associating. This intelligence led to a most useful interface between CCTV and radio link with the ability to monitor a suspect’s activities and co-ordinate arrests following surveillance. The relationship between CCTV and retail radio was explored in a Home Office report published in 1994. The report while identifying the benefits through sharing information between retailers and the police and alerting CCTV operators to incidents, also reported upon the ‘great co-operation and team spirit that a radio link system can create’ (Edwards and Tilley, 1995: 14).

In his study of CCTV systems McCahill (2003) described how the use of City Centre Radio Link (CCRL) interfaced with CCTV and in-store radio communication systems in the study area to deal with early warning messages passed over the radio link. The CCTV operator used the information passed over the CCRL to initiate the following actions:

- Repeating the description of the suspected person (s) and passing them over the in-store radio system;
- Use the CCTV system to search for and follow the person (s);
- Use the CCTV system or store security staff to monitor the person (s) leaving the store and use the CCRL to report this to neighbouring stores;
- Deploy a guard to the store entrance to deny access to the person (s) or observe them; and
- Call the police at the city centre station on the CCRL to inform them (2003: 86).
The author's perception at the time was that the participants in the radio link were finding uses for the system beyond those for which it was originally conceived, to address violence to staff. This was most vividly illustrated in April 1993, when, the day before the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) terrorist attack at Bishopsgate, London, (George et al., 2003: 233) a coded bomb warning was received in Wolverhampton. The radio link provided the author with the ability to immediately forewarn large numbers of stores, the two shopping centres and the majority of retail security personnel about the threat. The radio link allowed the author to give precise details of the telephone call, the exact location of the alleged device and the time limit within which the evacuation had to be achieved. Security personnel, public address systems and staff with retail radio assisted the small numbers of police officers within the town. These resources, co-ordinated through the radio link evacuated the town centre within thirty minutes. Eventually the town centre was declared safe with the recovery phase again being organised by the radio link. Managers and security staff were called to the police cordons and escorted to their stores by police search teams. The total evacuation of the town centre was achieved without loss or injury. Other systems of communication to aid major incident management have been utilised with Gearson (2003) in his study of terrorist attacks against London, describing the use of a pager alert system. This system was introduced by the City of London to keep businesses informed about potential and actual threats and better co-ordinate disaster recovery (2003: 224).

There has been limited research conducted into retail radio links and those that have been undertaken have primarily been concerned with the effect of the system upon users. The University of Leicester undertook an in-depth study of an individual system in Leicester City Centre in 1995 on behalf of The Burton Group PLC (Beck and Willis, 1995). The research found that in general staff perceptions were very positive with the major benefits being identified as enhanced information exchange between participants and direct access to the police with some 60% of staff reporting being less concerned about crime (1995: 35).

It is suggested this finding is relevant in that it is related to concepts of public reassurance and also because of the association between fear of crime and its adverse effect on health. In a study of the effects of crime upon health it was found that:
‘The effects of the fear of crime, rather than crime itself, on the health of individuals and communities, have been largely underestimated. In particular the effect of incivilities on well-being is not well recognised’ (McCabe and Raine, x: 1997).

The University of Leicester study (1995) included interviews with six City Centre Unit police officers and reported they were very positive about the scheme. The advantages identified by the police officers were: increased co-operation and information exchange between the police and retailers; more arrests and recovered stolen property; reduction in fear of crime and response times to incidents; and the system acting as having a good deterrent effect (1995: 36).

The officers also identified a number of disadvantages, which were: having to carry another radio (their own police radio and the retail radio); retailers assuming the police were only there to deal with their problems; and retailers misusing the system by not using the telephone to summons a police officer. In addition, officers identified retailers not following radio procedures and their becoming ‘too accessible’ (original emphasis) as problematic (Beck and Willis, 1995: 36). The executive summary of the report identified the radio as being a ‘reassuring symbol’ (emphasis added) within the store reducing fear of crime amongst staff, with retail radio representing a ‘beneficial and low cost addition to store security’ (Beck and Willis, 1995: 11). The image of the radio becoming a symbol of reassurance was one that prompted considerable reflection by the author as to how mobile communication systems affected radio users and this in turn led to the development of the theory of participative reassurance. The staff perceptions of the role of CCTV and retail radio were again subject of a study in 1995 by the University of Leicester on behalf of Next Retail Ltd. This study undertook a comparison between perceptions of personal safety between users and non-users of retail radio. It found that whereas 57% of non users believed the radio link would increase their perception of safety, in reality 91% of participants reported an actual rise in staff feelings of well-being.

The grounds given for this were cited as being a direct link and back up from the police. The study noted that for this retailer, which employs a majority of women, the importance of staff safety is of paramount importance with all stores with retail radio being positive in their responses.
It was again highlighted that the ready flow of intelligence on criminals was considered to be of particular benefit, with one respondent being quoted as saying:

‘...we get to know who the known groups are now and we prevent them from entering the store. It has reduced crime’ (Kinsley and Neal, 17: 1995).

Consideration of the research reveals that retail radio increases staff’s awareness of crime, even to the extent of identifying groups or individual criminals within the vicinity of a store. It may be logical to conclude that this might increase staff’s fear of crime. However, use of a radio link appears to increase staff’s willingness to tackle crime, even to the extent of preventing criminals entering the store. It could be suggested that this is one of the more significant outcomes from retailers, security staff and police working together through using two-way communication. The use of radio links within retail areas, other than those found in large towns and cities has been a natural development for the schemes. Ryan (2003) found that Home Office funding for retailers in deprived areas had been used to purchase inexpensive radios and establish a radio link between small retailers in Barnsley. The report stated that:

‘With a radio to hand shop owners feel reassured that they are not working in isolation and that they can link up quickly with a wider support network of other retailers and police officers’ (2003: 9) (Emphasis added).

The area in which the shops are located has a CCTV system and the radio link has been integrated with the control room, which monitors the cameras. The scheme is widely publicised and builds upon an existing ‘highly effective’ system, which operated in the force area. The local crime reduction officer PC Bradley was quoted as saying ‘We wanted to encourage more interaction, more communication and a more human element’ (2003: 9). The rapid expansion of retail radio led to consideration of the management, operation and future development of this and other radio communication systems, by the author and a colleague Sgt Christine Gibson, West Midlands Police, who was involved in the Coventry radio link. As a result of these concerns and deliberations an application was submitted to the Home Office Police Research Group (PRG), for funding to research the concept of radio links from a police perspective. The application was successful and in 1994 retailers and police radio link users in a number of towns and cities were interviewed.
The research identified similar results to the two University of Leicester studies for example 48% of staff reported a reduction in their fear of crime (Gibson and Wright, 1995: 21). Perhaps one of the most significant discoveries of the research was that retail radio links had existed since 1980 in Great Yarmouth and Norwich and had remained in as active use in 1994 as the day they were launched. The difference between the longevity of radio links and the pager systems they often replaced was considered. Although no specific research has been conducted to test the effectiveness of paging systems as against retail radio it is thought that the obvious difference between the two systems is that radios allow two-way communications. This fundamental advantage of radios over pagers, especially in cases of personal violence, is considered to be the main reason as to why radio links have replaced paging systems in town and city centres. In his study of CCTV McCahill (2003) found that security personnel employed within the city-centre had previously used a pager system but this did not provide a quick enough response. The author quoted a security manager who said:

‘We used to have a small pager which had text on it. You’d sit and read it and there’d be spelling mistakes and all sorts of problems with that, erm, and it was thought that it would be better if we had a common link. You know, the voice is a lot quicker than these visual read-outs that had to be run through and transcribed and sent out’ (McCahill, 2003: 86).

The study conducted by Gibson and Wright (1995) included the results of two small scale and limited studies undertaken in Wolverhampton by the Home Office Safer Cities Project and the Town Centre Association. These showed that some 68% of retailers reported a reduction in stock losses following introduction of the retail radio. In addition 44% of staff reported a reduction in their fear of crime, with one store reporting a 23% reduction in stock loss equating to a saving of £60,000 per annum. This was achieved through the purchase of two radios at a cost of £700 with the cost of an average professional range radio being less than £400 and the base station and aerial costing about £3,000 (Gibson and Wright, 1995: 23). The findings can at best be described as indicative as both studies were never intended to be thorough academic enquiries but more project evaluations. They are however, relevant in that they point to the general nature of the radio user’s views as to the effectiveness of the scheme.
In Maguire’s (1998) study of a retail radio link in Swindon, Wiltshire he was concerned with the management of the system and the retailer’s perspectives of such issues as police involvement and its cost effectiveness. The study also sought to explore any differences between large and small retailer’s opinions of retail radio within the town centre. The study concluded that there were two main areas of concern about the operation and management of the system. The first was that with there being neither police involvement nor support for the system it was not fully effective and lacked credibility. The extent of retailers feelings about the lack of police involvement can best be summarised by an anonymous retailer who thought they were doing the work of the police. The second major area of concern was the effectiveness of management control of the system. More specifically these concerned the lack of information from the radio link management committee to the participants about such basic issues as the objectives of the system and the identity of other users, particularly new members. It was reported that there was an apparent reliance of smaller retailers, in the absence of police involvement, on the larger stores’ security staff providing them with a free service; indeed it was argued that the major stores were policing the town centre (Maguire, 1998).

The interface between security staff and other retailers through the medium of a radio link has been described by Wakefield (2003: 186) who in her study of the role of private security staff employed within shopping centres talks about the ‘retailer’s radio network’ readily supporting the transfer of information, comprising observations and suspicions, between shop staff, the shopping centre control room and security officers working in the centre. Wakefield (2003) quoting the work of Jones (1997) suggested that CCTV systems are becoming more integrative and act:

‘...as a tool to manage security resources – mainly police officers and security officers – through the simultaneous use of two-way radio links’ (Wakefield, 2003: 54).

It may be suggested that in the absence of physical links between different CCTV system and their respective monitoring facilities that the radio link does indeed provide a level of integration. Police support – or lack of it – for radio link participants is an issue that will be considered later and with particular reference to residential networks.
McCahill (2003) described how the geographical location of stores and the human mediation of the radio link technology caused ‘breaks’ in the chain of communication. The reason for the breaks occurring is because; security staff only tended to pass information to their neighbouring stores and not direct them across the whole system. Because of the geographical nature of the stores and shopping centres in the City studied by McCahill (2003: 89/90) some security staff and CCTV control room personnel choose to neither monitor the CCRL nor pass on early warning messages. These problems were exacerbated by the fact that only security personnel were permitted, within the city-centre studied, to use the CCRL. This meant that many of the smaller shops that did not employ security staff were denied access to the system. The break in the communication systems became so severe that one of the larger stores established another radio link CCRL II to safeguard a number of small shops around the city-centre bus station. There are a number of obvious and significant issues that arise from this study regards the ineffective management of the different security and safety systems in the City studied, for example how do the police and other agencies interface with the differing communications systems?

McCahill (2003) believes that ‘distance still provides a barrier to communication’ and suggests that security personnel are more likely to communicate with those located close to themselves (2003: 91). The author would suggest that this finding fails to address the real issue that participants within a radio link are far more interested in messages that relate to issues likely to affect them or their store. Simply put distance is not the key factor but relevance to the user. For example, while stores will obviously be interested in a known thief being seen outside their shop they will also be very concerned about a large group of rowdy football supporters being reported on the opposite side of the City. In short retailers will be interested in those messages that will or may affect them. As such it is suggested it is not the physical distance between participants that is the issue but the relevance of the message for users.

McCahill (2003) believes that there may be another explanation for this, namely that the people at the other end of the radio link may not be known to the person sending the message ‘The importance of knowing the person at the other end of the electronic link…’ (2003: 91). He further suggests that physical distance may play a part in this issue as the chance of the radio users meeting will be reduced by their separation.
Knowing who you are talking to is but one factor in assisting and facilitating communication, ties such as friendships and relationships play an extremely important role, as McCahill says ‘Interpersonal links were also very important...’ (2003: 93). This is an important issue but McCahill does not develop the concept for what would be the case if the people at opposite sides of the City were related? Again distance may not be the real issue but the relevance of the message for the user; in this case it would be important to the participant in that the communication originated from a relative.

**Community Radio Link**

The close involvement of the local authority, especially the Emergency Planning Officer, in the evacuation of what was then Wolverhampton town centre led to a steady increase in the number of council staff within the town centre who held retail radios. At the same time police officers in Coventry City Centre began to be approached by a number of non-retailers such as the Cathedral and University staff, asking to be allowed to join retail radio.

Discussions between the police in Wolverhampton and Coventry about these issues confirmed the need for a separate radio link, which could be used by public and voluntary sector employees across a wider area, such as a Borough or County. This second system was named Community Radio Link to reflect both the nature of its membership and role. Two difficulties immediately became apparent firstly, who would assume responsibility for monitoring this 24-hour system and secondly, how would it be interfaced with the police? In Wolverhampton the solution to both problems was found in locating the monitoring facility for the community radio within the Council’s central control room operated by the housing department. This room operated 24 hours a day, was staffed by experienced personnel who were used to monitoring similar communications systems, responding to calls for help and dealing with the public and emergency services. The local police control room provided emergency contact telephone numbers and agreed to have both a retail and community radio thus creating additional links with the local authority. There has been no research conducted in community radio links and the only reference to them was in the PRG report (Gibson and Wright, 1995).
Business Radio Link

The involvement of a large number of security personnel in retail radio and the absence of any similar system to assist other commercial and business users led to consideration of a third radio link. This was aimed at reducing incidents of commercial and industrial crime whilst offering the opportunity of creating a unique operational link between the police and security industry. This system, known as Business Radio Link, also faced the same problem of monitoring and interfaces with the police. The Home Office Safer Cities Project in Wolverhampton was again involved in these early discussions and was able to secure funding for a pilot system to operate across the Black Country of the West Midlands. The major shopping centre in Wolverhampton, at that time, employed contract staff from Group 4 who were actively involved in the retail radio link. Through them discussions with a senior representative from Group 4 showed an active level of interest in developing the project. It was decided that to co-ordinate the project and provide the requisite level of representation, the British Security Industry Association (BSIA) would be approached to manage the project.

Following meetings with the then membership liaison manager, additional funding was secured from within the security industry and a series of presentations by the police were made to interested parties. A BSIA member company, Burns Security, whose Midlands control room was based in the Black Country of the West Midlands, agreed to allow the independent business radio to be located in a separate office in their building. A further grant of money was secured from the Department of the Environment and the then Home Office Minister, David MacLean, launched the project in January 1995. The project enjoyed considerable initial interest from a wide variety of potential participants such as: out of town retailers; security companies; vending machine companies; petrol retailers; and financial institutions. Unfortunately for a variety of commercial reasons this level of interest was not translated into the purchase of radios, with the system being forced to close through lack of funding. The last manager of business radio Mr Mike Olds, speaking in February 1996, attributed the scheme failure to the absence of a full time sales person, the cost of radios and subscription. In addition he spoke about the ‘…lack of a coherent marketing strategy and adequate resources’ (Rainey, 1996).
Community Action Tackling Crime & Harassment (CATCH)

In 1997 the author assumed responsibility for policing an area of Sandwell, West Midlands within which there were a number of quite high crime housing estate comprising local authority owned dwellings. Following a meeting between one of the area Tenants and Residents Association (TRA) and the author it was proposed that the residents adopt the use of simple back-to-back radios. A residential radio link was developed and introduced in May 1998 (Self, 1998; Lewis, 1999). The radio link was given the name Community Action Tackling Crime & Harassment (CATCH). The TRA was provided with funding from the West Midlands Police Authority, Sandwell Council and local shopkeepers to purchase a number of radios, at a cost of about £120 each, with further radios being donated by a local shopping centre. There has only been limited research conducted into CATCH schemes (Wright, 1999; McAllister, 2003).

In Wright (1999) semi-structured interviews were held with residents from two estates who were involved in radio links schemes. The research found both similarities and differences between the residents’ experiences, for example in terms of the relationship with the police. Specifically two residents from one of the estates, through participating in the radio link, reported having gained a greater appreciation of the work of the police, with this understanding being considered to be of benefit to them. The response of one resident was ‘I never knew any police before but now I feel they know me...’ is of interest in that this is an emerging policy objective of the Home Office for people to know their local officer. The public information leaflet that accompanies the current Home Office Police Reform White Paper (Home Office, 2004a) specifically states that the Home Office believes that citizens should ‘know who their local police officer ... are ... and how they can be contacted’.

What is thought to be implied by the respondent is that what is important to them, as an individual, is not that they know their local officer but that that officer knows them. What does this mean? We can easily imagine the personal satisfaction of going to a shop or restaurant and being recognised by the staff. That recognition of ones self by others is a fundamental human experience. In the context of CATCH it may be that local residents seeking to work with the police feel that recognition of them by their local officer is of value and of importance to them as individuals.
The difficulties of effectively implementing a residential radio link on the Yew Tree Estate; Sandwell has been explored as part of the evaluation of the Home Office Reducing Burglary Initiative (RBI) (Millie, et al. 2003). As part of the funding made available under the RBI, which in turn formed part of the Crime Reduction Programme (Laycock, 2003) forty radios were purchased with twenty-one being distributed to separate Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinators and other key individuals on the estate, such as the community health worker and police beat officers. This approach to implementing the scheme was different to those where residents lived in the same street or immediate area formed the radio link. On the Yew Tree Estate scheme one individual, the Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinator, from a number of different streets, was asked to join the radio link. The then local police inspector (Malpass, per comms) has highlighted that while the estate had a historically high level of domestic burglaries it did not suffer from the same problem with other crimes nor with anti-social behaviour. In addition the users lacked the confidence to use the radios and the level of support from the police, which was needed to develop the scheme, was not provided (Malpass, per comms). The Home Office evaluation (Millie, et al., 2003) found that the users did not know each other well enough, probably through not being neighbours, to communicate via their radios leading to the scheme being abandoned and the radios diverted to local businesses. These issues coupled with the fact that the introduction of other more successful burglary reduction interventions on the estate actually removed the problem the scheme was designed to address led to the users having nothing to talk about. It could be suggested that the name of the scheme ‘Community Action Tackling Crime & Harassment’ defined – and limited – the nature of community problems to be addressed and may have led to resident’s expectations being raised beyond the ability of the police to manage and deliver.

Wright (1999) found agreement among the residents of the two estates as to the benefit of CATCH. One resident, when asked what is good about CATCH stated:

‘Everything about it, I know more people and I’ve lived here for 31 years and yet I know more people through being in the CATCH than the other 31 years’.

This statement raises a number of important questions relating to issues such as loneliness, social inclusion and community cohesion. It is pertinent to ask what caused this change in the lady’s relationships with her neighbours.
Is it simply that she could communicate with more people, and all at once, and this inter-personal contact had increased her knowledge of and trust in her neighbours? Or is it simply the fact that she felt better able to trust her neighbours as they were demonstrating their desire to reduce the impact of crime in the area?

In an attempt to answer these questions it is useful to refer to the work of McCahill (2003) for in his study of the CCTV surveillance web he found that among the different individuals and agencies, employed within the City centre he studied, there was considerable emphasis placed upon the importance of working together. While those individuals often worked on their own, for example CCTV control room operators or shop security staff, they saw themselves as operating as part of a team and knew there were others available to assist them (2003: 94 / 95). McCahill referred to the work of Thrift (1996: 1473) who argued that ‘the development of electronic communications systems does not produce ‘an abstract and inhuman space, strung out on the wire’; rather it produces more sociation, much of it face to face’ (2003: 95). In this case it is suggested by McCahill that technological interventions, CCTV and it is argued radio links, give rise to increased levels of information-sharing and liaison arising out of what is termed ‘human linkages’ (2003: 95). In the context of security staff it is suggested that:

‘...one of the main reasons for the development of this informal network is that it allows the security personnel to deal with the problem of classification, i.e. the problem of putting names to faces, putting faces to names, and sharing information on ‘known’ names and faces’ (McCahill, 2003: 95).

Applying these thoughts to residential radio links it can be understood that residents will want to know amongst whom they live. However, to assume that the resident’s use of the radio link is the same as that of retail security staff, i.e. purely to address crime through the identification of offenders may be seen to be too narrow a construction of a residential network, which may have a broader role in supporting friendships and associations. For example, in her recent study of a residential radio link and Neighbourhood Warden scheme McAllister (2003) found evidence of the scheme having had a ‘community empowerment impact’ and having turned resident’s ‘initial fears and anger about local crime disorder into positive community action’ (2003: 7).
In a most telling passage she reported that residents involved in the radio link had identified a perpetrator of domestic abuse in the vicinity of his former partner’s home and with him being in breach of a court order reported the matter to the police.

In Wright (1999) the response from the residents of the one estate to the question about the failings of the radio link system again highlighted their criticism of poor police response to incidents reported by CATCH members. They spoke of the wasted time and effort incurred by the police and residents when criminals are not arrested. Residents on both estates highlighted the potential dangers of retaliation from local criminals should their membership of CATCH be known. This fear must be taken seriously when the residents themselves stated they could be ‘letter-bombed’. This is where petrol or some other accelerant is poured through a letterbox and ignited, a particular problem as some of the radio link users were elderly and lived in high-rise blocks of flats.

**CATCH: The Technology**

The type of radio currently used in residential schemes is known as the PMR 446 type. Prior to 1997 the only radios that could be purchased in the United Kingdom were traditional Professional Mobile Radio (PMR), which were predominantly used by the emergency services, police, fire and ambulances officers, utilising the high end of the radio spectrum and by security guards and major retail outlets, etc. on the low end. There were two main problems with this type of radio, when considered for use in residential radio link schemes. Firstly, the radios were expensive to purchase, from £500 up to and in excess of £1,000. Secondly, the radios require a licence granted by the then Radio Communications Agency (RA), now the Office of Communications (Ofcom) – a statutory corporation – which would have led to significant additional yearly costs.

Because of this the main radio equipment manufacturers, Motorola, Kenwood, Maxon and Icom, lobbied the RA for a pan United Kingdom frequency that would allow them to launch a product at a minimum cost with regards to licence fee and unit price. In January 1997 Motorola launched the first such product, named the Short Range Business Radio (SRBR) on the PMR 461 frequency.
It is worth noting that prior to this date, research undertaken as part of the Home Office Police Research Group award (Gibson and Wright, 1995) had informed the RA, Home Office and the communications industry about the potential use of such radios in a crime reduction capacity, in particular to assist Neighbourhood Watch schemes. The radios were limited to 500 milli-watts power output, which restricted the range of up to 3 kilometres, which was ideal for use in one street or between nearby houses. A radio licence was required by the RA, which cost £30 for 3 years for any number of radios but again was restricted to business use only. One of the earliest advantages for residential schemes was that this product could be purchased over the counter, rather than through radio dealers. The PMR 461 frequency was not site specific therefore, you could use the radios anywhere as the radios worked back-to-back that is between each other rather than through a base station. The SRBR radio service was well regarded as it introduced new users to radio and was in fact adopted in the earliest CATCH schemes. To be acceptable to the RA for licensing purposes the earliest CATCH schemes had to be registered as security systems. In March 1999 Motorola was the first manufacturer to launch what can now be thought of as the residential radio link handset. The first models used a fairly basic dry cell battery, later replaced by models incorporating a recharging system, similar to mobile phones. Current PMR 446 radios are retailing at less than £35 each and Motorola has supported their development by sponsoring the National Neighbourhood Watch Association (NNWA) and manufacturing a branded Neighbourhood Watch radio, which is badged as such (please see - www.iscep.net/radiolinks.htm).

Conclusion

Thinking through the responses of the retailers and specifically the residents from the housing estates in the West Midlands suggested that a radio link facilitated dialogue which may either destroy or strain existing relationships or create new friendships and associations. It can then be theorised that the formation of a positive scheme may lead to the projection of those relationships across a relatively small geographical area, which may influence the participant’s perceptions of a range of issues, such as: their sense of community; of belonging; their understanding of and fear of crime; and their ability to contribute to the safety of themselves and their neighbours.
As part of that thinking it was suggested that participant’s involvement in a radio link offered them levels of reassurance (Beck and Willis, 1995; Wright, 1999; Wright, 2000) and while no clear definition has been proposed the idea seemed to merit further thought and enquiry. Any detailed consideration of these issues begins to open a whole range of potential areas for further research. While this study has focussed on issues of reassurance it is suggested that future research could be undertaken into areas such as: the nature of relationships between participants in a radio link; a longitudinal study of a radio link; and offender’s perspectives of radio links. But thinking about participative reassurance and radio links is clearly not being undertaken in a policy, policing and political vacuum. They are emerging during a period of quite considerable change and policy focus upon issues of public reassurance.

This study is not concerned with the detail of the technology because radio links merely facilitate dialogue and assist in developing – or harming – personal relationships, but more with the interaction of individuals and the effect on their level of reassurance. As stated, there has been limited research undertaken into radio links but what was of interest, and which has led to this research, was the suggestion that involvement in the schemes offered some reassurance to the participants. The question that arose was what specifically is the nature of that reassurance and why does it occur?
Chapter Two

Fear, Communities and Communication

Consideration of social systems, which enable people to communicate with each other when they are not all present at the same location, opens up a wide range of potential sociological enquiries. An example of such a research study would be to enquire into the effectiveness of such systems in transferring information between people and compare any differences between radio users and non-users. Recognising the variety of potential studies requires an explanation as to why research has been conducted into the specific relationship between individuals involved in a radio link and issues of reassurance. The reasons vary, for example they relate to policy issues such as addressing the 'reassurance gap' to the arguably more important need to offer victims of crime and individuals 'peace of mind'. At a personal level criminal victimisation through fear is far more widespread than say individual physical injury or financial loss, for example the abduction and murder of a child will be a loss felt most immediately by their family but its reporting may lead to a protective reaction or 'parental paranoia' which extends far wider (Womack, 2002: 6). Therefore, systems which offer reassurance are of importance in addressing such widespread fears of crime and protective or avoidance behaviours. At a local level consideration by organisations such as the police or Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP's) as to mechanisms by which to offer public reassurance are presently centred on increasing the number and visibility of patrol staff and reducing environmental or social indicators of crime and disorder. For example, through employing Neighbourhood Wardens to patrol housing areas to respond to complaints of anti-social behaviour and remove graffiti and abandoned cars it is hoped that one of the outcomes will be public reassurance (Jacobson and Saville, 1999). At a policy level there is an awareness of the fact that nationally crime levels have been decreasing over the last few years (Mirrlees-Black and Allen, 1998) however, only quite recently have public surveys suggested that people’s fear of crime is decreasing (Allen and Wood, 2003). In fact organisations such as the Home Office and the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) are now particularly concerned with closing the 'reassurance gap' (HMIC, 2001).
Finally, within the context of social cohesion, research into radio links and reassurance is relevant in beginning to understand the relationships between an individual’s ability to communicate with their neighbours and the development of what are described as ‘social bonds’ (Taylor et al., 1984: 326). In this chapter it is proposed to further explore the background to the research, in particular what is meant by participative reassurance. This will entail reviewing the relevant academic literature, being specifically concerned with the subject areas of visible reassurance, fear of crime, community and electronically mediated communication. The rationale behind the choice of these specific areas is that they are most closely associated with this research – fear of crime is directly relevant to issues of reassurance and concepts of community relate to individual’s participation in social networks. A review will also be undertaken of particular issues such as Neighbourhood Watch as it is the community based crime reduction initiative, which can most usefully be compared with radio links. Specific reference will also be made to cellular phones and the Internet as examples of widely used electronically mediated communication systems.

**Patrol: the Myth of Visible Reassurance**

This section begins by discussing the current national policy initiatives concerning public reassurance and fear of crime reduction and considering them in light of the knowledge gained during the above research into radio links. Specific consideration will be given to reassurance programmes, such as the National Reassurance Programme (http://www.reassurancepolicing.co.uk/) and the drive to increase the number of uniformed personnel, for example police officers, Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), and Neighbourhood and Street Crime Wardens, patrolling public areas to offer visible reassurance. In an American study Bahn (1974) conducted research into the reassurance effects offered by police patrol. In some countries the public and political demand for more police can be thought of as quite simply a requirement for more reassurance ‘the feeling of security and safety that a citizen experiences when he sees a police officer or police patrol car nearby’ (Bahn, 1974: 340-1). But the key issue and one that directly relates to radio links is that ‘...since it is obvious that more crime occurs inside buildings, hallways, passages, and vehicles than occurs in plain view on the public streets, the deterrent value of the prowl car is limited’ (Bahn, 1974: 338-9).
It can be suggested that reassurance in the home is never provided by police officers patrolling outside, a fact known to the many victims of domestic violence but may be provided by a radio link (McAllister, 2003: 7). What though is the situation in the United Kingdom? It cannot be contested that a fundamental policing activity is patrol. Police officers, security staff and wardens patrol for a number of reasons for example, to reassure the public, detect offences and assist the public (McConville and Shepherd, 1992). Police patrol has been defined by ACPO as:

‘The overt presence, whether on foot or mobile, of a locally accountable uniformed police constable who provides public reassurance; is capable of authoritative intervention and who is approachable and available to ensure an appropriate response from all the resources of the police service, to the needs and demands of the general public’ (Audit Commission, 1996a: 12) (Emphasis added).

The presence therefore, of a uniformed officer on patrol or at the scene of an incident will reassure those members of the public who can physically see the officer. This reassurance is achieved through the public perceiving there to be a reduction in the likelihood they will be a victim of a criminal act (Bahn, 1974). If one of the outcomes of police patrol is public reassurance then essentially people must see the officer or uniformed individual, logically hence the term visible reassurance. How often will that happen if the public’s attention is taken up with other everyday activities? It has been argued that increased numbers of patrolling police officers would have no discernible effects upon crime figures (Livingstone, 1996). This should come as no real surprise as it was suggested that an officer on foot patrol in London can expect to pass within a hundred yards of a burglary in progress roughly once every eight years (Clarke and Hough, 1984: 7). It is submitted that the visible presence of officers whilst on patrol or engaged in policing tasks acts as a deterrent to crime. But it has been calculated by the Audit Commission that for every police officer on patrol he or she will be responsible for:

18,000 inhabitants
7,500 houses
23 pubs
9 schools
140 miles of pavement
85 acres of parks or open spaces

77 miles of road (Audit Commission, 1996b: 5) and,

over 100 prolific criminals (Morgan and Newburn, 1997: 126).

It quickly becomes obvious that the public will rarely see the officer and therefore, are unlikely to be reassured by police patrols, hence, it is suggested, the frequent and vocal demands for more officers on the beat. In a report into effective practices in policing problem residential areas it was suggested by Morris (1996) that ‘practices to maximise public perception of a police presence may be considered a priority in light of the national objective regarding high visibility policing’ (emphasis added) and states that simple techniques, such as officers wearing high visibility jackets, targets for officers to achieve foot patrol time and double crewed vehicles stopping and allowing one of the occupants to walk back to the station will achieve these objectives (Morris, 1996).

In a study conducted by PA Consulting (2001) on behalf of the Home Office into the working patterns of a police officer it was found that 43.1 per cent of their time was spent in the police station and that for ‘...five hours a day, over 50 per cent of officers on a shift are in the station’ (2001: v). The study highlighted that only 17% of police officers time is spent on reassurance patrol and that mostly officers engage in mobile patrol from a car ‘...in part because officers need to be able to respond rapidly to priority incidents’ and that ‘...it appears that foot patrol is a rarity’ (2001: v). The study found that officers were able to get out of the police station more at night and spend ‘...two-thirds of their time out in the community – but at a time when fewer people see them – so the reassurance impact is less’ (2001: v). Butler of the Adam Smith Institute is quoted as saying that council estate tenants should be allowed to hire their own policing and enjoy some tax advantages if they are not thereby using public services so much. He said:

‘The police are pretty hopeless because they are a nationalised industry which is increasingly centralised and drawing away from its customers, so to speak, and like many big public services it tends to become more and more professionalized’ (Butler, 2001: 62).

As we have seen above (Bahn, 1974), if the deterrent value of high visibility policing is limited then logically so is the police’s ability to offer reassurance to the public.
In a study of the effectiveness of a police-led fear reduction initiative, Bennett (1991) conducted research on two housing estates, one in London and the other in Birmingham. The study was based upon American research, which discovered that citizen contact patrols provided an effective means of public reassurance. The nature of the contact was the establishment of a local police shop designed to improve police public contact and with officers visiting local residents and shopkeepers (1991: 2). Notwithstanding, both programmes achieving their implementation aims Bennett (1991) found that ‘...there was no evidence that the programme achieved its major outcome goal of directly reducing the fear of crime’ (1991: 12). The study did however; find some positive outcomes, such as: improving some aspects of the quality of life; improving respondent’s involvements with neighbours in home protection; in satisfaction with the police; and logically in contact with the police (Bennett, 1991: 12). It was concluded by Bennett (1991) that a possible reason for the police patrols not reducing people’s fear of crime was that the major factors which affect such fears are not easily controlled by the police. A similar conclusion was reached by Crawford et al. (2003) in their study of a community policing initiative in a North Yorkshire village, which found that resident’s hopes and expectations of crime and fear reduction through increased levels of police patrol had been undone through failures in the schemes implementation. The particular study also found that resident’s levels of satisfaction with the police fell while their concerns over issues such as security and safety had increased. Taking this study with that of Bahn (1974) and Bennett (1991) it should be asked if hopes for the success of police led reassurance programmes through high-visibility patrols might be misplaced.

The need for the police and other public agencies, such as local authorities to provide the means by which to reduce people’s fear of crime lies at the heart of two significant current debates. The first is the dilemma faced particularly by the police as to how to prioritise their limited resources – do they concentrate on those issues which cause most anxiety for local communities, such as litter, vandalism, noise, etc. – or do they respond to those more serious crimes which make the media headlines and inform people’s perceptions of their vulnerability, such as armed criminality, paedophilia, drug abuse, etc?

The second major policy debate surrounds the fact that for the last few years recorded levels of crime, particularly acquisitive crime, have fallen but people’s perceptions of
safety have not matched such reductions. The policy imperative therefore, of increasing the number and visibility of uniformed personnel, for example police officers, Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and wardens, as a means by which to offer both public reassurance and address local issues of crime and disorder can be best understood when placed within the context of these debates, and yet has been criticised as being of limited value (Wright, 1999).

As stated a significant dilemma for both the police and Government is that falling crime rates have not led to significant reductions in levels of reported fear of crime. It has been suggested by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) (HMIC, 2001) that such reductions in crime have been enabled, partly through increasing levels of police public contact, such as reporting a crime, being a victim or being stopped while walking or driving, factors which should lead to increased feelings of reassurance. However, such contacts are not influencing reductions in fear of crime levels, forcing a conclusion that other strategies have to be introduced. The police strategy for public reassurance as outlined in the HMIC report ‘Open all Hours’ (HMIC, 2001), which declares that the need for high levels of public confidence in the police is vital in securing witnesses to come forward and for encouraging people to provide intelligence to detect and reduce crime.

While no specific mention is made of the importance of increasing the number of victims’ complaints, particularly relevant in cases such as domestic and hate crime, the general belief is that it is necessary to secure a ‘virtuous circle’ of a ‘reassured and confident citizenry actively support[ing] the police, leading to crime and disorder reduction and even greater reassurance’ (HMIC, 2001: viii). The HMIC report defines reassurance in the context of police work as comprising two main elements: the actual and perceived level of security – both of themselves and their property; and the extent of ‘order’ – behavioural and physical that exists within the local environment. The former Chief Constable of Surrey Police, Dennis O’Connor has led upon the need for the police and other agencies to address what is termed ‘signal crimes’ which have been defined as ‘an incident that is disproportionately influential in terms of causing a person or persons to perceive themselves to be at risk in some sense’ (Innes and Fielding, 2003).
This work has led to the development of the National Reassurance Policing Programme, (www.reassurancepolicing.co.uk) which is based upon research commissioned by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) from the University of Surrey. This research, quoted in the HMIC report suggests that the maintenance of order is a priority in achieving public reassurance. The factors which influence such perceptions of order range from the physical – what people see around them, such as graffiti and litter – but also what they are told by the press and media. The HMIC report goes on to offer an initial definition of reassurance as ‘the extent to which individuals perceive that order and security exist within their local environment’ (2001: viii).

The National Reassurance Policing Programme, being promoted by the Policing Standards Unit is currently seeking to understand if signal crimes or events have a disproportionate impact on public feelings of safety. It is felt that through accurately identifying what those signal events and crimes are and addressing them, for example removing litter and graffiti, repairing broken windows or targeting police resources to reduce the incidence of disorders then these will have a beneficial effect on community well-being. The HMIC (2001) report prioritises the importance of uniformed police patrol in a community but distinguishes between a passing speeding police car, which is likely to be visible but not as effective as an accessible foot patrol officer. It is ironic that one of the disadvantages of the retail radio link highlighted by City Centre patrol officers in Leicester was the fact they were ‘too accessible’ (Beck and Willis, 1995). In one section of the HMIC report reassurance is again defined within a policing context:

‘The term ‘reassurance’ is often used interchangeably with other linked concepts such as ‘fear of crime’…A starting point is the dictionary definition, which states that to reassure is ‘the action of removing someone’s doubts and fears’. This definition extends public reassurance well beyond the remit of policing’ (HMIC, 2001: 20).

The HMIC report raises a number of policy and practical implications, for in seeking to address reassurance in 2001, particularly through reducing environmental cues of disorder, two questions could be asked of the police.
Firstly, why has it taken so long for the service to recognise the issue; arguably these issues surrounding ‘signal crimes’ have been known about since 1982 (Wilson and Kelling, 1982); and then to do something about it? And secondly, in light of the Government’s national Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (Cabinet Office, 2000), which specifically focussed large scale funding in addressing environmental issues in priority neighbourhoods, could not the service be accused of seeking to identify a problem for an already existing solution? The identification of public reassurance as a policing priority is significantly premised upon environmental audits and disorder reduction strategies, particularly graffiti, poor lighting, vandalism, litter and abandoned vehicles. It is suggested that these factors have a ‘cumulative effect on increasing perceptions of fear and heightening risk perception’ (Surrey Police, pers comm) (Original emphasis). Additionally, research commissioned by ACPO in the form of focus groups held in Surrey and Staffordshire showed that:

‘...visibility, quintessentially in the form of beat policing, affords the public the most in terms of reassurance. In the public mind there is no substitute. Perhaps, more saliently, it highlights a tension between police perceptions of beat policing – as a policing method of limited effectiveness – and public perceptions. The public believes that beat policing is the most effective generator of ‘local knowledge’ a factor, which they perceive as imperative to successful policing. The dearth of either factors impacts negatively on public reassurance’ (Surrey Police, pers comm) (Original emphasis).

While it is accepted that this study was undertaken from a police perspective and that mention is made of improving relationships between the police and communities, there appears to be an absence of consideration having been given by ACPO to issues that may also affect reassurance, such as community cohesion, social support and control. Accepting it could be argued that there is limited involvement by the police in generating community cohesion, could not the same argument be applied to removal of graffiti and abandoned cars? The relationships between crime, incivilities and fear, as outlined in Wilson and Kelling’s (1982) ‘Broken Window Theory’, have been considered by the HMIC and the University of Surrey reports above, however they have not been universally accepted, especially within the ranks of the Left Realists. In his study Matthews (1992) highlights various concerns, including questioning ‘the exact relationship between crime and incivilities: is it ‘a relationship arbitrary and contingent, or is there a causal connection [?]’ (1992: 21).
Matthews is clear in his suggestion that physical incivilities – signal crimes – are different from social incivilities, those involving people ‘the messages they give out are different, I would suggest they may create anxiety rather than be fear inducing and they don’t ‘necessarily occur together’ (1992: 25). In contrast to Broken Windows Matthews proposes that:

‘Certain crimes and incivilities seem to occur together, and the fear which is associated with them may, in part, be based on assessments of an overlap of those involved in perpetrating both crime and incivilities. Thus, in contrast to Wilson and Kelling’s thesis which claims that incivilities attract outsiders into the neighbourhood, it may be that in a range of crime and incivilities, the perpetrators are in fact the same people’ (1992: 27) (Original emphasis).

Matthews (1992) suggests the public might make decisions about their exposure to incivilities as a potential increased risk of future victimisation, thereby heightening their fears. But what would appear to be critical in these calculations is:

‘...when crime and incivilities are: 1) perceived to involve the same set of victims and offenders; 2) identified as involving the transgression of certain areas of social or defensible space; 3) to be seen as related in a temporal or developmental sequence’ (Matthews, 1992: 28).

Applying Matthews’s critique of Broken Windows to the HMIC Environmental Audits clearly shows that any periodic examination of an area by an external agency, police or council staff, might not be effective in detecting firstly, the underlying relationship between victims and offenders, secondly, be unable to detect such transgressions – even if the areas were known to the official, and thirdly, may be unable to detect any temporal or development changes. As such it is suggested that any official attempt at understanding signal crimes may be very different to resident’s appreciations of both the actual incident but also its underlying local significance. In what is a key element of Matthews (1992) paper, he believes that social empowerment, the creation of social networks and intermediary agencies, park keepers, housing concierge officers, etc. who can exercise social control, is key, for policing ‘plays a relatively minor back-up role in this empowering process’ and he argues that there should be the means by which ‘creating the mechanisms through which different values and aspirations can be mobilised, discussed and realised’ (1992: 41) (Emphasis added).
In recognising these issues a significant policy development of the current Government has been to increase the number and visibility of police officers and other uniformed personnel operating particularly within priority neighbourhoods. These latter schemes which have created Neighbourhood, Street or Street Crime Wardens (Jacobson and Saville, 1999; Wakefield, 2003) are intended to address a wide range of issues, most importantly reducing levels of crime and fear of crime. It has been suggested that these can be tackled through the presence of what Jacobson and Saville (1999) describe as a ‘full-time, recognisable ‘warden’ with the capacity to take preventive action against crime and disorder and provide general assistance to residents’ (1999: v).

Warden schemes encompass three elements: they are located primarily within residential areas – although it is to be noted that Street Wardens have a particular remit to address robbery, which occurs in other public areas; the appointment of individuals through a multi-agency partnership arrangement; and that their functions may include security patrols, environmental improvements and responding to neighbour disputes and anti-social behaviour. As part of the research conducted by the University of Surrey and Surrey Police consideration was also given to the potential contribution of Wardens to public reassurance. The research concluded that while Wardens or other authority figures can add significant value in terms of aiding reassurance they are not ‘an adequate substitute to police officers in the public mind’ (Surrey Police, pers comm). It was also noted that with an average salary of £25k for each warden there is not necessarily a cost advantage when compared to the salary of a police constable as well as there being significant differences in levels of training, protective equipment, organisational support and legal powers.

With the potential cessation of central government funding for Warden schemes’ there will eventually be a need for agencies, especially local authorities, to decide if they wish to continue to provide such a service and if so how should they fund them. Central to the demands for such services to continue will be pressure from Councillors and the small number of residents from areas in which Wardens are already patrolling to retain control over such resources. There will then be a number of other new and emerging issues for local councils to consider if they have found the money to sustain the Wardens services.
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Firstly, how to manage and co-ordinate such diverse policing services, for Wardens will now join the ranks of housing concierge officers, park rangers, environmental health officers, etc. Secondly, once these Wardens have all been confirmed as full-time employees of local councils they will have to enjoy a range of protective measures required under Health and Safety legislation, for example lone worker systems. It is possible to conceive that in the future any comparison between Wardens protective systems and those of other local government employees undertaking similar roles will lead to significant demands being made upon local authorities for additional equipment and training to protect all such employees. Thirdly, how will a local authority meet demands from areas that previously have not enjoyed the services of Wardens for a slice of the limited reassurance resources? It is suggested therefore, that there are two major issues likely to arise from the current policy direction of increasing visible reassurance. Firstly, economic with local councils and their crime reduction partners having to manage and pay for existing alternative public policing services. Secondly, within the strictures of Health and Safety legislation and in the context of increasing recourse to civil litigation it is suggested that a growing number of public employees will demand ever-greater levels of protection, through systems, legislation and equipment. These two problems, through significantly increasing the cost of provision, may reduce the quantity – ironically by increasing the professional capabilities – of non-police patrol services and as such limit the availability of the very resource currently proposed to offer public reassurance – uniformed individuals. It is to be asked, will local authorities just accept the increase in numbers of PCSOs as an alternative to paying for Wardens? And if so how will this outcome affect public reassurance through visible patrol?

It is to be noted that many local authorities now have to consider meeting the cost for the retention of Wardens (Neighbourhood and Street Crime), originally funded via the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), following the imminent cessation of Central Government funding. This decision will be made within the context of the Police Reform Act 2002 having created another sibling for the extended police family, namely PCSOs (police wardens), funded via the Home Office, who will have some enforcement powers and who are being directly employed by the police.
In what is considered to be a fascinating analogy, the last Conservative Government through the introduction of Parish Special Constables (PSCs) had also attempted to reduce levels of crime and fear by increasing the number of uniformed personnel. Comparing the two strategies, Parish Special Constables, police dominated and located in rural areas – Conservative, and Warden schemes’, partnerships dominated and located in priority urban estates – Labour, perhaps offers up an interesting study in policy decisions and priorities. In their study of PSCs Southgate et al. (1995), found that their main aims were to ‘provide a foot patrol presence and to address problems of nuisance and minor crime’ with one of the specific outcomes being ‘to increase communication between the police and rural communities’ (1995: iii) (emphasis added). The study recognised the rise in concerns about levels of rural crime, related to increases in both property offences and personal violence, were exacerbated by an awareness that:

‘...the police resources available to them were very limited. These concerns, coupled with the disposal of police premises in villages, and various reorganisations in police service delivery helped encourage the widespread anxiety that resources for rural policing were being progressively reduced’ (1995: 1) (emphasis added).

Southgate et al. (1995) quoting (Reiner, 1992) identify that increased police patrol is unlikely to lead to reductions in levels of crime and fear and that ‘rural police patrols have to cover much larger areas and more widely dispersed populations’ (1995: 1).

When considering the place of residence of the PSCs clear reference was made to the village police officer living amongst their community. However, with PSCs, who were part-time volunteers, both the police and Parish Councils agreed that they could live elsewhere so ‘they did not get personally embroiled in any of the more hostile conflicts which might arise between residents over law and order issues’ (1995: 20). This is a telling admission both of their perceived vulnerability, but more importantly of their lightweight role. Communication with the PSCs both by the public and by police colleagues was considered problematic, particularly in light of their being volunteers and only working part-time. Discussion groups, formed as part of the study, gave the use of answering machines or message system lukewarm support and in one case only three messages per month were recorded. In another case a PSC was issued with a mobile phone, the number of which was only given to the police, the parish clerk and the Home Watch co-ordinators.
The phone, which at that time cost over £300 for a six-month pilot period, had carried a total of only six messages, five of them from police officers (Southgate et al., 1995: 33). The low level of calls is perhaps reflective of the small number of crime related messages within rural communities. In a very relevant comment, the research concludes ‘PSCs have a difficult task in trying to identify who, if anyone, does now speak for the community, and what form that community actually takes’ (1995: 43) (Emphasis added).

Police recognition of the need for increased high visibility patrolling to offer public reassurance can be evidenced in the example of Merseyside Police who, prior to the Governmental concerns over street robbery, launched a high profile – in every sense of the word – patrol strategy. Jenkins (2000: 18) reported that in a survey conducted prior to the police campaign residents of Merseyside reported being most fearful of being a victim of street robbery or attack. The gap between public perception and the reality of street crime – as reported to the police – caused the police to question the residents and ask what they felt would be a solution. The response was a desire for an increased visible police presence. A Superintendent Byrne was reported as saying it is not the crimes itself that people are frightened of it is the fear of crime. He added:

‘We’re not saying that the number of street robberies isn’t a problem. What is clear is that this fear of crime is having a negative impact on the quality of life for those people’ (Jenkins, 2000: 18).

The patrol strategy involved increasing the proportion of marked police vehicles; Supt. Byrne is quoted as asking ‘Why do we need unmarked cars? If people see a police car parked up, it does make them feel safe’ (2000: 20). The report concludes by stating that the force is using more targeted policing to help the public feel reassured and that in April 2001, it is realigning its structure to return to a neighbourhood style of policing, to encourage officers to forge better relationships with the community. Similarly in a series of policy developments the police Superintendent’s Association advocated a range of measures designed to increase police visibility, for example more uniformed foot patrols, fewer plain clothes officers, that constables should patrol alone rather than in pairs, spend less time in cars and eat in restaurants, pubs and cafes instead of staff canteens, with all these measures being intended to offer public reassurance (Johnston, 2000: 12).
In a comment upon the development of increased numbers of non-police patrols, and their future role, the Home Office (2001) report ‘Criminal Justice – the way ahead’ suggests that a range of people contribute to community safety, for example park keepers (some with constabulary powers), security guards in shopping centres, car park attendants, neighbourhood wardens, and the private security industry. The report identifies the issue for policing is how these various agencies’ activities can be co-ordinated to make the most effective contribution to making safer communities and to achieving public reassurance. It is relevant to note that this diffusion of state authority raises an important issue as to accountability and extension of authority (Wakefield, 2003). Sir Ian Blair, the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, has proposed that the police should undertake such co-ordination of local security provision. Thinking through the uncertainty of funding for Wardens and the significant increase in numbers of PCSOs, could it be suggested that the Home Office has wrestled control of public area patrol from the ODPM?

To enable our better understanding of reassurance this study will need to consider those circumstances or individual characteristics, which contribute to or cause an individual to be fearful of crime. This is because our understanding of fear of crime will serve to assist our analysis of radio user’s responses. In addition it will inform our discussion of the relationship between fear and anxiety. This study entails a specific examination of one aspect of the current form of residential radio links – does mobile person-to-person and person-to-group communication systems, involving individuals, who need not be physically together, but who can talk to and listen out for each other, offer participative reassurance to those involved?

**Participative Reassurance: A Definition**

Relationships between people exist in a multitude of locations and contexts, for example work and marriage. Those relationships can be positive; such as when people meet and pray together or they can be destructive, when rival football fans fight each other. Relationships can be expressed in a wide variety of means: through the spoken word; text messages; or actions such as agreeing to be a godparent or helping strangers with directions.
And it can also be said that relationships are very important to people, in some cases it may mean the difference between life and death, for example donating blood. Relating these thoughts to radio links it is clear that people, as we have seen with retail staff, share a number of relationships with other radio users. They talk to one another and listen out when others call. They also assist each other not only when they are threatened with violence or by a car bomb and help unknown members of the public who may lose their children. In a residential neighbourhood it can be suggested there is a divide and often conflict between privacy and sociability. People will want to enjoy the comfort of their own homes, to relax and shrug off the obligations of their public existence and yet seek to establish positive social relations with their neighbours, interactions that may safeguard them both, for example watching out for each other’s homes. These relationships are undertaken and facilitated through communication for example, positively through talking to or negatively shouting abuse at each other. In circumstances where there is a positive relationship between neighbours it is suggested supportive participation can be considered to be divided into four main areas of activity: looking out for each other – such as when a neighbour is on holiday and you look after their home; caring for each other – such as doing the shopping or running an errand for a neighbour; enforcing community control and maintaining standards – such as telling a neighbour’s children off when they are rowdy; and finally socialising and committing to each other – such as attending social events i.e. christenings and parties. In the context of residential communities it is suggested that community participation can be thought of as the active and positive involvement of an individual in the lives of their neighbours, thereby establishing supportive social networks. As such it can be submitted that the existence of community participation presupposes there exists between individuals and households levels of inter-personal communication, elements of mutual trust and understanding, a shared interest and investment in their neighbourhood and a hope for an acceptable or improved quality of life. The essence of this study therefore, is to determine if those shared relationships create a ‘social bond’ (Taylor et al., 1984) between people who may previously not have known each other and if through the medium of communication they enjoy a sense of reassurance. Thinking about reassurance perhaps requires consideration of some hypothetical scenarios to try to find elements of reassurance. Imagine you are sitting in a room on your own and you hear outside the door the sound of someone behaving violently. Would you be reassured?
If not would the presence of a group of strangers in the room with you, offer you any form of reassurance? Or would the presence of a group of your friends and relatives in the room with you offer reassurance?

Thinking through the scenarios above it is suggested that reassurance, when you are faced with the threat of the violent stranger, may be derived from different sources, internal and external. When on your own you may feel you are reassured because of say, your personal attributes, your physique, level of self-defence training or the fact you have a weapon. Reassurance in the context of the presence of other people can obviously vary. If those people are your family and friends it is safe to assume they would, through the relationship you enjoy, offer you some protection from the violent stranger. If however, those people are strangers, you may on the one hand be reassured if they are say followers of the same football team or of the same religion, but not necessarily if they are not. There has been some research undertaken to determine if people would be prepared to intervene for the common good. Attwood et al. (2003) undertook a survey and asked what individuals did the last time they saw someone drop some litter? This showed that only 15% of those questioned challenged the perpetrator and asked them to pick the litter up, while 25% picked it up themselves. The majority 39% ignored the incident and 22% thought about challenging the perpetrator but again did nothing (Attwood et al., 2003: 69). It can be assumed that placing yourself at risk while seeking to trust a complete stranger to come to your aid might be an ill-judged strategy, however see the findings of Hackler et al. (1974) below.

It is suggested therefore, that participative reassurance in the context of residential communities has a number of key elements. These include; the presence of trusted relationships based upon a variety of shared interests; the ability to communicate and relate to each other and the existence of a real or perceived threat or challenge to that community. Taking these thoughts together it is proposed that a definition of participative reassurance is:

'\text{The reassurance derived by individuals through their participation in supportive social networks}'.
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One of the most important studies related to ‘participative reassurance’ is that of Giddens (1991) whose work on what he termed; ‘ontological security’ (1991: 35) is directly relevant. Giddens begins to explain ontological security by suggesting that as human beings we are aware of what we are doing and why, nearly all of the time. He describes that awareness as being ‘reflexive’ in that we continuously monitor the ‘circumstances’ of our activities as a characteristic of all human actions, if asked, Giddens believes, all of us are able to intuitively describe and interpret our behaviour. As part of our everyday activities we conduct what he describes as ‘non-conscious’, rather than unconscious, reflexive monitoring of our actions, which are integral to continuing our daily life. This non-conscious or practical consciousness is the mechanism, which enables us to go on. Giddens asserts that ‘Most forms of practical consciousness could not be ‘held in mind’ during the course of social activities, since their tacit or taken-for-granted qualities form the essential conditions which allows actors to concentrate on tasks at hand’ (1991: 35).

In the back of our minds then, non-consciously, we are continuously monitoring what it is we are doing and why. That practical consciousness is the ‘cognitive and emotive anchor of the feelings of ontological security characteristic of large segments of human activity in all cultures’ (Giddens, 1991: 36) (Original emphasis). The feeling that our self, our being, is secure is nothing less than essential for us as human beings to continue our everyday existence. If you think about trying to read this thesis with a stranger leaning over you holding a knife, do you believe you could concentrate? (it is hoped you find the subject so interesting that you could!).

It is suggested that the threat posed by the stranger is such that the everyday activity of reading would be unsustainable. Having defined ontological security Giddens then describes what it is that creates such a sense of feeling. He suggests that trust is the key issue ‘the existential anchorings of reality in an emotional, and to some degree in a cognitive, sense rests on confidence in the reliability of persons’ (1991: 38). A more detailed analysis of the importance of trust is described below; however, Giddens suggests that the basic elements of trust are learnt as an infant through a relationship with its mother or ‘caretaker’. During this time the infant learns the importance of habit and routine, which play an important role in establishing and reinforcing the relationship between the child and its caretaker.
In essence Giddens suggests that the routines of sleep, feeding, cleaning, etc. establish within the infant confidence as to the security of its future, basically its survival. The infant learns the key connection between, routine, the 'reproduction of co-ordinating conventions' and the feelings of safety, 'ontological security' (1991: 39). Giddens goes on to say that we, 'the actor', maintain constant vigilance to enable us to 'go on' with our lives. What considerably helps is the maintenance of 'habits and routines' as a 'crucial bulwark against threatening anxieties, yet by that very token it is a tensionful phenomenon in and of itself' (1991: 39). In an important passage Giddens describes how the discipline of routine, the everyday repeated activities of life, helps us to create a 'formed framework' to assist our understanding of ourselves as 'being' rather than 'non-being', which he suggests is 'elemental to ontological security.' At a basic level we are aware of a vast range of risks and dangers but trust that for us, for all of the time, we will not come to harm. If we did not have that 'basic trust' then we would not walk out of our front door everyday. That basic trust is therefore, termed by Giddens as a:

'...screening-off device in relation to risks and dangers in the surrounding settings of action and interaction. It is the main emotional support of a defensive carapace or protective cocoon, which all normal individuals carry around with them as the means whereby they are able to get on with the affairs of day-to-day life' (1991: 39-40) (Original emphasis).

We therefore, have a sense of reduced vulnerability which derives from our basic trust and which allows us to block out any 'negative possibilities in favour of a generalised attitude of hope' (1991: 40). Giddens (1991) points out that the protective cocoon is a false creation, we know people are hurt and that risks are real. That protective barrier 'may be pierced temporarily or permanently, by happenings which demonstrate as real the negative contingencies built into all risk' (1991: 41). That non-specific risk, the abstract danger that lurks outside, is understood by Giddens to be anxiety. Anxiety therefore, has to be differentiated from fear:

'Fear is a response to a specific threat and therefore has a definite object. As Freud says, anxiety, in contrast to fear, 'disregards the object': in other words, anxiety is a generalised state of the emotions of the individual. How far anxiety will be felt in any given situation, Freud goes on to point out, depends to a large degree on a person's 'knowledge and sense of power vis-à-vis the external world' (1991: 43-44).
It is perhaps important to note the use of the word power, which is related to feelings of connectivity with one’s surroundings and neighbours, of control and knowledge. Giddens specifically differentiates between the sense of ‘anxious readiness’, which is different from anxiety because it is a ‘functional, condition of preparedness’ in the face of a given threat. He suggests ‘preparation for action, as it were, is what expedites an appropriate response to danger; anxiety itself is inexpedient and tends to paralyse relevant actions rather than generate them’ (1991: 44). In a further analysis of anxiety Giddens suggests that it is not caused by our ‘unconscious repression’ but rather it is the opposite effect ‘repression, and the behavioural symptoms associated with it, are created by anxiety’. He explains that anxiety is ‘essentially fear’, which is formed through there being no specific danger or threat, for example we cannot see or hear the risk of our being a victim of a crime but are anxious we may become one. Such, ‘unconsciously formed emotive tensions’ begin to ‘express ‘internal dangers’ rather than externalised threats’ (1991: 44).

In summary therefore, Giddens (1991) believes that anxiety is a free-floating unconscious feeling rather than a response, a fear, of a specific threat or danger and suggests that when we express an anxiety about a specific issue, for example going to a particular location, we may be expressing a fear as that location exists. Giddens makes an important contribution through his definition of ontological security. That security of being is based on routines of daily life, those everyday behaviours and thoughts, which enable us to place our realisation of danger and risk in some semblance of order and thereby, to retain them under control. However, anxiety also differs from fear in so far as it concerns (unconsciously) perceived threats to the individual. Giddens tells us that:

‘Anxiety ... attacks the core of the self once a basic security system is set up, which is why it is so difficult for the individual to objectify it. Rising anxiety tends to threaten awareness of self-identity, since awareness of the self in relation to constituting features of the object-world becomes obscured. It is only in terms of the basic security system, the origin of the sense of ontological security, that the individual has the experience of self in relation to a world of persons and objects organised cognitively through basic trust’ (1991: 45).
This passage began by suggesting that in the context of our understanding of participative reassurance that the work of Giddens, his definition of ontological security, the importance of routines and anxiety was of real importance. How does ontological security relate to participative reassurance? It is suggested that the security of self, of being, derived through the discipline of routine, offers the level of basic reassurance referred to by Giddens, as being ontological security. The routine of activity, for example social participation – talking to your neighbours – and community connectivity – knowing you are an active member of your neighbourhood – sustains the sense of ontological security. That anxiety is not fear can be directly compared with reassurance and relief. It is suggested that reassurance is a sense of wellbeing rather than relief at the absence of a specific risk or threat. We are relieved when the stranger with the knife is arrested but reassured by the house being locked and the burglar alarm set. We know and feel relived when the stranger is arrested, as that is an actual event but feel reassured through improving our security against a non-specific eventuality. How that reassurance is derived, its relationship with participation in radio links and how it is informed by research into anxiety, determine the essential relationships that constitute this study.

**Fear of Crime**

In this section it is intended to consider fear of crime and how a variety of factors influence perceptions of fear such as, age and gender specifically as these are related to concepts of anxiety and reassurance. It can be stated with certainty that research into fear of crime has generated a sizeable body of literature and attracted a large degree of debate with active sub-sets of division surrounding issues such as appropriate research methods, (for example Hollway and Jefferson, 2000) and arguments about what is being measured: anxiety, fear or anger, (for example Ditton et al. 2000). In one of the earliest works in this field Furstenberg (1971) makes the distinction between concern about crime, and the fear of victimisation. It is suggested by Furstenberg that the fear of crime is assessed by an individual’s perception of their risk of victimisation but that concern [anxiety] is based upon people’s judgment as to the level of crime in their area.
The work of Furstenberg however, is set within a particular historical context, what Ditton and Farrall (2000) describe as ‘…murky, if not downright Machiavellian … what we now rather blandly describe as fear of crime began life as the fear of blacks’ (2000: xv). The racist implications of this early study are alluded to in the reference to concern about crime in the locality ‘…our findings generally support the view that concern about crime is at least in part an expression of resentment of changing social conditions, especially efforts to eliminate racial injustice’ (1971: 8) (Emphasis added). In this one early example the debate about the relationship between fear, crime and society is clearly illustrated. Before beginning, through defining fear of crime, it is useful to reiterate that it is important to identify the factors which influence people’s fear and define what is the effect of fear upon people as these issues will inform our understanding of participative reassurance.

**Understanding Fear of Crime**

Allatt (1984) in a study of the impact of improved security measures on difficult to let housing estates concludes:

‘Finally for a substantial proportion on both estates the fear was sufficient to adversely affect their living patterns. A few were made ill by worry, several more said they could not sleep, whilst the majority said social and family life was affected; for example, they could never or only rarely go out, husband and wife could not go out together and families could not be visited’ (Allatt, 1984: 174).

Allatt goes on to describe the fear of crime as ‘destructive worry’. In their American study Norris et al. (1997) strongly believe that ‘…crime poses a significant threat to our nation’s health … engenders pervasive and persistent psychological distress’ (1997: 163). This observation sets the scene for what is the reality for most of us, we worry about many things but we will all worry about criminal victimisation some time or other during most of our lives. Furedi (1998) when discussing what he terms ‘the worship of safety’ states ‘…we are living through insecure times and that as a result people are more anxious and predisposed to fearing risks’ (1998: 8). This seemingly ever-increasing but unanswerable demand for more ‘safety’ – perhaps mirrored in the demands for more police patrol, better health, improved education, etc. – creates, what Bauman calls the ‘tangible means to an elusive end’ (2000: 36). The effects of such demands:
‘...is the self-propelling of fear. Preoccupation with personal safety, inflated and overloaded with meanings beyond its capacity due to the tributaries of existential insecurity and psychological uncertainty, towers yet higher over all other articulated fear, casting all other reasons of anxiety in a yet deeper shade’ (Bauman, 2000: 36) (Emphasis added).

Bauman (2000) further suggests that ‘fighting crime, like crime itself, and particularly the crime targeted on bodies and private property, makes an excellent, exciting, eminently watchable show’ (2000: 36). It can be argued that this ‘watchable show’ promoted via the media and fiction is likely to further increase our preoccupation with personal safety thereby, fuelling the ‘self-propelling of fear’. If this is the reality of our fear then what are its characteristics?

A number of writers have sought to define fear of crime, examples of these are: ‘...perceived threats to personal safety in crime victimisation surveys’ (Carrabine et al. 2002: 69); ‘...a recognition of a situation as possessing at least potential danger, real or imagined...’ (Ferraro, 1995: 4); ‘...a personalised threat rather than abstract beliefs and attitudes about crime as a problem’ (Maxfield, 1984:3); and ‘...an internal disturbance produced by an objectively harmful external condition’ (LaGrange and Ferraro, 1987: 384). These different definitions suggest that fear of crime is related to an external threat, particularly one which is of a violent nature likely to result in the subject being harmed, the consequence of which is that the subject will be emotionally and or mentally disturbed.

In his study of psychology and crime, Ainsworth (2000) discussed the general public’s understanding of crime rates. He notes that people do not read official papers or academic journals about crime but rely far more upon information ‘...from the mass media and from rumour, gossip, embellished stories or urban myths’ (2000: 20). This is important in that there is continued official concern over crime rates, particularly as people tend to over-estimate the problem (Mirrlees-Black and Allen, 1998: 1). And yet ‘official’ pronouncements count for little in people’s experiences of crime and fear. In recent times the extent and fear of crime, perhaps sparked by just one incident, such as the abduction and murder of children, have had dramatic effects producing ‘... a massive amount of fear and result in an increase in protective (and hopefully preventive) behaviour by a large number of people (Ainsworth 1995a quoted in Ainsworth, 2000: 21).
One such case that was specifically mentioned during this research was that of the abduction and murder of the two children Holly Wells and Jessica Chapman in August 2002 from the village of Soham, Cambridgeshire. Ainsworth (2000: 24) provides a most useful description of the effects of crime and fear; what he calls the psychology of victimisation, which can affect an individual’s whole life. Studies by Davis and Friedman (1985) found some 75 per cent of victims of burglary, robbery and assault were found to experience distress or sleeping disorders up to three weeks after the event, and others by Resnick et al. (1993) and Sorrensen and Golding (1990), describe the impact of crime victimisation on people as experiencing a ‘deterioration in their mental health.’ The importance of fear of crime is summarised by Ainsworth:

‘... becoming a victim threatens people’s feelings of control – they may have to admit that they were powerless to prevent a crime occurring. A feeling of safety and security has been identified as one of the most basic foundations for human fulfilment (Maslow, 1954). Thus, if an individual no longer feels safe in their own home, or when walking down the street, much of their fundamental feeling of well-being will be threatened’ (2000: 38).

The feeling of control is clearly related to Giddens (1991) ‘ontological security’ and in concluding his review of the impact of crime and fear on individuals Ainsworth refers to the work of Shaw (1999) who suggests that chronic victimisation can have such a devastating emotional impact that it can produce many of the symptoms normally associated with bereavement (2000: 41). It can be concluded therefore, that reducing the number of incidents of criminal victimisation will have a direct and beneficial effect upon an individual’s sense of control and wellbeing. However, in a number of cases fear of crime can have a devastating impact on not only the individual but upon the wider population as well. Having noted the severity of the issue and existence of several debates about the fear of crime it is intended to examine in more detail specific circumstances surrounding people’s fear of crime and in conclusion how these relate to participative reassurance.
Fear of Crime and Age

The context within which we consider fear and age is that the UK population is steadily getting older. The Association of British Insurers (ABI) in its statistical and research review (2000: 14) records that the Government Actuaries Department (GAD) predicts that by 2040 there will be 15.9 million people over state pension age, an increase of nearly 50%. The reasons given for this increase in population ageing are an improvement in life expectancy coupled with a reduction in birth rate. This means that:

‘Between 1940 and 2000 life expectancy at birth for men increased steadily from 58 years to 75 years, while for women it rose from 63 to 80 years’ (ABI, 2000: 14).

In the same year the ABI (2000) analysed the future crime trends in the United Kingdom. Their analysis was based upon the results of the British Crime Surveys up until 1998 and the UK Government’s Foresight Programme (www.foresight.gov.uk). In the executive summary the ABI predicted that:

‘Changes in demographics and lifestyle are likely to produce groups and members of society with an increased risk from criminal attack in the future. For example, the potential increase in the percentage of elderly people due to better health care, etc. may provide a vulnerable target to attack’ (ABI, 2000: v).

Taken together the two papers from the ABI indicate there will be an increase in the number of elderly people, particularly women, and logically an increase in the number of elderly persons who may become victims of crime. It is important therefore, within this context to understand the relationship between fear of crime and the elderly. In a recent Home Office study Chivite-Matthews et al. (2002) found that older people have similar levels of worry for most crimes to those of other age groups, however statistically they face a reduced risk of becoming a victim of crime (2002: 1). While older people may be less likely to become a victim of crime, in particular related to their household or violence they are more likely to report such crimes to the police and are much less likely to be repeatedly victimised. The report found that:
Older women are more likely than older men to worry about fear of household or personal crime. Those that perceive their health to be bad or very bad also worry more about crime than those that perceive their health to be fair to very good. This may help to explain why older people have disproportionate levels of fear, given their relatively low levels of victimisation, as they also tend to suffer from worse health than the other age groups' (Chivite-Matthews et al., 2002: 1).

In their research into fear of crime Clarke and Lewis (1982) studied the responses of elderly people living in an urban environment, including those from sheltered housing schemes. The research sought to pay particular attention to the social conditions within which elderly people lived, for example factors such as those living in age homogeneous and sheltered conditions as against those who were not. The authors also sought to enquire into the relationship between actual crime victimisation and the problem posed by fear of crime itself. Their conclusion was that ‘it was found that fear of personal victimisation was an important feature in the lives of the elderly’ (1982: 60). The same study also looked at the differences between residential circumstances, for example with sheltered accommodation there is a degree of age similarity between residents, there is more supervision and by implication security offered by on-site wardens and an enhanced support network, through extensive personal contact and social events (1982: 52). They concluded from their study that when comparing residents from sheltered accommodation with those living in unsheltered ‘fear was more frequently expressed by subjects in unsheltered accommodation’ (1982: 61). Clarke and Lewis (1982) determined that the factors, which influenced this, were reduced levels of contact with their neighbours and thereby uncertainty as to the extent of support they may expect to receive. They also noted the stronger personal relationships that exist in sheltered accommodation, which provided a cohesive social support network, and because of age-similarities and communal activity it generated a sense of common identity. The impact of this fear of crime and perceived threat is ‘...that they may influence the manner in which individuals organise their daily activities...’ and ‘...have repercussions on the quality of life experienced by individuals due to self-imposed restrictions on certain social activities and the subsequent engendering of feelings of isolation and alienation’ (1982: 53). The key issues that emerge from this study are that relationships sustained through inter-personal contact offer increased levels of social support and reassurance.
A study by LaGrange and Ferraro (1987) critically examined research conducted into fear of crime amongst the elderly. The authors concluded that ‘...the portrait of fear drawn by surveys of the public is largely contingent upon the measurement process and many estimates of the prevalence of fear may be overstated’ (1987: 376). A more detailed review shall be undertaken in the next chapter of the debates surrounding research into fear of crime, in particular the validity of survey data, suffice to say LaGrange and Ferraro (1987) take issue with studies which point to the 'victimisation-fear paradox' (Lindquist and Duke, 1982). The author’s found that ‘...the elderly are no more afraid of crime when it is concretely measured, but are somewhat more fearful – or anxious – of crime when measured as formless fear’ (1987: 376). The reference to anxiety mirrors our earlier consideration of Giddens (1991) ‘ontological security’ and highlights the importance of offering elderly people systems of reassurance. This conclusion is mirrored by the findings of Ferraro (1995) who succinctly identified that: ‘Neither older people nor their interpretation of victimisation risk are the problem. Crime is’. He concludes by advising that if you wish to find the status characteristic most likely to affect fear ‘...age is a poor candidate. Sex is a far more substantial predictor...’ (1995: 83).

Fear of Crime and Gender

In her book ‘Everyday Violence’ Elizabeth Stanko introduces the subject by stating, ‘Violence for women, is so common that it often goes unnoticed’ (1990: v). This stark assessment of the risk and fear of criminal victimisation to women is compounded by the absence of consideration given by fear of crime studies to ‘private’ violence. As Stanko identified:

‘But when we speak about fear of crime, why do we exclude the anxiety and fear caused by experiences of private danger? To talk about fear of crime, instead of fear of danger, means that criminologists can only discuss the hazards of the ‘public’ (1990: 146).

If gender related fear is known to stalk the private realm how effective will reassurance measures, which operate in the public domain, such as uniformed personnel and CCTV, be in reducing women’s fear of crime? It is suggested that in many regards current policy initiatives to reduce fear of crime are singularly failing a large and vulnerable group of victims, namely women in abusive relationships.
If this suggestion is accurate then can a different conclusion be drawn from women’s general experiences when out in the public domain?

In her essay on women in public places and their concerns with crime prevention Gardner (1990) analysed the impact of violence, in particular sexual assault and its effects upon the behaviour of both women and men. She summarises her observations by stating ‘…women’s fear of crime in public spaces does not spoil public places for women alone, but that it also spoils, in some larger sense, men for women and women for men and public places for everyone’ (1990: 325). These rather bleak introductions to the subject of fear of crime and gender highlight the very great deal of concern that rightly exists about criminal victimisation of women, in particular sexual assault.

Clarke and Lewis (1982) found that in their study of older people that women were more fearful of crime than men, with over half the female subjects being more afraid as compared to just over a third of men. It is right to recognise that women are more afraid of crime than men (Akers et al., 1987; Warr, 1984, quoted in Ferraro, 1995: 85) but it is especially relevant to enquire why such a difference exists. Ferraro (1995) in reviewing the relevant literature concludes that ‘…*any* victimisation of women may involve the possibility of sexual assault’ (Original emphasis) and:

‘Rape certainly qualifies as a perceptually contemporaneous offence to most crimes; but its uniqueness as a form of victimisation to women probably escalates the degree of fear attending other crimes committed against women’ (1995: 87).

What has been described as the ‘shadow of sexual assault’ (Ferraro, 1995: 86) or ‘female fear’ (Gordon and Riger, 1989), is often only conceived as being experienced by women when in the public domain. Again Stanko (1990) cautions us to remember that ‘the public discussion about women and violence only acknowledges women’s fear of attack at the hands of strange men’ (1990: 9), which is in clear contradiction to the findings of the 2000 British Crime Survey (BCS) (Myhill and Allen, 2002).
In their analysis of the BCS interviews it was found that; women are most likely to be sexually assaulted by men they know (32%), partners (22%), or acquaintances, and ‘current partners’ accounting for (45%) of reported rapes. In contrast strangers were only responsible for (8%) of reported rapes, which appears to confirm that fear of crime victimisation from a women’s perspective is most likely to occur within familiar surroundings, often the home and by people they have entrusted, most often their partners.

The implications of this overview of a large volume of research are that any policy initiatives aimed at offering reassurance to women must not be limited to the public domain, for example through environmental improvements or uniformed patrol. To do so will fail to address the real issues of their experience of crime and fear therefore, any systems of reassurance must reach into the home, the location in which arguably some women have most to fear.

*Fear of Crime and Race*

At the beginning of this review of the fear of crime literature, specific mention was made of the alleged racist implications inherent within the early American studies. Indeed Ditton and Farrall (2000: xvii) observe that Liska et al. (1982) ‘…found that racial segregation was related directly to low levels of white crime fear’ and Stinchcombe et al. (1980) that ‘…white crime fear was related to both proximity to black people and to racial prejudice’. Moeller (1989) in her study of fear of crime, which focussed on the racial composition of American neighbourhoods, found that community size was related to fear and suggested that residents living in large urban neighbourhoods rather than rural settings were more likely to be fearful (1989: 214). She also found a strong correlation between racial composition of neighbourhoods and race, implying that whites will tend to live in racially segregated neighbourhoods, but concluded that ‘…race as a predictor of fear of crime has not yet been firmly established’ (1989: 219). The findings from these American studies offer no clear policy implications for reassurance strategies in Britain. It can be strongly suggested that offering racial segregation, as a solution for fear of crime is both repugnant and destined to fail – people will equally fear same-race burglars.
In contrast to the alleged racist findings of the early studies Ditton and Farrall (2000) comment that work by others, particularly Skogan (1995) concluded that ‘...blacks are more likely to be fearful and that there is probably good reasons for this (in America, anyway, they are more likely to be victimised and more likely to live in neighbourhoods where serious crime is more frequent)’ (2000: xvii). The above findings are directly relevant to this study in that the radio link scheme in Eastville was located amongst a resident BME community.

This community comprising a majority of Muslim families sharing similar religious and ethnic backgrounds was chosen for its specific identity however, during the course of the research the events of the 11th September 2001 (9-11) the war on terrorism and the second Gulf war in Iraq raised a number of issues for UK based Muslim communities. These comprised fear of identification, through dress and appearance, with Muslim based terrorism and potential reprisals. The same concerns have been reported upon in America (Rennie, 2002) and while the findings from the research will be discussed later suffice to say it is encouraging to report that during interviews only one respondent commented upon these issues, suggesting that there was limited apparent impact from 9-11 on the research.

**Fear of Crime and Victimisation**

Direct experience of crime, for example being assaulted or having your house broken into, is, for many people, an experience likely to result in them not only being fearful during that specific event but of being afraid of that crime reoccurring (Maxfield, 1987; Ainsworth, 2000). It is also found that people who associate with others who are victims of crime, experience what has been termed ‘indirect victimisation’ or ‘vicarious victimisation’ (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981) and that indirect victimisation is in itself a powerful predictor of fearfulness. A contrary finding by Clarke and Lewis (1982) whose study divided respondents into two groups: those with personal and or indirect knowledge of crime and those with no experience, found that:

‘Analysis of the data showed that those subjects having indirect victimisation experience were not over-represented among the fearful individuals. In other words, those having knowledge of victims were not more likely to be fearful of crime’ (1982: 58).
Clarke and Lewis (1982) suggested that information about the criminal victimisation of others is considered an ‘informational variable’, which affects the fear of crime. It does not necessarily follow that knowing of the victimisation of another person will lead to fear of crime but it will ‘...form the basis for the individual’s subjective assessment of the risk of victimisation’ (1982: 58).

This study though, conducted amongst older people may not be directly comparable to the initial findings of, say Skogan and Maxfield (1981) because of the influence of the sheltered housing in which some of the respondents lived. In their study Norris et al. (1997) found that ‘greater levels of fear of crime were also reliably associated with victimisation, especially with larceny and violence’ (1997: 160). They conclude that crime is a significant cause of stress with victims of repeat victimisation suffering longer-term effects with poorer outcomes. It is suggested that clinically these findings have important implications in that for any ‘treatment’ to be truly effective it must influence both the victim and the environment. This is most obviously the case with domestic violence but Norris et al. (1997) suggest assessments should be made of future risk of victimisation ‘...based on lifestyle and environmental factors’ (1997: 162). It can be suggested therefore, that based upon the findings from the above studies that fear of crime has a direct relationship with actual victimisation, with repeated victimisation having a severe and detrimental impact on the mental health of individuals.

**Fear of Crime and Social Networks**

It has been suggested that fear of crime can be attributed to a breakdown in social relationships and that where strong social bonds exist then crime as well as feelings of insecurity may be reduced (Henig and Maxfield, 1978). The work of Clarke and Lewis (1982) also found evidence in support of this, as residents living in sheltered accommodation reported lower levels of fear of crime, than those living in non-sheltered. The authors concluded that:

‘Overall the findings indicate that those persons residing in protective, age-concentrated housing environments knew and recognised more people as neighbours, had more frequent contact with them and were more certain that they could rely on them for help and support than were persons living in non-protective, age-integrated residential environments’ (1982: 60).
Clarke and Lewis (1982: 59) hypothesised that the greater the number, frequency and intensity of social contacts the lower the fear of crime. This was believed to be because social interaction, which it is suggested must always be facilitated by interpersonal communication, engenders supportive relationships and reduces the number of people who may be viewed as strangers. While this study makes a contribution to our understanding it can be suggested that within the environment of a sheltered housing facility for elderly people there may be a range of other factors present which could have a significant impact upon reducing their fear of crime other than just personal contact. For example, when comparing the environment within sheltered housing against those in a more age diverse residential environment there will be factors such as, indicators of disorder: noisy neighbours; abandoned cars; litter; or damaged street furniture. If the sheltered scheme employs the services of a warden it can also be assumed there may be constant reassuring contact with a guardian figure that is tasked with offering protection. As such the work of Clarke and Lewis (1982) may be taken to be indicative only without a wider study being undertaken.

It has been found that the likelihood of a potential intervention by an observer on behalf of a victim significantly increases when they are known to each other. The work of Hackler et al. (1974) found that the likelihood of such intervention increases with familiarity, even if the victim and observer had previously met only briefly. This is important in that it can be assumed knowledge of each other increases through greater social contact and cohesion leading to an increased likelihood of interventions in cases of emergency. It is possible to theorise that based upon these findings increased levels of inter-personal communication and social contact leads to greater familiarity and thereby, meeting reduced numbers of ‘strangers’ leads to an increased likelihood of assistance being provided to others.

The work of Sundeen and Mathieu (1976) found that the existence of a cohesive and extensive network of social contacts creates a sense of community, which can be influential in reducing fear of crime. Norris et al. (1997) researched the impact of various crime prevention strategies on reducing the psychological effects of criminal victimisation. They found that precautionary behaviour practised both at the individual and household level had little impact on reducing the risk of victimisation. However:
‘The most promising strategy was protective neighbouring because it showed no adverse effects and some positive ones, such as the capacity to buffer the effects of fear on generalised distress’ (1997: 162).

The above review of literature related to fear of crime has identified some of the areas where social or individual characteristics may lead to an increased level of fear, such as: age; gender; race; criminal victimisation; and absence of social networks. The concluding observations about the relationship between social contact and protective neighbourhoods are clearly related to concepts of community. Within any residential area the absence of positive and supportive social relationships may lead people to describe their area as lacking a sense of community. What does this mean and what does it tell us about participative reassurance? Can we determine, from a review of the available literature, if a radio link creates a sense of community amongst its participants and what in turn does that tell us about the relevance of social interaction as a means by which to reduce fear and anxiety through offering levels of reassurance?

**Concepts of Community**

Concepts of community occupy a central section of this chapter as they cover a wide range of the key issues concerned with the structure and meaning of participative reassurance within a social network, such as a radio link. This section will therefore, consider definitions of community, trust, social support and control and conclude with alternative perspectives on the centrality of community. In this section we begin by utilising the question of whether a radio link comprises a community as a means by which to explore some of the main issues surrounding the concepts of community.

There is a significant body of literature concerning community, a word described by Bauman (2001) as having ‘a feel’. He considers that ‘it feels good: whatever the word ‘community’ may mean it is good ‘to have a community’, ‘to be in a community’. However, he believes that community stands for the kind of world which is not, ‘regrettably available to us’ (2001: 1). In their study of community Crow and Allan (1994) believe that ‘it is clear that while community is often associated with place, it is by no means the case that all communities are territorial communities...’ (1994: xvi).
Crow and Allen (1994) in their study suggest that there are a number of features of a community; these include social networks located within neighbourhood, kinship and friendship networks, which make up 'community life' and ties based upon links between individuals with ‘...common residence, common interests, common attachments or some other shared experience generating a sense of belonging’ (1994: 1). They quote the work of Willmott (1986) who simply suggests that community refers to people having something in common. Willmott (1986) identifies a second meaning where the basis of community is ‘...shared characteristics other than place, in which people are linked together by factors such as common ethnic origin, religion, occupation or leisure pursuits’ (Crow and Allan, 1994: 3).

Fielding (1986) analysed the different meanings of community, firstly a fixed or bounded locality, secondly ‘...there is a colloquial sense of a common culture in which values such as ‘community spirit’, ‘common identity’ and shared experiences are assumed; homogeneity is emphasised’ (1986: 172). Fielding though describes his third understanding of community as being ‘a local social system, a set of social relationships which take place wholly or mostly within a locality. A community exists if there is a network of inter-relationships among the inhabitants of the same village’ (1986: 173). Applying these considerations to a radio link it is possible to find that each of the current systems, (see above), has a specific geographical focus, for example retail radio links are designed to cover town and city centres and residential schemes may operate in a single road or street. In addition the participants have a number of common interests and attachments, such as retail staff exchanging information on violent shop thieves, or residents discussing how to deal with a neighbour found drunk in their car (see below). Taking the definition of a community used by Crow and Allan (1994) as not being bound by territorial limits, it is possible to ask does participation in a radio link creates a virtual community?

Accepting that the radio users, for example retail staff or residents, work or live in a specific geographical location their participation in the network means the individuals need not be in the same location. As such it is possible to theorise that the participants may enter into a dual sense of community, firstly one of location, residents can pop round to their neighbour’s home, but also one that exists through their own creation – a virtual community lived and experienced by the participants themselves. As Crow and Allan (1994) state:
‘Community’ stands as a convenient shorthand term for the broad realm of local social arrangements beyond the private sphere of home and family but more familiar to us than the impersonal institutions of the wider society’ (1994: 1).

As such it is possible for us to think of the radio link users creating a sense of there being another, a secondary, local community through their daily interactions and conversations. As such a radio link may be considered to be a community both real and virtual, of place and through creation of common interest. Having proposed that a radio link may create a sense of community does this offer some guidance as to the most appropriate method by which it can be studied?

Crow and Allen (1994) refer to the work of Lee and Newby (1983) in which they state that ‘...individuals are linked together in social networks, the patterns of which can be studied as objective social structures’ (1994: 4). It will be suggested that a radio link can be thought of as a social network within which residents through talking to and listening out for their neighbour engage in interactions which can be usefully studied.

This enquiry into participative reassurance within a residential context requires further consideration of the relationship between people, their community, and social circumstances. In a review of the urban disorders of the 1990’s, Campbell (1993) discussed the relationship between space and power. She found that the social circumstances in certain housing estates made the neighbourhood feel akin to a prison. Residents were as at risk from their own neighbours as they perceived themselves to be from ‘strangers’, such that they leave the area because of the sense of threat (1993: 168). Her criticism of the police and schemes such as Neighbourhood Watch was also extended to the local authorities of the areas. The residents suffered high levels of stress related specifically to ‘...endless battles over repairs, their difficulty in engaging the attention of their landlord’ (1993: 316). These difficulties clearly had nothing to do with the design layout of the estate and the relevance of situational crime prevention is dismissed because ‘...tenant’s’ problems were not manifest in buildings but in social relations’ and ‘the design [of the estate] did create vigilance – residents could at least see burglars climbing the drainpipes opposite or, from their kitchen windows, racing across back gardens’ (1993: 316).
Her analysis of the reasons for this crisis over power and space centred upon the role of men, particularly criminally oriented young men, who occupied the public domain:

‘The crisis of public space on the estates was not caused by people’s congress, but by the extinction of their economy and the erosion of *cooperative* use of public space, its tyrannical appropriation and degradation by lads who terrorised the men, women and children with whom they shared space’ (1993: 320) (Original emphasis).

Campbell saw the use and dominance of space as a means by which ‘...to confine and fragment the social space of the dominated’. She contrasts the behaviour of men with the relationships, the solidarity and self-help, of women, which were ‘...open, expansive, egalitarian and incipiently democratic’ (1993: 316). This is an important observation in that it has been the author’s own experience, when working with community groups involved in radio links, that women often form the majority of participants and the driving force behind the schemes. In summary, and rather bleakly, Campbell states ‘Crime and coercion are sustained by men. Solidarity and self-help are sustained by women. It’s as stark as that.’ (1993: 318). The work of Campbell could be criticised for not being methodologically sound and for the fact the findings are presented in a sensationalist manner. However, the issues discussed above echo the author’s own experiences of policing urban areas, particularly when developing radio links.

In a further study of high-crime estates Evans and Walklate (1999) conducted extensive observations, surveys and interviews on two areas in Salford, which they named Oldtown and Bankhill. Their study considered the place of community in criminological thinking and specifically challenged the inability of policy makers and practitioners to deliver crime reduction programmes, as they have ‘...failed to understand the specific dynamics operating in the communities in which they have been applied’ (1999: 6). The official reason, often given for such failures, or limited success, is due to the absence of social control. This is alleged to be caused by weak community ties, an absence of social networks and a lack of concern for the environment of the estate. This assumption is strongly contested by Walklate and Evans (1999), who argue that:
‘...community works on a number of different levels. Many local people whom we spoke to were closely linked to their local areas and recognised the importance of sustaining such links in order to maintain their own ontological security (Giddens, 1991)’ (1999: 6).

Failure of understanding of a community by outside agencies rather than a ‘failing community’ is therefore, suggested to be cause of poor scheme delivery, however it is a difficult task for unsupported communities to initiate, let alone deliver programmes with one of the major difficulties being access to resources and funding. It can be concluded that for statutory agencies to heap the blame for intervention failure on a potentially fragile and fractured community is hardly expected to help matters. Walklate and Evans (1999) analysed the notion of community within the meanings found during their study, these comprised community as: social networks social groupings such as ‘sequence dancing and scrabble clubs’; symbolic constructs – where notions of ‘belonging and exclusion were more readily invoked’; shared characteristics – where ‘ethnic identity played an important part’; and as collective action. Applying these definitions to our residential radio link it can be conceived that the radio link forms: a social network of neighbours; a symbolic construct, previously described as a virtual community; and as a vehicle through which collective actions could be undertaken. In a particularly relevant passage Walklate and Evans refer to the work of the TMO (Tenant Management Organisation), which had developed out of:

‘... independent resident action in response to a perceived rise in crime and incivilities within one particular part of the estate. Its formation had been prompted by a perception of police inaction. In a classic example of resident action a group of local people had formed a ‘telephone tree’ to organise response to crime and incivilities. If any resident who was part of this communication network saw a stolen car brought into the area, for example, the telephone tree would be brought into operation and some designated person would go out to deal with the incident’ (1999: 16).

The reference to the telephone tree is of particular interest in that the need for effective methods of communicating information throughout the community was recognised by residents and acted upon.
Historically the earliest forms of communication between retailers, used to forewarn members of say active criminals operating in a town centre, was a telephone tree, which pre-dated both pager schemes and radio links – see previous chapter. Throughout the study period the authors found that residents in both research areas had:

‘...turned to it [community] in an attempt to organise fellow community members in some sort of resistance to disorder, incivility and insecurity ... turned to their understanding of community dynamics in order to try to place their own feelings and experiences of crime in a context in which they felt familiar’ (1999: 17).

The relevance of this reference to individual’s use of concepts of community as a mechanism through which they and others could begin to address the problem of crime is important in that a radio link has been utilised as a similar organisational mechanism (Gibson and Wright, 1995; Edwards and Tilley, 1994). In addition, organisations such as TMOs or in the case of Northville, a Parish Council and Neighbourhood Watch scheme also offer existing neighbourhood-based mechanisms through which crime reduction programmes such as telephone trees or radio links have been established. The important issue is that existing personal relationships and shared objectives are utilised by individuals as mechanisms through which to reduce those problems of local concern, which sometimes include crime and disorder. It can be suggested though that there are compromises to be made by residents, when in search of a secure community. Bauman (2001) in his analysis of community and safety suggests that ‘membership’ of community is contingent upon a loss of some degree of autonomy; you sacrifice some of your rights as:

‘Security and freedom are two equally precious and coveted values which could be better or worse balanced, but hardly ever fully reconciled and without friction’ (2001: 4).

Comparisons are made here with earlier references to a resident’s conflicting desire for privacy and sociability. In any community complete freedom will necessarily mean a reduction in levels of security, likewise promoting security will lead to a loss of freedom.
The demand for safety is perhaps epitomised by the gated community, what Davis (1990) in his study of Los Angeles calls a ‘frenzied residential arms race’ where residents demand ‘social insulation’ (1990: 246). He further tells us about the housing-project-as-strategic-hamlet, which:

‘... has recently been fortified with fencing, obligatory identity passes and a substation of the LAPD. Visitors are stopped and frisked, while the police routinely order residents back into their apartments at night. Such is the loss of freedom that public housing tenants must now endure as the price of ‘security’ (1990: 244).

This development of ‘gated communities’ involves far more than just individual housing estates. McKee (2000) reports upon the development of 100 new towns along the Florida coastline, designed as traditional neighbourhood developments. The rationale behind the scheme is because fear of crime has reached ‘...panic-level in the States, these settlements, often gated, appear to offer a return to the wholesome, safe neighbourhoods of childhood’ (2000: 1). The layout of the town is designed to encourage neighbourliness and a sense of community.

However, the report found that ‘...they do feel strange and soulless and there appears to be a complete absence of black, Asian or Hispanic residents’ (2000: 2). Bauman (2001) in a critique of modernity points to the loss of the personal, the closure of banks ‘replaced by anonymous and impersonal ... voices on the other end of the telephone cable or ‘user friendly’, yet infinitely remote nameless and faceless website icons’ (2001: 46). In an important conclusion he states:

‘To sum up: gone are most of the steady and solidly dug-in orientation points which suggested a social setting that was more durable, more secure and more reliable than the time span of an individual life. Gone is the certainty that ‘we will meet again’, that we will be meeting repeatedly and for a very long time to come – and that therefore society can be presumed to have a long memory and what we do to each other today will come to comfort or grieve us in the future; that what we do to each other has more than episodic significance, since the consequences of our actions will stay with us long after the actions have apparently ended – surviving in the minds and deeds of witnesses who are not going to vanish’ (2001: 47).
The loss of certainty, the absence of personal, regular contact with others, echoes of the controllability and predictability of the future, the very grounds upon which the existence of trust and ontological security are based. In the absence of the, 'epistemological foundation' of the experience of community' the ‘...decline of community is in this sense self-perpetuating’ (2001: 47). In its extreme form Bauman refers to the demand for safety and insulation leading to 'exterritoriality' a guaranteed community-free zone, were ‘the new ‘global elite’ live with the company of maitres d’hotels, room maids and waiters’, as its only population’ (2001: 55). He concludes 'the deepest meaning of spatial separation was the banning or suspension of communication, and so the forcible perpetuation of estrangement’ (2000: 27) (Emphasis added). It is suggested by Bauman that the ultimate state of safety and security, available only to an elite, is achieved at the loss of community, the absence of communication and recurring relationships. For the majority of people such a situation is not only unobtainable but also, it is suggested, unwanted, for it creates a significant degree of social isolation.

Thinking through these rather fundamental issues and how they relate to a radio link leads one to conclude that membership of the scheme will necessarily mean a loss of autonomy; participants are open, available and committed to the other members. The primary obligation undertaken by radio link participants is to listen out for and assist any of the other members. As such the participants receive the benefits of early warnings of problems and direct assistance but forfeit the privacy they might have enjoyed before becoming a member. Therefore, it can be concluded that by implication those individuals who participate in a radio link are those for whom some loss of privacy is acceptable when weighed against the perceived benefits of security and involvement. It will be suggested later that by implication such individuals may already be active within their community, for example as members of Neighbourhood Watch, TMOs or as Parish Councillors and that membership of a radio link is seen as almost a natural extension of their existing community involvement. A question this study sought to address was does the community that is a radio link: create; sustain; or destroy those networks of social interaction whose regularity and predictability promote trust and participative reassurance?
Trust: A Community Adhesive

In her study Walklate (2002) turned her attention to the issue of trust and while recognising people’s desire to hark backwards to what they felt to be familiar, to find some sense of purpose, she believes that ‘…the desire for ontological security takes us beyond nostalgia, especially in the context of understanding the concept of community invoked by community safety’ and ‘….it is the regularity or otherwise of the behaviour that sustains or threatens social trust relationships’ (2002: 302). This reference to Giddens (1991) ontological security and habits and routines again makes links with trust, community and social relationships. It is suggested that sustained personal relationships based upon trust create the necessary social bonds that form a community. In an associated article Evans (1998) refers to the elements of trust within the communities of Oldtown and Bankhill:

‘Different relationships of trust are found within the two areas. In Oldtown residents seek ways to manage their fears and anxieties, establishing relationships of trust where they can, hoping to find themselves ‘on the inside’ and thereby protected. In Bankhill there are few sustained relationships of trust – here crime is seen to come from within the community, and therefore alliances within the community to combat crime are more difficult to set up and maintain’ (1998: 187).

Walklate and Evans proposed the concept of the ‘square of trust’ (1999: 97 and 135) which is a representation of those factors ‘whom you can trust, how you trust, and how much you can trust (Nelken, 1994)” (1999: 96). The authors ask:

‘…how does trust manifest itself? The comparative data … supports the usefulness of exploring the mechanism of trust, which underpins people’s sense of ontological security in high crime areas. The value of this has been suggested by the ‘square of trust’ … The actual manifestation of this square of trust may be differently mediated by the nature of community relationships, age, gender, ethnicity, etc.’ (1999: 135).

Reference to ontological security is again found above however, it is suggested that these issues extend to a wider range of residential communities not just those in high crime areas. An example of the ‘square of trust’ is:
It is suggested that an omission within the work of Walklate and Evans (1999), and an area that will be discussed later, is the emphasis placed upon the importance of community relationships without recognising its reliance upon systems of communication.

The authors state that ‘whom you can trust, how you trust and how much you can trust (Nelken, 1994) at an individual level depends upon where an individual is located between these mechanisms’ (1999: 135). This useful concept will be re-visited when analysing the individual mechanisms, which feature in each of the three research areas in this study however, the importance of community organisation and mechanisms for sociability are directly relevant to radio links. A question that needs to be asked is does participation in a radio link presuppose the placing of trust in the other radio users? As will be seen later these issues of trust featured significantly during one incident in Northville and throughout the establishment of the radio link scheme in Westville. However, it is suggested that any radio link participant must place their trust in other users and expect them to be trustworthy. That trust at its most basic level would be that the other users would listen to their radios and respond should assistance be required.

The work of Walklate (2002) is again relevant to this study, as there are a number of key similarities between the three areas studied here and those described in her paper. She discussed a crime reduction initiative in a rural area of Cheshire and compared this to her own two research sites Oldtown and Bankhill. In the rural area, Walklate (2002) found the residents offering the police a ‘generalised trust’ and expressed a desire to work with them. However, their experience was that the police had neglected them and that they felt ‘...excluded from the policing ... services they feel they have a right to’ (2002: 310).
Walklate’s (2002) analysis of the rural community suggests that the fears and anxieties are an expression of their ‘fear of the outsiders’. Walklate suggests that this fear of the outsider is located within resident’s concerns over their desire to maintain their secure economic position but believe the means by which they could manage those outsiders, specifically through police responses, had been removed. Walklate having studied trust and trust relationships ‘...through the lens of place and at the level of the social’ suggests that the relationship between the rural community and the local police is such that:

‘...when people call for ‘bringing back the bobby on the beat’, what are they referring to? For some people, this is more than viewing the past through rose-tinted spectacles. This was their experience of policing in their community where the village bobby lived and that worked for them. They knew whom to trust; not just collectively as 'the police' but as an individual, the local police officer. This was their experience of who would sort things out’ (Walklate, 2002: 312-3).

In a study of trust, Sztompka (1999) states that there has to be an understanding of uncertainty, and of risk before trust can be entered into as trusting is the crucial strategy for dealing with uncertainty and uncontrollable futures ‘...it appears that trust is intimately linked to uncontrollability of the future’ (1999: 25). The reference to uncontrollability can it is suggested be applied to concepts of social control for if there is any degree of uncertainty as to the controllability of future events, say the extent of crime and disorder then trust will be an essential element in establishing and maintaining community relationships. It is thought that there must be a need to establish some form of trust to sustain personal relationships. Such relationships in turn help maintain levels of social support and control, which create a sense of community. Sztompka (1999) offers a definition of trust ‘trust is a bet about the future contingent actions of others’ (1999: 25). The important elements of this are, belief in the actions of others and commitment of yourself to that course of action. Walklate (2002) also suggests that another key-factor in understanding trust is that:

‘Other people and their actions make up the most important environment of our life and those are the crucial targets of our own actions. We have to at least coexist with others, to co-ordinate our actions with them and ... to co-operate with them’ (Walklate, 2002: 22).
If as Walklate (2002) suggests the reality for rural communities is that they can no longer trust the police to protect them, their position and security and resolve their problems for them, when they wanted, whom can they trust? It maybe that in the end the answer is only each other, their family and kin. Ultimately it is all a question of trust, the one factor that could be described as a community adhesive.

**Social Support and Control: Foundations of Community**

It has been suggested above that trust can be thought of as the adhesive that binds a community. When developing this concept it was also suggested that the establishment of trust helped create or sustain personal relationships, which in turn sustain social networks. These are significant steps requiring some explanation however, it is possible to conceive of a situation were individuals who did not trust their neighbours, for example they might be known to be active burglars or drug dealers would not enjoy the best of relationships with them. If they did not talk to or support each other then there would be little chance of the creation of social networks within that community (see Walklate and Evans (1998) above). Consideration should therefore, be given as to how social support and control, the actions and beliefs of individuals, in turn create or sustain social networks. Social support and control will be defined below but to illustrate these issues it is useful to refer to an article by McSmith (2001) who reported upon the visit by Professor Robert Putnam to 10 Downing Street to explain his theories about why he believes America is suffering from a catastrophic decline in its social capital, why people are becoming more isolated from their neighbours, friends and families. The report suggests that the loss of social capital is the cause of much of America’s crime and health problems. Putnam claims that loneliness is a more common cause of illness than cigarette smoking. Social capital has been defined as ‘the collective value of social networks and the inclinations that arise from these networks for people to help each other’ (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2003). This study of a residential community in Bournville, Birmingham found that the longer someone expected to live in a community the more they would be inclined to invest in that neighbourhood.
The report found that individual’s investment in the well-being of an area is dependent upon ‘the longer people have lived in the community, the more they knew their neighbours and have an association which develops into trust’ (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2003) and ‘the formation of social ties takes time’ (Sampson et al., 1997: 919). The former Home Secretary David Blunkett strongly supported concepts of social capital, which he defined as ‘those social networks and forms of trust which enable people to work together to achieve common objectives’ (Blunkett, 2002) and believed that Government has a key role in developing what he termed Civil Renewal (Blunkett, 2003a) because:

‘If we want to achieve empowered communities in which social order derives from trust, belonging and genuine mutuality, then we have to pursue a comprehensive agenda for civil renewal’ (Blunkett, 2003: 16).

The concept of helping each other is related to our consideration of social support. Cullen (1994) quotes Lin (1986) who defines social support as ‘the perceived or actual instrumental and/or expressive provisions supplied by the community, social networks and confiding partners’ (1994: 530). Cullen (1994) in analysing this definition finds four main elements; firstly the distinction between ‘the objective delivery and the perception of support’ with perceptions being important in that they are interpreted by people in the context of social situations (1994: 530). Secondly, social support is generally divided into two main elements: instrumental and expressive where instrumental involves the use of a relationship as a means to a goal, such as finding someone to baby-sit (Lin, 1986: 20) and expressive which involves the effective functions of support, such as belonging and companionship (Vaux 1988: 21). Thirdly, Cullen comments upon the different levels at which support can be offered, individual – between ‘a spouse or a best friend’ but also at the macro-level – ‘as a property of social networks and of communities and larger ecological units in which individuals are enmeshed’ (1994: 531). Finally, Cullen suggests that there is a fourth dimension to be considered when thinking about the definition of social support, that is if the support is delivered through formal or informal relations (1994: 531). It can be suggested that following our discussion of trust above that an absence of social support within a neighbourhood would render that community less able to resist the impact of crime. Cullen (1994) is quite clear in his submission:
‘... that both across nations and across communities, crime rates vary inversely with the level of social support’ (1994: 537).

Indeed he quotes Currie (1985) who suggests that ‘...economic inequality can generate crime not by exposing people to relative deprivation but also by eviscerating and inhibiting the development of social support networks’ (1994: 550). At an individual level Cullen (1994) suggests that increased levels of social support have a positive effect on reducing rates of criminal victimisation, both at an individual level, by reducing offending behaviour, but also within a community. He describes a situation in which social support builds ‘connectedness among community members; in particular, it fosters bonds of reciprocity and intimacy’ (1994: 549). In these circumstances Cullen suggests individuals are less likely to become victims of crime because the offender would lose any past or future support from a victim and secondly, because knowledge of the offender by the victim would render identification and subsequent prosecution easier.

Through interpreting Cullen’s (1994) work it can also be suggested that widespread and effective social support networks would provide enhanced levels of guardianship (Felson, 1986) to deter offenders and a greater number of informants, to detect offences. The idea of an offender losing a victim’s and community’s support can be seen to relate to the principles of restorative justice (Braithwaite, 1989), while the latter suggestions are clearly aspirations of community based crime reduction initiatives, such as Watch schemes. Cullen (1994) concludes by suggesting that ‘...there is a lack of attention to the public good, service to others, and an appreciation for our need for connectedness. Accordingly there is a call to revitalise our common bonds and to build a society supportive of all its citizens’ (1994: 552).

Turning to social control Hudson (1997) refers to the work of Edward A. Ross who in a paper Social Control published in 1901 used the term to refer to ‘...all the processes, which induce individuals to behave in conformity with the norms and values of their society’ (1997: 451). As such this definition of social control encompasses both the production of normal behaviour and the suppression of deviance and also encompasses differing forms or techniques of control ‘...educative/repressive; control through internalisation of norms/control through external coercion’ (1997: 451).
Fielding (1986) makes reference to the historical notion of community control of crime, specifically to the early New England colonies. In these stable and closed societies institutions such as the family and church had a deterrent effect upon incidents of crime and disorder, through the law being seen as an extension of common community standards (1986: 175). In modern communities however, the ‘...public is taught to stand up for individual rights, is resentful of pervasive police intrusion into community life. It conventionally does not share responsibility for crime control. Crime is a police matter’ (1986: 176). The situation as described by Fielding above has been significantly changed by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and the Police Reform Act 2002 in which statutory responsibility for crime reduction is no longer the sole duty of the police. In his analysis of those factors, which lead to homogeneity, Fielding determines them to be:

‘...the extended family system, which is instrumental in perpetuating stability, (Wilmott and Young 1964); the ecology of the working class neighbourhood, in which the organisation of play and economic activity around the street encouraged self-policing; and the labour market, in which the availability of diverse employment locally meant that issues at the workplace were also issues of the community (Hobbs, 1986)’ (1986: 172) (Original emphasis).

These factors are of course strikingly absent or in short supply in the type of community described by Campbell (1993) where there are no or limited numbers of locally available jobs, were families are divided and where ‘working class’ is a term that seems only to have an historical relevance. Modern concepts of social control, what Hudson refers to as ‘Post-Social Control’, are of increasing interest as the means by which to ‘control’ are becoming increasingly prevalent and intrusive. Hudson suggests:

‘... new modes of control, which appear to dissolve some of the distinctions between coercive and non-coercive, penal and social, control. Closed-circuit television in city centres; security patrols in shopping malls; strengthened asylum and immigration policies; expansion of electronic data collections, catch in the control net the innocent as well the guilty, and operate on distinctions such as member/non-member, resident/non-resident, creditworthy or non creditworthy, as much as criminal/non-criminal’ (1997: 465).
Hudson (1997) anticipating these concerns and referring to the work of Stenson (1995), identifies the shift of locus of control from the state and social to the individual and community ‘...the new forms of control are operated by and on behalf of private individuals and institutions, individually and in co-operation...’ (1997: 466). These changes, referred to by Nikolas Rose (1996) as the ‘death of the social’ are creating situations were control is now being assumed by individuals and institutions as part of their acceptance of the need to safeguard themselves. Hudson (1997) concludes with the concerns of O’Malley (1996) that these community groups may be composed of individuals who are ‘...not necessarily oriented to an ideal of community or society, but recognising common interests for limited purposes...’ as such the problems of the ‘social become at least as important as the problematics of control (Sumner, 1997)’ (1997: 466/7) (Original emphasis).

The concerns about social control should however, be considered in the context of the views of Cohen (1979) that the new modes of community control, for example community sentences or Watch schemes are being promoted at a time when he suggests traditional communities have been lost. Fielding (1986) asserts that the methods by which the promotion of community based social control is undertaken must begin by reducing the divisions within communities. He cautions that:

‘The vogue for crime prevention exemplifies the potential and dangers of orchestrated rather than self initiated informal social control. Crime prevention has long been a colourless topic ... by concentrating on physical measures. The closer it comes to pursuing change at an interpersonal level the more it becomes politically tinged and the less clearly feasible. Target hardening, target removal ... and environmental design push the moral implications of crime control behind the mechanism of physical security measures. But formal surveillance, ‘natural surveillance’ (for example, using receptionists as security informants) and employee surveillance (sensitising staff to the need to interrogate strangers) pose more apparent challenges to current mores’ (Fielding, 1986: 187).

Reflecting upon the above discussions of social control and community requires consideration of the current issues surrounding the state of society. In an emotive response to the murder of Damilola Taylor (a young boy murdered on an inner-city housing estate in Peckham, London 2000) it was reported that the area in which he was killed had ‘no society’ (McKinstry, 2002: 22).
In the article it was suggested that 'the word community is one of the most over-used in modern Britain. Yet it can never have been more badly misplaced than in the hand-wringing debate over the death of Damilola Taylor' (2002: 22). The report goes on to describe how community implies solidarity, shared identity and mutual concern. But that 'Such values have been entirely absent from North Peckham where social breakdown, fear and aggression pre-dominate' (2002: 22). It is appreciated that the article is but one reference to the state of society within some residential communities in modern Britain, and potentially a politically biased one at that, but the importance attached by the current Government to policy initiatives supporting neighbourhood and civic renewal, social inclusion and cohesion suggest the problems have been recognised and are being addressed. In his work on citizenship, community and the management of crime Clarke (1987) states that:

'The rise of citizenship and the decline of community have conspired to eliminate the basis for the informal management of social control. What the concern with community as a route to re-establishing that management fundamentally involves then, is the restoration of a sense of control, of perspective, of normality' (1987: 397).

This is perhaps an early indication of the sense of loss of social capital described by Putnam, (see above). Clarke (1987) in what is considered to be an interesting suggestion proposed that the actual reduction of the incidence of crime is not necessarily the only measure of community-based initiatives and he makes specific mention of Neighbourhood Watch in this context. What is thought to be important is not only that actual control is restored, but also that:

'... the development through revived community institutions of a sense of control of crime and a security deriving from an understanding that collective resources, formal and informal, are being directed at those kinds of conduct which are held to be most offensive’ (Clarke, 1987: 399).

In a similar vein Fielding (1986), refers to the recent emphasis upon community as an instrument of control ‘...as in community service and other programmes associated with the movement promoting ‘community corrections’ (1986: 172). Fielding (1986) develops the suggestion that involvement by the community in responses to crime may have unexpected consequences because of the ‘interlocking nature of the system of social control’ (1986: 173). It is conceivable that effective community interventions to address crime, assisted by the police and other agencies may lead to those agencies subsequently being withdrawn as the problems diminish.
There are though examples of what Fielding calls 'spontaneous normative control' which is described as 'alternative forms of control for a wide range of deviant behaviour' for example the various self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous and drug rehabilitation clinics (1986: 176). Other examples of 'normative control techniques' exist in that communities can influence the behaviour of their members, such as staff at work feel under some moral control by group pressure not to steal from their employer.

These are useful thoughts when considering a radio link, which may assist in 'facilitating' normative control techniques, for example members through their involvement in the scheme may feel under an obligation to act responsibly (Wright, 1999). In his work, Cohen (1989) refers to the status of social control in its many forms, for example by the private sector through means such as ‘...mass media, popular culture, advertising’ (1989: 351). He believes that the State apparatus of social control, for example through the actions of criminal justice agencies, have a privileged status but that we must always recognise the ‘...dominant roles played by the family, gender, mass culture and the market in the regulation and control of social life’ (1989: 353). Considering the points above and how they relate to radio links and participative reassurance leads to the suggestion that measures aimed at offering public reassurance, such as publicising quantitative measures of police performance showing reductions in crime, may not be perceived by individuals to be as important as their enjoyment of social support and control. Sampson et al. (1997) describe such a state as 'collective efficacy', which they define as 'social cohesion among neighbours combined with their willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good’ (1997: 918). In this sense therefore, it can be theorised that participation in a radio link may offer individuals levels of social support, for example in listening out for each other, and may offer social control, such as residents challenging unruly children and will act as a basis for generating and sustaining a community. In developing and proposing a theory of participative reassurance it has been suggested that the positive nature of social interactions will be facilitated and supported by enhanced methods of communication, in this case achieved through the radio link. The theory further suggests that such social interactions may in turn lead to the development of what has been described as 'normative control' and 'collective efficacy'.
The End of Community?

It can be argued that the existence or absence of community will determine not just the effectiveness of crime and fear reduction programmes within a neighbourhood but that it will also affect wider issues, for example resident’s levels of satisfaction with their quality of life.

It is suggested we live in an age when the search for security requires not just the absence of insecurity but also ‘positive reinforcement of public perceptions of their safety’ (Zedner, 2000: 201). Crawford (2002a) believes security and safety are:

‘...bound up with quality-of-life issues and nostalgic quests for genuine human identity, connectedness and reciprocity precisely at a moment in time at which these appear most absent’ (2002a: 7).

This point has been made above (Campbell, 1993) but is an important consideration for, if as is being suggested, notions of community are actively being sought as a means by which to offer security and safety but are rarely found, then what are the alternatives? It is suggested by Crawford (2002a) that people are buying their own security and as such the notion of ‘security as commodity’ provides consumers with choices, for example whether to live in a specific area or install an intruder alarm. But individuals risk believing that their environment has become both predictable and manageable despite:

‘... or maybe because of, the realities of uncertainty, fragmentation and a loss of collective identity. As such, it may represent a quest for an unattainable and imaginary ideal in which comfort, reassurance and order are sought’ (Crawford, 2002a: 8) (Emphasis added).

Crawford (2002a) believes that the ‘security and safety arms race’ may be self-defeating by ‘institutionalising anxiety’ and further disadvantage certain individuals and communities unable to meet the cost of additional security through displacement and concentration of crime (Crawford, 2002a: 8). In conclusion, alternatives to community safety, in particular the commodification of security with its ‘concerns about safety and ontological insecurity’ (Crawford, 2002b: 30) offers no clear solutions and in the case of the gated community (see above) may promote division and inequality within society.
We began this discussion of concepts of community by seeking to determine if a radio link can be thought of as comprising a community, both in the context of place and interest for example, a retail radio link operates in a town centre and is concerned with incidents of crime and disorder. It was proposed that a radio link facilitates the creation of such a community and that it can be conceived as being both real and virtual. It was argued that an essential characteristic of any social network was the existence of relationships of trust between individuals and it was suggested that as such trust can be thought of as the adhesive that binds a community. When developing this concept it was also suggested that the establishment of trust helped create or sustain personal relationship, which in turn are supported by social support and control. It has been argued that social support and control are essential characteristics in addressing levels of crime within communities. Finally, we considered an alternative to the social control of crime – the end of community – and the commodification of security. We need perhaps to pause and ask is that what awaits us?

**Electronically Mediated Communication**

Professor Ken Pease (pers. comm.) suggested that the development of radio links pose a number of questions as to its similarity with the Internet. He asked some simple questions, such as why do people join chat rooms and what does it all mean for radio links? To try and answer those questions this section will consider a broader range of electronically mediated communication systems than just radio links, particularly cellular phones as a mobile form of communication and the Internet as an interactive communal medium. It will discuss the relationship of people with technology and with others through electronic media.

Any study of mobile communication devices must consider the cellular phone, and while this communication medium clearly shares a number of similarities with radios, such as it uses the radio spectrum there exist a number of differences. The most important, for our current analysis, is that, in the main, it only allows one-to-one dialogue, as compared with the one-to-many capability of radio. It is argued that this is the most important distinction as it prevents the type of open dialogue that helps create a sense of involvement, participation and of community.
Before turning to the detail of the findings of this study (see below) a useful analogy would be to ask how great would be your sense of involvement in another person’s telephone call? If there is little or no involvement, particularly as you are unlikely to hear every part of the conversation, then what would be the extent of your participation? It is suggested that in the context of our understanding of community and of issues such as social support and control, mobile phone one-to-one dialogue offers little in terms of opportunities for participative reassurance.

The vast increase in use of mobile telephony is perhaps best illustrated by Barrow (2002) who reports that nearly 75 per cent of British adults and closer to 90 per cent of younger people own a mobile phone. The popularity of the mobile phone has increased significantly in recent years, for it was found that three years ago, fewer than 30 per cent of British adults owned a mobile phone, by 2000 ownership had reached the 50 per cent mark and the current level is fast approaching saturation. The latest generation of mobile phones, 3G (third generation) services are already being replaced in Japan. Fitzpatrick (2001) reported that in Japan there exists a culture associated with being always available on your mobile phone. This is described as creating a new type of neurosis, particularly amongst the young, where the level of mobile phone ownership has reached saturation point. “Ketai”, or mobile phone culture means always being contactable and it has been found that when a friend or relative is not available then relationships suffer. Fitzpatrick reports that Hisao Ishii, a sociologist and author of The Superficial Social Life of Japan’s Cell Phone Addicts, writes:

‘Teenagers can be seen taking advantage of every spare minute to touch base with their friends. However, it is not the content of the communication but the act of staying in touch that matters. Indeed, many become extremely uneasy if they find themselves unable to contact their peers countless times every day, fearing that they are becoming socially isolated’ (2001: 9).

The importance of communication to the individual is noted but it may be thought that such an obsessive reliance could be considered harmful. But what if being contactable and able to make contact is a matter of personal safety? In many instances mobile phones have been purchased on the basis of offering increased safety.
It is worth briefly discussing the issues involved in this as in essence it is suggested the use of a mobile phone to safeguard its user is problematic. A report by Steel (2000: 8) into the use of mobile phones to contact the police via the 999 emergency telephone number described cellular phones as being a 'scourge'. At a time when 50 per cent of the adult population had a mobile phone the West Midlands Police force control room recorded a 15 per cent rise in overall 999 calls between the 1998/1999 and 1999/2000 financial years. It was explained that any incident requiring police attention that occurs within sight of a public audience results in an eruption in emergency calls, for example an accident on the motorway would then have resulted in between 20 and 50 calls (Steel, 2000: 8).

At that time a third of all emergency calls to the police where being made via mobile phones and there had been a significant increase in silent calls, those for example generated by very young children or by phones dialling 999 accidentally in people’s pockets. It is usual for the police to trace landline silent 999 calls and send an officer to that address. However, there is a very real problem with cell phones, particularly those on the ‘Pay as You Go’ tariff, in that a large number of them are unregistered, which specifically means that the police are unable to trace the user’s address and more importantly attend their location. As a consequence silent mobile phone calls to the West Midlands Police are no longer pursued at all. Not only is the issue one of silent calls but also there has been a significant level of abuse and non-urgent calls to police 999 call centres. Weeks (2000) reported upon the situation in Surrey, where it was found that only about 14 per cent were genuine emergency calls requiring an immediate police response. Some 12 per cent where nothing whatsoever to do with the police, 38 per cent were abandoned or duplicate and 36 per cent were non-urgent. The sort of non-urgent 999 calls related to; lost cats; one caller said he had just bought a mobile phone and was testing it out; and another said he was stuck on the M25 and was dying to go to the toilet (2000: 38). In conclusion, it is suggested that mobile phones do not guarantee personal safety as there are such a number of difficulties, particularly when dialling 999 with the police being unable to identify or locate unregistered callers or differentiate between genuine or false call.

Within our discussion of current policy developments it can be suggested that further consideration should be given by the police and other agencies to the extent of current use of mobile communication technologies.
For example, while there is some use being made of text messaging by the police as a medium through which to engage with the public, in particular young people, there are limited examples of police resources being made available to support the use of picture messaging. In Bristol public houses, nightclubs and shops were engaged in an initiative over the period of Christmas 2003 with the police and local council CCTV control room to use mobile phone technology to alert other users as to the identity of potential troublemakers through the use of a photo messages. In essence if someone caused trouble in one public house their picture was captured on a mobile phone by staff working on the premises and circulated so that other businesses could prevent their entry. This is very similar to the provision of folders of photographs of retail offenders by crime reduction partnerships, such as the Retail Crime Initiatives. The photo message was also sent to the police and council CCTV operators so that offenders could be more easily identified and dealt with. Photographs taken for circulation have not been kept on a police database and were only used to share information between premises and help the police to identify individuals.

However, the concept of the public being encouraged to use their cellular phones as mini-mobile CCTV systems to record images of offenders or crimes appears only recently to have been accepted by the police, particularly following the London terrorist attacks of the 7th July 2005. In an age dominated by mobile two-way communication systems little policy attention appears to have been given to the impacts of these technologies and the extent of human interaction within them. It may even be suggested that such a failure to capitalise upon any potential benefits may lead to missed opportunities in terms of fear reduction and public reassurance. In fact it is often the case that ownership of mobile phones is presented as a crime problem, particularly regards street robberies and young people, rather than as having any potential benefit, for example to inform the police of crimes. As has been explained above there may be a number of existing and future issues, which could limit the potential benefits offered by visible reassurance therefore, any inability on the part of the police to engage constructively with mobile communication systems may further limit opportunities to deliver public reassurance.
Turning to the Internet our consideration of such a vast system must by necessity be specifically concerned with areas relevant to the development of the theory of participative reassurance. Therefore, it is intended to return to our consideration of concepts of community, identity and relationships mediated through electronic communication systems. In their study of the use of the World Wide Web (WWW) Smith and Kollok (1999) researched the existence of community within and through the Internet. They believe that ‘...it is clear that computer networks allow people to create a range of new social spaces in which to meet and interact with one another’ (1999: 3). There are many groups, who meet on-line to ‘share information, discuss mutual interests, play games, and carry out business’ (1999: 16). Smith and Kollok dispute suggestions that these groups are not really communities in that ‘not only are online communities real communities, but also that they have the potential to support face-to-face communities and help hold local communities together’ (1999: 16) (Emphasis added).

The emergence of sociological agreement upon the fact that communities do not necessarily have to be physically located together (Crow and Allan, 1994) is supported by the fact that modern systems of transport and communication can establish and sustain personal relationships across any distance. In the case of radio links, it is known that participants live and work in close proximity to each other so the issue of physical distance between users may not be so relevant. The important issue is that the relationships so formed and supported may then be sustained through face-to-face interaction. In conclusion, Smith and Kollok (1999) referring to the work of Wellman and Gulia (1999) suggest that the Internet does facilitate the creation of a community (1999: 169). Smith and Kollok (1999) suggest that ‘technology has its most profound effect when it alters the ways in which people come together and communicate’ (1999: 4) (Emphasis added). Analysis of control, co-ordination and coercion within relationships on the Internet, by Smith and Kollok (1999) suggests they can only really be truly effective if the individual members can be identified and held responsible. It is suggested that the ability to identify an online individual, and perhaps even more importantly, detect a deception is necessary to sustaining relationships. In her research, Donath (1999) states unequivocally that:
‘For assessing the reliability of information and the trustworthiness of a confidant, identity is essential. And care of one’s own identity, one’s reputation, is fundamental to the formation of community’ (1999: 30).

She refers to the concept of trust for not only do participants have to be sympathetic to the aims of the group but ‘Trust in the shared motivations and beliefs of the other participants – in other words their social identity – is essential to the sense of community (Beniger, 1987)’ (1999: 31). Donath (1999) asserts that while anonymous contributors are capable of communication with one another:

‘… reputation of any kind is impossible in a purely anonymous environment. The motivation for many of the qualities we associate with community, from co-operative behaviour to creative endeavour, depends on the existence of distinct and persistent personae’ (1999: 53-4).

The issues of identity and deception in the Internet are it is suggested somewhat different to those found in a radio link, for example participants will get to know the voice of the other users and if there is any doubt as to their true identity perhaps arrange to see them. It has been suggested above that trust is an essential constituent in sustaining any community. As such it is thought the involvement of say, an active burglar in a radio link, would, once it became known conceivably destroy any trust between the members and that individual. It is of interest to note that within this context the decision by Microsoft (September 2003) to close its UK chat rooms and replace them with subscription based services, on the basis of protecting young people from on-line paedophiles, prompted commentators to observe that ‘…fear is one of the biggest profit opportunities of the 21st century’ (Siklos: 2003: 9). A meeting place on the Internet may be based around a wide variety of issues, from discussing current affairs and news to swapping recipes. Analysis by Donath (1999) summarised the variety of discussion newsgroups:

‘Some newsgroups are closely-knit communities, in which people refer to each other by name and ask after each other’s friends and family members. Others are primarily places to exchange information, repositories of knowledge where one can submit a question and receive a (possibly correct) answer. Some groups provide a warm, trusting, and supportive atmosphere, while others promote a raw and angry free-for-all’ (1999: 34).
In a clear difference between radio links and the Internet Donath (1999) states that the online world is wholly determined by the design of the environment, the software and site administrators (1999: 55). As such they ‘shape’ the virtual community in a particular way, Donath (1999) compares it to a building in which people live. The building design affects how happily they use the space but does not completely shape their perception of the world. For a radio link the physical and technological design of the type of simple radio used in this research will not have the same affect upon the users as the Internet does. But it is worth considering if the nature of the conversation, knowledge of your neighbours and individual’s imagination, creates in the mind of every radio link participant the same social network? Or are the participants in a radio link, where nothing is recorded, all believing in a different network? Donath (1999) assists our thinking for she predicts that ‘making social patterns more visible would increase the strength of social pressures, making the community both more orderly and less spontaneous’ (1999: 55). Within a voice only environment such visibility in social patterns may be technically feasible, for example voice recognition software recording and transmitting instantaneous text messages and it is worthy of thought as to what would be the impact upon relations, norms and beliefs if accessible records existed of all radio link conversations. Reid (1999) in her study of social control in the Internet makes a number of particularly relevant observations concerning the absolute need for social interaction in Multi User Domains (MUDs) that originated in 1978 as part of games known as Multi-User Dungeons (1999: 107). She refers to the need for communication to support the community:

‘Moreover, the MUD community depends on a richness of communication and the creation of social context. The system itself encourages MUD users to become intimate – or at least to simulate intimacy. MUD systems, like any other, abhor a vacuum, and a vacuum on a MUD is seen in a lack of textual exchanges. The MUD universe functions only while users are willing to elicit text from the program and from each other, and are willing to volunteer their own contributions. Communication is necessary to the existence of the MUD’ (Reid, 1999: 113) (Emphasis added).

When active, even intimate communication exists in MUDs, evidence has been found of the formation of strong personal attachments.
Reid (1999) referring to the work of Hiltz and Turoff (1978), suggests that some participants in computer-mediated communication systems ‘come to feel that their very best and closest friends are members of their electronic group’ (1999: 113). It is relevant to ask is this sense of intimacy and attachment found in MUDs present in a radio link? A radio link facilitates dialogue, but it achieves this within a context of one-to-many communication, which may act to restrain some relationships, for example intimacy. A simple explanation could be to ask how intimate will you feel chatting-someone-up with the whole street listening in and knowing whom you both are? Reid (1999) suggests that the popularity of users determines the extent of co-operation. She also argues that:

‘Within these hierarchical systems of power, social spaces form. Users of MUD systems love and hate in their virtual environments as strongly as they do in face-to-face environments. The manifestation of emotion is made possible by tools that give virtual realism to the imaginings of users. The exercise of imagination is necessary for the creation of a social context within which to act’ (1999: 131) (Emphasis added).

It can be suggested that the importance of this observation for radio links is that the feeling of reassurance, can be thought to be an emotional response, one felt and received. This emotion is achieved through social interactions achieved by the creation and maintenance of social relationships.

The hierarchy of popularity of users, for example the scheme co-ordinator, raises the question will everyone be reassured to the same extent or just the popular ones? In addition we need to think through whether radio links provide the tools through which a virtual realism of a safe, harmonious community manifests itself so that the emotion of reassurance is achieved through the imaginings not just of that individual user but through those of all the participants. It can be concluded from the above discussion that there exists a strong desire among some individuals to enjoy a sense of belonging and of community. Analysis so far suggests that this desire can perhaps be best understood when coupled with a need to feel safe and secure, particularly when at home. The final section of this chapter will therefore, consider the nature of participation of individuals in the 160,000 residential based crime reduction initiatives in the UK (National Neighbourhood Watch Association, www.neighbourhoodwatch.net).
Neighbourhood Watch: Lessons Learnt

As with the above discussion concerning cellular phones any consideration of radio links, in this case a study of residential based schemes requires that some attention be paid to similar community based crime reduction schemes, in this case Neighbourhood Watch (NW). This section begins by considering two early studies undertaken before the widespread introduction of Watch schemes. It would be useful therefore, to begin by describing the nature and impact of Neighbourhood Watch, which has been described as ‘...one of the most significant attempts to involve the British public in crime control for many years’ (Hope, 1988: 146). The scheme originated in North America but was quickly developed in the UK particularly by the Metropolitan Police. In their study of Neighbourhood Watch, McConville and Shepherd (1992) state ‘the concept of NW is based upon the formation of a network of public-spirited members of the community who will assist the police in the fight against crime’ (1992: 4). It is obvious therefore, that the police would strongly support the development of any new initiative, which would help in the reduction of crime, especially if one of its stated aims was to ‘...make the citizen the ‘eyes and ears’ of the police’ (1992: 4). What though can we learn from Neighbourhood Watch, in particular what are the factors that relate to individuals participation in the scheme, how effective is it and what is the extent of its support? In a significant analysis of the subject, Bennett (1989) undertook a detailed review of two schemes in the Metropolitan Police Force area, one in Acton and the other in Wimbledon. He undertook a crime and public attitude survey in the two scheme areas after they had been in existence for a year. His initial thoughts about the scheme centred upon the apparent conflict between two criminological positions ‘...the Durkheimian view that communities faced with crime and fear of crime would respond to this threat by some form of collective action’ and secondly referring to the work of Wilson and Kelling (1982) that ‘...crime and fear as divisive forces, which destroyed the capacity of communities to take effective action’ (1989: 208). Bennett (1989) in his review of the published material found there to be conflict between the findings of Hope (1988) who concluded that support for Neighbourhood Watch was significantly related to being worried about becoming a victim of burglary, and DuBow and Podolefsky (1982), who found the opposite (1989: 208).
The work of Lavrakas (1981) was also found to show no relationship between participation in community organisations and fear of crime thus supporting DuBow and Podolefsky (1982). Bennett in concluding his review of the published findings stated ‘...the findings are not sufficiently consistent to enable more general conclusions to be drawn’ (1989: 209).

Bennett’s analysis of the findings from the public attitude surveys in the Acton and Wimbledon found that ‘participants were significantly more worried than non-participants about burglary and robbery victimisations’ and that participants were more fearful of criminal victimisation than non-participants (1989: 212). This is a significant finding for two reasons; firstly, the origins of the scheme were to promote a climate of crime reduction, the very circumstances, which would logically lead to a reduction in participant’s fear of crime. Secondly, the creation of supportive and beneficial relationships between both other scheme members and the police would presuppose that participants would again be reassured. Can it be suggested therefore, that there needs to be a level of concern about crime before participation in Neighbourhood Watch is deemed desirable?

This question was addressed by Bennett (1989) who concluded that ‘fear of crime was shown to be significantly related to participation after controlling for other variables’ (1989: 216). These findings are significant in that it could be argued Neighbourhood Watch schemes created within a climate of fear of crime would logically be located and be most effective in high crime areas, which clearly they are not. A final area of consideration for Bennett was to discover if there was any difference between scheme members and non-members in the extent of community interaction and involvement. This was measured by perceived ease of recognising strangers, the number of neighbours considered to be friends, the extent of help offered to neighbours and the involvement in home protection. Bennett concluded that in general participants in Neighbourhood Watch reported a greater degree of community involvement, as measured by the above factors, than non-members (1989: 213).

The second major study is Hope’s (1988) analysis of the 1984 British Crime Survey (BCS) responses to questions about the scope of Neighbourhood Watch.
It is important to note that there were only a ‘...handful of experimental schemes’ in 1983 and while the number of registered scheme was clearly increasing dramatically, by 1987 the police had registered some 29,000 schemes, the extent of public involvement in Neighbourhood Watch during the time of the BCS sweep 1984 would have been small (1988: 146). Hope however describes such involvement as being ‘...self-selection of new members to a novel and expanding idea’ (1988: 147). Initial analysis by Hope found that:

‘... there were significant differences between participants and others: participants were wealthier, more likely to live with others than alone (including living as families), and twice as likely to own their own home as to rent it’ (1988: 146).

This finding again conflicts with the suggestion that the existence and fear of high levels of crime would promote the establishment of Watch schemes. Hope (1988) referred to research conducted in America (Titus, 1984; Greenberg, Rohe and Williams, 1985; and Shernock, 1986) where Titus suggested that:

‘... fear of one’s own victimisation seems less important [as a predictor of participation] than do concerns over crime as a neighbourhood problem, interest in other neighbourhood quality of life issues, a tendency to join and participate in other sorts of local voluntary organisations, and being acquainted with neighbourhood adults and children. Participation in collective activities also increases with income, having children at home, length of residency, homeownership, sense of attachment to the neighbourhood and being black’ (Titus, 1984: 103).

When reviewing the findings of the BCS, Hope (1988) proposed that, at that time, membership of Neighbourhood Watch was being driven by two factors; firstly the rate of success of different police forces in introducing new schemes and; secondly the newness of the initiative in attracting people who welcomed innovation and challenge and that such people were ‘...more confident, open-minded etc.’ (1988: 147). The research conducted by Hope (1988) sought to determine the level of support for Neighbourhood Watch and respondent’s willingness to join a scheme. As Neighbourhood Watch was such a relatively new concept a series of descriptions of the scheme were given to the respondents. These included the idea of Neighbourhood Watch being introduced by the police.
Other descriptions of the scheme referred to the police asking residents to get know whom the other people are who live nearby and promoting good neighbourliness. There may well be an argument to suggest that any measure of the extent of support for the introduction of Neighbourhood Watch, at this time, would have been biased by the perceived promises made of less crime, improved neighbourliness and more police involvement in their community – conceivably therefore, a scheme that offered greater reassurance. Notwithstanding the fact that the description of Neighbourhood Watch may have influenced the expectations of respondents they were asked about their support for the idea of Neighbourhood Watch, which was assessed by: 1) whether they thought Neighbourhood Watch would work in their area and 2) whether they would join. The research showed that whilst some people were prepared to join Neighbourhood Watch (62 percent), more expressed support for the idea (89 percent) (Hope, 1988: 148).

The reasons expressed for not joining were explored and it was found that respondents believed they were: away from home too much; too busy; too ill; or too old. Of those who believed Neighbourhood Watch would not work in their area, the reasons advanced included: lack of motivation and untrustworthiness of local people; physical difficulties in keeping an eye on each other’s homes; and problems in distinguishing between intruders and legitimate callers. It is important to note the reference to trust as a key determinant in influencing community participation.

Hope (1988) then began to develop a model for predicting the potential support of residents for membership of Neighbourhood Watch. He grouped these under the general headings of: 1) efficacy, feasibility and acceptability of the scheme, 2) personal and household characteristics, 3) the nature of the relationship between neighbours, 4) type of area and 5) threat of crime. In reviewing responses to each of these factors Hope (1988) found that: 1) perceptions of the efficacy of Neighbourhood Watch in preventing burglary was the strongest predictor of support and that those people who regard their neighbours as friends or acquaintances ‘are more likely to be supporters of Neighbourhood Watch than those who do not’ (1988: 150). 2) That certain personal characteristics seem to mark out supporters: household tenure, (owner-occupiers as against rented); household income, (poor less likely to be a supporter); and marital status, (married rather than single, divorced, separated etc)’ (1988: 151).
Hope (1988) referred to unnamed American literature which indicates that ‘...communities which are socially homogenous and where there are dense social networks may be better hosts to community crime prevention groups than other kinds of areas’ (1988: 153). Hope found that ‘...though support for Neighbourhood Watch varies between neighbourhoods this does not seem to be a direct consequence of their social composition or cohesiveness. The effect of crime on these neighbourhoods would appear more crucial’ (1988: 153).

4) Hope found that two factors need to be present to prompt the greatest level of support for Neighbourhood Watch, the first that respondents believe they may become victims of burglary in the next year and, secondly they believe they reside in a community which is socially cohesive. He concluded that:

‘Unfortunately, it is also to be expected that, in general, areas of high crime risk would also be those where trust and co-operation in the community diminished’ and ‘... there seems no direct relationship – supporters were no more nor less likely to have been the victims of any kind of crime than others. Yet the indirect experience of crime – in particular its potential threat – does seem to be related to support, though mediated in important ways by people’s feelings about their neighbourhood’ (1988: 154/5).

Before moving on to review other studies of Neighbourhood Watch, particularly those that have sought to evaluate its effectiveness, it is worth pausing and reflecting upon the implications of the work of Bennett and Hope. These two studies came at the very early stages of the development of the schemes (a similar situation now to that of residential radio links) and as such give an indication, possibly a prediction, as to the importance of various factors in determining people’s preparedness to join Neighbourhood Watch. It is clear that issues such as the level of trust and interaction between neighbours are a key determinant in member’s participation. This is a logical finding in that neighbours would be reluctant to inform each other of their going on holiday if they thought they would have their houses broken into – possibly by the neighbours themselves. Another major factor is the existence of a prompt or driver, in this case a concern that they would become a victim of crime in the foreseeable future. This again is a logical finding, for without the need or requirement to expend time and effort on a venture people may not be prompted to join such a scheme.
However, joining Neighbourhood Watch was not seen, even then, as an entirely risk or cost free venture. Hope (1988) predicted that the existence of such schemes might well change the nature of the relationships between neighbours (1988: 159). Participation in Neighbourhood Watch requires the establishment of relationships of trust and an expectation of reciprocity, important issues for later consideration. These relationships can be fragile indeed for people want to be reassured their property and person, and by implication their privacy, will be safeguarded but may have to accept a loss of some of that privilege when joining any neighbourhood based crime reduction initiative, (see Bauman, 2001 above).

In an interesting association with Neighbourhood Watch, Bamber (2002) reports upon the Safer Areas For Everyone (SAFE) scheme in Heaton, a suburb of Bradford in which the police support patrols of middle-aged women in an effort to deter offenders. The scheme involves a fifty strong group of women, mostly in their forties and fifties, who patrol the streets in the afternoons and evenings and approach people they suspect. The group is comprised of unpaid volunteers who do not wear uniforms and the police are issuing the women with mobile phones with an emergency number to call if they come across a serious crime or get into trouble. The scheme has deliberately set out to recruit ‘mothers, aunts and grandmas’ as middle-aged women are thought to be effective in deterring youngsters from committing crime and are also likely to be less confrontational than men (2002: 8). It is reported that the idea had grown out of the informal street patrols of the Neighbourhood Watch scheme and has clear similarities with the community interactions described by Walklate and Evans (1999), for example the telephone tree and of the supportive role of women in communities (Campbell, 1993). While there is no mention of the scheme having been evaluated nor even if it is successful the report is of interest with regards the reported links with Neighbourhood Watch and with the use of mobile communication systems.

The final and a significant study of Neighbourhood Watch was that undertaken by McConville and Shepherd (1992). In their book ‘Watching Police, Watching Communities’ they set out on an intensive study of Neighbourhood Watch in three police force areas over a two year period. Their study involved interviews with residents and police officers, as well as undertaking a survey of both scheme and non-scheme areas.
McConville and Shepherd (1992) confirmed the objectives of Neighbourhood Watch as being outlined in the official Metropolitan Police guidelines issued in June 1983 (1992). These describe the scheme as having four main elements: first, ‘neighbours watching out for each other’s homes and reporting suspicious activity to the police, secondly, ‘the marking of valuable property’; thirdly, the availability of a free home security survey carried out by a police crime reduction officer; and fourthly, ‘the promotion of crime prevention and community campaigns (1992: 5). The overall aims were therefore, to reduce crime, reduce the fear of crime, improve local community relations and by implication improve the level and extent of police public contact. McConville and Shepherd (1992) however, conclude that:

‘Most official pronouncements on NW, however, tend to be vague on detail and there is no clarity on what it means to have a NW scheme or to be a member of a scheme’ (1992: 5).

This lack of clarity is critical for both the police and the members, for what is meant by a scheme and what are the obligations or commitments upon the members and police? In most cases members attend an inaugural meeting, often with a police officer but what thereafter are the obligations involved in being a Neighbourhood Watch member?

This absence of clarity as to the role of members, in particular, reduces the effectiveness of any subsequent evaluation. It also means that no one can really be sure as to what, if anything, is acting as a deterrent to crime. In reality the members and police officers involved in the establishment of Neighbourhood Watch schemes probably did not think too long about the need for clarity to assist subsequent evaluations neither, it is presumed, would they have sought to establish definitive causal links between interventions and outcomes. It is suggested they would have been perfectly happy as long as they could register the scheme, receive their household insurance discount and believe they have reduced their level of exposure to crime. McConville and Shepherd (1992) suggest that the conceptual thinking behind Neighbourhood Watch is that the creation of a scheme will affect a number of changes in the behaviour of residents. These changes include:
‘...improving household security; increasing personal safety measures; and heightening an individual’s social awareness and civic responsibility, by setting up positive relationships with neighbours and by engaging in watching or surveillance activities’ (McConville and Shepherd, 1992: 10).

There exists the potential for confusion within these aspirations for the creation amongst residents of a greater degree of awareness and suspicion and advancing a defensive mentality may militate against social interaction, a key factor in reducing crime and fear. The centrality of crime in the (police) objectives of Neighbourhood Watch are identified by McConville and Shepherd (1992) however they suggest that the belief that crime is a major concern of the community is, however ‘an assumption rather than an established fact’ (1992: 11) and that schemes will fail if the public are not concerned about crime. This is especially relevant in that Neighbourhood Watch and many other crime reduction initiatives are promoted on the basis that the public’s defensive reactions are prompted through a sense of fear of crime (1992: 13).

McConville and Shepherd (1992) while not trying to determine the relationship between isolation, loneliness and lack of community attachment and fear of crime found that:

‘... in all our research sites it clearly emerged that people felt little sense of ‘community’, had a narrow conception of their ‘neighbourhood’ (often characterised by 'a few houses either side’) and were, therefore, insecure in their relationships with ‘strangers’ in their area, and unsure and suspicious of areas beyond their immediate locale. It seems plausible to conclude, therefore, that some elements of concern about crime simply express uncertain and fractured social relations’ (McConville and Shepherd, 1992: 48).

Is it reasonable therefore, to ask if Neighbourhood Watch and potentially radio link schemes should be more concerned with issues such as fear of loss of community rather than fear of crime? Why then did people join Neighbourhood Watch? McConville and Shepherd (1992) found a wide range of reasons: being attracted to its positive image and crime reduction potential – prime motivating factors; perceived civic responsibility; and being asked to by friends and neighbours. The authors found that there was little evidence of an increase in surveillance activities as a result of involvement in Neighbourhood Watch (1992: 91). When concluding their study the authors sought to determine if Neighbourhood Watch could be considered a success and if so why?
McConville and Shepherd (1992) began by seeking to identify those factors by which success could be measured, whether residents believe it has some social benefits, whether it is effective in reducing crime and whether, irrespective of any reduction in crime, it reduced fear of crime.

They found that only a small number of residents (fewer than one in ten) felt Neighbourhood Watch had been a success in their area, it is suggested that this was because Neighbourhood Watch had primarily been adopted in areas with low-crime profiles, consequently there is small chance it will be seen to reduce something there was very little of in the first place (1992: 103). In general terms therefore, Neighbourhood Watch had little or no discernible effect upon ‘...their relationships with their neighbours, their relationships with the police, on community spirit in the locality, or on any other matter’ (1992: 104). The obvious consequence of this is that residents cease to undertake any collective activity, such as surveillance and this was found to be particularly the case where people had not initiated the scheme themselves, in other words where it had been police-led. Neighbourhood Watch, perversely, through its association with crime and fear and the police, has failed to engage those communities who perhaps need it most, high-crime estates. In those areas where it was initiated it was found to be largely ineffective and short lived. Based upon the stated criteria of success McConville and Shepherd (1992) conclude that Neighbourhood Watch is judged to be a failure because it erroneously seeks to increase the importance of crime in people’s lives and ‘...it is not emergent and does not dovetail into community needs’ (1992: 226-7).

One of the major failings of Neighbourhood Watch for residents faced with significant levels of petty crime and intimidation from ‘within’ was its inability to deliver any significant increase in levels of policing (Campbell, 1993: 167). These findings accord with American research, which found that:

‘There is substantial evidence that community organisations created solely to fight crime have neither long lives nor much success in recruiting members. Fear of crime per se is not much motivation for long-term collective action’ (Taub et al., 1984: 184).

The less than encouraging observation above is a clear indication that agency or policy led approaches to community issues are, in the absence of actual community involvement and support, likely to either produce little, or fail.
Studies of Neighbourhood Watch conclude it is: predominately police-led; located in low-crime areas; and specifically concerned with crime, an issue of marginal concern to residents. These are important lessons, which need to inform the method by which radio link schemes are implemented, managed and evaluated.

**Literature Review: Concluding Comments**

The above review of literature related to this study of residential radio links and participative reassurance has considered issues relating to: ontological security; fear of crime; concepts of community; trust; social support and control; mobile phones and the Internet; and Neighbourhood Watch. It was suggested that participative reassurance is defined as:

"The reassurance derived by individuals through their participation in supportive social networks".

The suggestion was made that routine activities, social participation and community connectivity create and sustain individual levels of reassurance. A number of distinct deficiencies were found with the current policy initiatives intended to increase the number of uniformed personnel to offer visible reassurance. It was concluded that uniformed patrol was unlikely to be that visible so as to have a significant effect upon levels of public reassurance and that victims of say domestic crime would also be unable to benefit from such policies.

The majority of research conducted in this field is concerned with fear of crime. Personal characteristics, such as age, gender etc. and how they affect fear of crime were also considered and it was concluded that fear can have a profoundly detrimental impact on people’s quality of life. A central part of this chapter has been to review and consider concepts of community, real and virtual. It was thought that a radio link could be conceived of as a community both in terms of location and of interest. It was established that trust is a key constituent not only of personal relationships and our sense of ontological security but also of community participation. In turn social support and control constitute essential foundations for any form of crime reduction activity located within a community. When developing this concept it was also suggested that the establishment of trust helped create or sustain personal relationships, which in turn sustain communities and assist in offering reassurance.
When thinking about radio links comparisons were made with cellular phone systems as well as consideration of the Internet as an electronically mediated community. Finally, a review was undertaken of both the early studies of Neighbourhood Watch and its effectiveness. It was apparent that some of the structural and conceptual issues associated with what does Neighbourhood Watch mean to the participants and police are ones that need to be taken forward and considered later when discussing the research findings.

In conclusion, it is proposed that a review of the available literature suggests there may be some evidence to support the underpinning concepts of the theory of participative reassurance and that it points to the importance of issues such as trust and personal relationships, particularly those based upon a wider range of issues not just crime reduction. If radio links are the means by which those relationships are to be created or developed and individuals reassured, then appropriate methods of testing the theory needed to be determined.
Chapter Three

Methodology: Numbers, Voices and Discussion

In the previous chapter the theoretical position of participative reassurance was described, it was simply suggested that individuals through their participation and relationships with others may be reassured. That participation was considered in the light of our knowledge of community, social control and support and electronically mediated forms of communication. The relationship between, anxiety – a non-specific risk, the abstract danger that lurks outside (Giddens, 1991) and participative reassurance was explained. It is suggested that reassurance is similarly a non-specific sense of well-being and can therefore, be directly compared with anxiety. This chapter will discuss and explain the choice of the three methods used to produce data for the research: numbers – a secondary analysis of quantitative data produced as part of a realistic evaluation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997): voices – individual free association narrative interviews (Hollway and Jefferson, 2000b) with radio link users; and discussion – focus group interviews held with radio link users.

It is further intended to prepare our consideration of the actual research findings, the success and failure of the research methods, what worked, and what did not and why. Before exploring the issues any further it is necessary to make a number of observations about the necessary relationships between the subjects, the theory and the researcher. It is clear that the research methodologies should be appropriate when evaluating the proposed theory. It is also apparent that when thinking about the subjects, the radio link users themselves that the most appropriate methods are chosen to offer a best fit with their experiences and perceptions, to do otherwise would be, at worse, an abuse. Bulmer (1984) helpfully suggests that:

‘… different kinds of information about man and society are best gathered in different ways, and that the research problem under investigation properly dictates the methods of investigation’ (1984: 15).

Taking the three areas: Westville a high crime inner-city estate; Eastville a BME area, comprised of a Muslim community; and Northville a village, it was necessary to choose methods that spoke to them, that made sense to each of the very different sets of participants.
Finally, thinking about the individual and group interactions involved in a radio link it was necessary to find the most appropriate means by which to evaluate both sets of circumstances, those at a personal and at a group level. The role of the researcher and their involvement in the study is one that also requires appropriate attention and it is worth noting again the potential influence of the author’s employment and involvement in radio links may have had on the data produced. As Bulmer (1984) states ‘there was no one ‘best’ method and each method had its strength and weaknesses’ (1984: 29). It is necessary to reflect upon the value of considering research methods for it has been suggested (Jupp, 1989) that there are two main advantages. Firstly, it ‘facilitates an appreciation of the ways in which empirical investigation is, and can be, carried out’ and secondly, and ‘more importantly, it provides a platform from which to generate clues as to the credence which can be placed upon criminological findings and the conclusions’ (1989: 4).

In essence Jupp believes that to have any faith in the research findings, assessing their ‘method validity’, entails questioning the way data has been collected and analysed (1989: 5) (Original emphasis). The importance of both questioning and understanding methods is also attributed to assisting in determining the relationship between the theory and research methods. Jupp (1989) commenting upon the research of crime a ‘social phenomena’ suggests that the assumption it can be treated as ‘objective facts’ and that the researcher is equally objective, is often linked to the use of quantifiable principles and units of measurement (1989: 6). He believes that the ‘often unthinking and indiscriminate application of numbers and their subsequent manipulation’ leads many people to adopt a qualitative approach. In conclusion, he suggests methods of criminological research are important because:

‘First ... they allow us to gain some understanding of the way in which criminological research is and can be carried out. Second, they provide a basis for an evaluation of method validity ... Third ... such considerations involve us in questions about what may be termed methodological validity especially questions which encourage us to address the implicit methodological assumptions in specific methods of data collection and analysis and to consider the extent to which such assumptions are tenable’ (1989: 8) (Original emphasis).
Two central issues emerge from Jupp’s consideration of research methods, firstly that methods and data collection must be related to the problems and theory and, secondly the need for plurality and variety in the ‘criminological enterprise’ (1989: 9). The hypothesis under examination therefore is that, individuals who participate in a radio link, being able to talk to and listen out for their neighbours, are reassured. This hypothesis contains a number of key factors, which need to be tested and have been touched upon above. Firstly, that individuals are involved in the social network that is the radio link, that they participate in some way and engage with their neighbours, secondly that the group, the other radio link users, support and engage with the individual thereby reflecting and amplifying the individual contributions and thirdly, that this active participation and reciprocity provides the individual with some sense of reassurance. To assist our understanding at this point it is suggested we examine one example of the use of the radio link – not forgetting that the issue is not the technology but the personal and social relationships supported through two-way communication.

In Northville a number of residents owned dogs which they exercised by walking in fields, lanes and woods around the village. Clearly they were often on their own out of sight and hearing of their neighbours and by implication they reported feeling more vulnerable to criminal victimisation than if they were in the village. As such they felt more anxious walking outside the village and so they took their radios with them. They used the radios to talk to one another and some of the villagers used them to arrange to meet most mornings so they could walk together. The villager’s experiences require we enquire into: their feelings of anxiety; their understanding of crime and its potential effects upon them as individuals and as a group; their individual and group interactions within the radio link; and their sense of reassurance – or otherwise.

The three methods chosen to provide data on the above were firstly, numbers – through use of a realistic evaluation and before and after questionnaire interviews to assess experiences of crime, anxiety and perceptions of risk and any changes for radio users and others before and after the introduction of the radio link and set those against a control site.
Secondly, voices – through individual free association narrative interviews determine the specific radio user’s perceptions of risk and anxiety in the context of their life experiences, their understanding of crime and involvement in the scheme and finally their level of participative reassurance. Thirdly, discussion – through bringing together the members of the radio link to assess their collective understanding of specific incidents, crime and reassurance and expose their opinions and thoughts to analysis by the group for either confirmation or rebuttal.

It is necessary to briefly consider the background and relationship between the two research studies that comprise this thesis. Some seven years ago it was suggested that additional research needed to be undertaken to study, the then embryonic, residential radio link schemes. The reasons for this were, as discussed earlier, to inform policy and expand the limited knowledge of participative reassurance. Other general reasons why research into residential schemes were considered desirable was because of the fundamental issues surrounding the security of people’s homes, the current debates around loss of community values and the issues of property related crime, anti-social behaviour and fear particularly in priority communities. To pursue such a piece of work a research methodology, based upon a realistic evaluation was prepared and submitted to the Home Office, requesting financial support to undertake that study. At the same time an application was also made to the Association of British Insurers to support this doctoral research. Fortunately both funding agencies supported the proposal, thereby offering a fairly unique opportunity to research radio links and reassurance through two quite distinct but related studies.

The Home Office funded study adopted a realistic evaluation methodology (Pawson and Tilley, 1997: Tilley, 2000) and undertook an experimental evaluation, using pre and post surveys to test the impact of the radio link on a range of factors, such as incidents of crime and disorder, fear of crime, levels of community interaction. This doctoral research has undertaken a secondary analysis of that data, in particular as it relates to participation, fear of crime and reassurance. This doctoral research allowed for a specific enquiry into one factor, levels of reassurance, utilising a free association narrative interviewing methodology (Hollway and Jefferson, 2000b) and focus groups.
It is hoped that through there being two independent but related studies in the three areas a number of benefits have been obtained, for example that the amount of available data for analysis has been increased, that comparisons between quantitative and qualitative data could be made and as a consequence the integrity of any findings has been increased. This last factor is of some significance given the very real issue of bias and it was planned that the data from the quantitative analysis and focus groups would provide opportunities to be cross-referenced with the findings from the individual interviews.

As an additional guard against bias the researcher undertaking the Home Office study had no previous involvement with radio links, the research used three distinct methodologies and was conducted in three very separate locations. Each of the sites was based in a different local government and police force area and a separate local evening paper covered each of the sites. In addition to the above the radio links were introduced into three quite distinct communities, each of which faced a range of different problems and issues and within which different social structures operated. The rationale was not only to robustly test the theory of participative reassurance but also to seek to reduce any opportunities for bias. It is also suggested that subjecting any hypothesis to a variety of methods increases the validity of any findings. In this particular study there were three research methods being utilised to test the theory in three sites and within three distinctly different communities, a process well known as triangulation (Campbell and Fiske 1959). However, Silverman (2000) cautions that ‘triangulation of data seeks to overcome the context-boundedness of our materials at the cost of analysing their sense in context’ (2000: 99). This potential loss of context is a serious consideration but one which, it is suggested, has been overcome through use of free association narrative interviews and focus groups, both context rich methodologies.

**Numbers: Realistic Evaluation and Secondary Analysis**

Earlier the relationship between this study and that of the Home Office funded realistic evaluation was explained. It is proposed to consider the methodological approach of realistic evaluation and review the use of secondary data analysis, which was undertaken as part of this study.
Much of the recent work on evaluating crime prevention initiatives has, quite rightly, highlighted the importance of understanding the context within which a particular initiative works. Tilley in particular has been critical of the rather generalised bottom line question of ‘does it work?’ He has proposed a much more systematic approach and in Pawson and Tilley (1997) suggested that:

‘The common thread running through the designs is to produce ever more detailed answers to the question of why a program works for whom and in what circumstances’ (1997: xvi) (Original emphasis).

This has been neatly summarised as identifying Contexts, Mechanisms and Outcome Patterns for any given crime prevention initiative, where the context is the conditions within which the initiative operates, the mechanism being the factors which may lead to the initiative generating outcome patterns which are the practical effects produced by the causal relationship between the first two. The basic realist formula has been represented as ‘mechanism + context = outcome’ (1997: xv). As the authors’ state:

‘The point is that realist research design employs no one standard ‘formula’, other than the base strategy of producing a clear theory of program mechanisms, contexts and outcomes and then using them to design the appropriate empirical measures and comparisons’ (Pawson and Tilley, 1997: xv).

The authors emphasise that a realistic evaluation will ultimately test theories as to how programmes work. It is necessary therefore to specifically think through and list the nature of the different mechanisms, contexts and outcomes, which can theoretically operate within any programme. This process of thinking through the realist formulae ‘will identify different groups of practitioners and subjects, who play quite different roles in the routine performance of the programme’ and ‘knowledge of how the programme works will thus differ from participant to participant and indeed between researcher and subjects’ (1997: xv). What then is the method? Pawson and Tilley (1997) describe the classic experimental design where the:

‘... anchor sheet of the method is thus a theory of causation. In this case the introduction of the programme to two identical groups, one experimental and the other the control group, which results in an outcome, can lead to only one conclusion, that the programme is responsible for the outcome’ (1997: 5).

The classic design though is perhaps only truly achievable in a laboratory and can arguably never be strictly applied in the complexity of the social world. This renders almost unobtainable any clear-cut programme causes outcome conclusion.
To overcome these inherent difficulties within the classic design, elements of control have to be introduced, through adapting ‘design and analysis’ to ‘make the basic causal influence secure’ (Pawson and Tilley, 1997: 6). Taking the framework of context, mechanism and outcomes it is possible to identify these factors for the Home Office research project:

**Context**

Given that the research was carried out in residential areas, the following contexts would be important in understanding any possible mechanisms, which might have been triggered:

- Types of crime and disorder problems experienced by residents in the area
- Demographic profile and cultural traditions of residents’ living in the area
- The extent of police patrol and their attitudes towards crime control in the area
- The attitudes of residents to police officers and their willingness to co-operate and communicate with them
- The presence of other types of crime prevention initiative such as Neighbourhood Watch
- The willingness of residents to use the system
- The extent of community engagement in requiring service provision
- The degree of existing community cohesion as represented by structures such as resident’s associations

**Mechanisms**

Given this context, it was proposed that the introduction of a radio link would trigger the following mechanisms:

- Reduce crime by helping to detect and arrest offenders, which in turn can have produced an arrest dividend – reduced levels of crime by the removal of known offenders from the scene
- Deter crime on the basis that offenders knew that there was a good chance of their actions being observed and reported. This may have resulted in lower crime levels, particularly for more opportunistic types of crime
• Reduce the fear of crime by providing participative reassurance for users of the scheme
• Increase the confidence of residents to intervene if they believed that they could readily contact other residents and the police
• Increase the awareness of residents of incidents thus improving levels of surveillance
• Increase the flow of information to and from the police about suspicious behaviour or criminal incidents thereby helping to prevent crime or arrest offenders
• Increase the flow of information between residents thereby, alerting others to possible criminal activity and therefore, enabling them to take preventative action
• Improving levels of formal and informal social interaction leading to enhanced social control over ‘semi private / public’ and ‘public’ areas
• Raising residents confidence to challenge local agencies to act to improve the provision of services, such as improved lighting
• Improving the social and reducing the crime profile of an area thereby attracting stable and law-abiding residents to the estate
• Increase user expectations of the ability of the police to respond to calls for assistance to the point where they became [more] dissatisfied with the local service

Outcomes

Therefore, the practical effects of the introduction of a radio link, given the context within which it was to operate and the mechanisms, which might be triggered, would be:

• Increased detection of crime
• Reduction in the level of crime
• A greater willingness by residents to help and communicate with the police
• A reduction in resident’s fear of crime
• An increase in resident’s levels of satisfaction with their community, the services provided to them and the area in which they live – improved quality of life
• A greater willingness among residents to initiate and become actively involved in other local schemes and their community

Following personal communication with Tilley, prior to commencement of the research, encouragement was given to try and offer some theoretical outcomes for the radio link schemes, which encompassed both negative and positive considerations. Therefore, thinking through the issues and reading across the contexts, mechanisms and outcomes it was possible at the time to conceive of:

1) An ethnically divided and fractured community into which a radio link is introduced facilitating dialogue and discussion among residents leading to, greater understanding and the establishment of social solidarity;

2) An ethnically divided and fractured community into which a radio link is introduced fails to facilitate dialogue and leads to providing a means by which to perpetuate their differences and further dividing the community;

3) An affluent but mobile professional community into which a radio link is introduced assists in accelerating personal contacts through communication and establishing shared understanding leads to an increase in social stability and community participation;

4) An affluent but mobile professional community into which a radio link is introduced but it fails to engage residents who are otherwise so committed as not to be bothered to communicate with others and who, should the risks increase, will move away from the area, leading to a failure to establish any community;

5) Long established residential community of predominately mature and retired residents into which a radio link is introduced, which facilitates additional communication and shared understanding leading to a strengthening of social solidarity;

6) Long established residential community of predominately mature and retired residents' into which a radio link is introduced, which becomes dominated by interest groups whose norms and values are not shared by others leading to a weakening of social solidarity;
7) A mixed age group of residents comprising families with children and teenagers and retired people into which a radio link is introduced, which facilitates communication and greater understanding leading to improved social solidarity leading to reductions in youth related nuisance issues through a sharing of parental responsibilities;

8) A mixed age group of residents comprising families with children and teenagers and retired people into which a radio link is introduced, which fails to facilitate communication and leads to reduced levels of tolerance and social solidarity;

9) An inner-city high crime area into which a radio link is introduced, which overcomes social isolation and facilitates understanding leading to residents overcoming differences and establishing social solidarity;

10) An inner-city high crime area into which a radio link is introduced, which aggravates elements of distrust between residents leading to residents fears of intimidation increasing and social solidarity being reduced;

11) An ethnically homogenous area in which the introduction of a radio link eases communication between individuals and families, thereby enhancing levels of social integration and co-operation; and

12) An ethnically homogenous area in which, the introduction of a radio link fails to engage individuals and leads to less social contact.

As will be seen later the research results show that elements of both the positive and negative outcomes shown above were found in each of the three areas. The Home Office research study followed the standard principles of an experimental design whereby matched pairs of residential areas were identified with one acting as a control while the other acts as the experimental areas.
Once the areas had been identified, a pre-survey of residents was carried out in order to gauge the extent of the concerns about crime, their attitudes towards the police in their local area and the degree of existing social cohesion. The survey was undertaken utilising the questionnaire in Appendix 1, being distributed to a random sample of homes in each area. Within Northville and its control village the sample was randomly picked from all the properties within the two areas. In both Westville, Eastville and their control sites attempts were made to interview residents at all the properties as the areas chosen were geographically small. In order to try and ensure the best possible response rate to the questionnaires, and to reassure residents, a letter was sent to the residents a few days prior to attempting to interview them. The letter explained the nature of the research, that it was funded by the Home Office, that it had the support of the local police (sector inspectors from the local police forces co-signed the letters) and informing them that all interviewers would carry an identification badge with them confirming them as being an interviewer from the University of Leicester.

The original aim was to obtain approximately seventy responses from the villages, and as many as possible from the other areas. This was because they were such small areas. A summary of the sample size is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Number of Letters</th>
<th>Respondents Interviewed 1st then 2nd interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>71/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville Control</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>71/62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>62/51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville Control</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>45/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville Control</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>57/39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University employed local interviewers in Eastville and its control area who were able to relate to the residents, both in terms of language and ethnicity. It is suggested that this factor led to the high response rates in these areas. Those residents from the three experimental sites, Westville, Eastville and Northville, who expressed an interest in continuing with the research, were sent a letter inviting them to a meeting (these were held in the evenings and weekends) where the project was described in greater detail.
It was explained that for those who agreed to take part in the research, that it would be conducted over a one-year period and that there was an expectation that they would offer a commitment to the research and for that time. This involved taking part in a focus group, completing questionnaires and agreeing to be interviewed during the research. An offer was made to the three communities to donate the radios to them on completion of the research. It is to be noted that the residents agreed to commit themselves to such a level of involvement in both studies and it is to their credit that a number of them saw the research process through to its completion. The expressed level of police support for the research should also be noted as well as the fact that the local beat officers for each of the three areas also received a radio.

As stated above during the pre-test survey residents in the three experimental estates were asked to identify whether they would be willing to become actively involved in the study by having a radio. It is important to note that at this time amongst the residents who volunteered to participate in the research and radio link scheme a number did not know the other participants. As will be seen later this approach, originally designed to reduce bias, led to a number of fundamental outcomes and was an entirely different method of scheme implementation utilised in the development of earlier residential radio links. In these previous cases the police worked with a local resident’s representative groups, such as TMOs or Neighbourhood Watch schemes and introduced the concept of a radio link to a group of individuals who knew one another and who had an existing relationship and it is assumed, trusted each other. Once the pre-test data had been collected, radios were introduced into the three experimental areas and appropriate training provided to the participants who volunteered to take part in the research. To ensure as large a number of residents participated in the research as possible every volunteer was issued with a radio. After twelve months the residents in all three experimental and control areas were again surveyed. The data from the three surveys was analysed utilising standard statistical tests software SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) to find differences between the before and after interviews and between the experimental and control residential areas.

An important consideration when undertaking the secondary analysis of the quantitative data was to categorise the variables, specify the questions chosen from the interview questionnaires and provide an explanation for each choice.
A variable can be thought of as ‘coded answers for one survey question’ (Fielding and Gilbert, 2000: 8); ‘any characteristic on which the elements of a sample or population differ from each other’ (Jaeger, 1990: 384) or ‘anything that can be measured or manipulated in the experiment’ (Norman and Streiner, 2003: 1). A variable within the context of this study could therefore, be either a change in: radio user’s perceptions of trust or the extent they may worry about being burgled when at home and whether or not the respondent was a radio link user or non-user or within which area they lived.

Calder (1996) further assists our categorisation of variables by defining independent variables as being ‘the cause of some effect on a dependant variable’ and further that an independent variable is ‘always antecedent and the dependant variable the consequent’ (1996: 228). Norman and Streiner (2003) further define an independent variable as ‘those that are varied by and under the control of experimenter’ while dependant variables are ‘those that respond to experimental manipulation’ (2003: 2). Applying those definitions to the current study the significant independent variable is whether a resident is a radio link user or not – those that are under the control of the experimenter – while the dependant variables comprise amongst others the resident’s perception of trust, etc. – those that respond to the experimental manipulation. It is apparent from reviewing the questionnaire used as part of the Home Office funded research that a number of the questions asked of respondents were not specifically relevant to this enquiry into participative reassurance. This is an inevitable consequence of undertaking secondary analysis, even with two studies which are so closely linked. As a result those questions related to issues of reassurance and participation were specifically utilised.

The questions that were chosen comprise:

Q. 4 How many people do you know (at least to say hello to) in this neighbourhood?

This question was chosen as it specifically measures the number and any changes in social relationships amongst the radio link members and within the community.

The reference to knowing a neighbour sufficiently well to say ‘hello to’ them is important in that it defines the relationship as being more than just an acknowledgment out of courtesy.
Q. 9 Do your neighbours tell you if they are going away for a few days?

This question seeks to determine the extent and any change in trust amongst the radio link members and within the local community. The question may relate to both neighbours who are members of the radio link or not and as will be seen later from one of the Northville respondents this question may also assess any change in non-radio link users perceptions of the trustworthiness of radio link members.

Q. 14 In general, do you trust the other people who live in your neighbourhood?

This question again seeks to determine the level and any change in trust. The use of the word neighbourhood seeks to concentrate the respondent's area of reference.

Q. 15 In general, can you rely on people in your neighbourhood if you need help or assistance?

This question seeks to determine the extent and any change in social relationships and networks amongst radio link members and within the community, as expressed through levels of neighbourly support and reliance. The question has also been chosen as it seeks to assess levels of participation again as expressed through the offer of help or assistance.

Q. 18 Do you feel part of a 'community' where you live?

This self-explanatory question seeks to determine the extent and any change in perceptions of community. The question is quite fundamental to any assessment by respondents as to the extent of supportive social networks in the neighbourhood.

Q. 50 How worried are you that certain things might happen to you in the next 12 months?

This detailed question seeks to determine the extent of the respondents' worries and concerns, and any changes, related to crimes against them and their property as well as issues of nuisance and anti-social behaviour. Two specific sub-questions have been chosen, those being a) worry about a resident's house being broken into and property being stolen or damaged while they are at home and k) worry about walking along a street in daytime in a resident's area when a group of youths are either walking towards them or are hanging around the pavement.
These two sub-questions have been chosen as they specifically touch issues that are of particular concern to residential communities, domestic burglary and youth related anti-social behaviour. The questions related to worry rather than fear Q. 59 have been specifically chosen as it is suggested they are more closely related to feelings of anxiety and therefore, reassurance.

**Q. 64 Do you think that crime, or how you feel about becoming a victim of crime has an impact on your everyday life?**

This question seeks to determine internal perceptions of the impact of crime, and any changes, within respondents and gauges their levels of reassurance. The reference to having an impact on the respondent’s everyday life mirrors the first free association narrative interview question.

A number of analyses and statistical tests have been applied to the data utilising SPSS. These tests are described below and detail is provided as to the nature of the enquiry and the rationale for applying them to the data.

**Statistical Tests: Chi-Square Test ($\chi^2$)**

In this test we are seeking to draw inferences about a population from a much smaller sample, in this case the respondents from the experimental and control sites. The strength of those inferences is based upon the probability, termed the p-value, of assertions made about populations, termed hypotheses. Two hypotheses are created; one termed the null hypothesis is true if there is no evidence found to refute the position that there is no difference between the sample and the general population. The second hypothesis is termed the alternative hypothesis, for example that radio link users in Northville trust the people in their neighbourhood more than non-users, that there is a difference between the sample – radio users and non-users in Northville – and the population. Using Chi-Square the data is tested against the null hypothesis with the smaller the p-value the greater the evidence is against the null hypothesis and for the alternative hypothesis. It is generally accepted that the measure used most frequently to determine statistical significance is a p-value of less than 0.05, expressed as $p < 0.05$. The further statistical measure is degrees of freedom, expressed as df. This simply means the number of independent terms in any table.
The Chi-Square figure is an indication of the extent of association between data with the larger its value the more ‘the numbers in the table differ from those we would expect if there was no association’ (Norman and Streiner, 2003: 88). Some of those variables are clearly nominal, for example gender, while others are ordinal being related to scales of worry or numbers of people known to say hello to by respondents ‘counts of people…in different categories’ (Norman and Streiner, 2003: 3), which required non-parametric statistical tests are applied. The most commonly used statistical test to apply, in these circumstances, is the Chi-Square test, which simply put determines the ‘goodness of fit’ (Balnaves and Caputi, 2001: 199) or a ‘test of association between two variables’ (Norman and Streiner, 2003: 88). Again utilising SPSS Appendix 4 lists the complete set of Chi-Square outputs for each of the chosen questions. However, there are a number of limitations associated with the Chi-Square test, for example it assumes no ordering among categories and treats all variables as nominal. More importantly, findings of association between variables ‘does not necessarily imply causality’ (Calder, 1996: 241).

**Statistical Tests: One-Way Analysis of Variance ANOVA**

As is already known this study was undertaken in three experimental and three control areas. Within the three experimental areas radios were introduced and as such three populations were created. It is possible to hypothesise that following the introduction of the radio link any change would be exactly similar across all three populations. If, as we suspect, the outcomes differ then a commonly used statistical test for analysis of variance, (abbreviated to ANOVA), for three or more populations is the one-way – the method involves the analysis of only one factor – ANOVA test. It is important to note that as with the Chi-Square test we are not yet looking to show causality but to determine differences. ANOVA tests have been applied to the chosen questions and compared with the before and after responses from the experimental area and also against the after responses from the experimental and control sites, please see Appendix 5. The one-way ANOVA tests again show the measure of statistical difference, namely the p-value. In addition a new statistical measure is introduced namely the F ratio, which is a measure of the relative variation between groups and of variation within groups.
In other terms 'it will summarise the variation among sample averages, compared to the variation among individual observations within samples' (Jaeger, 1990: 261). What is important is that the larger the F ratio is the smaller 'the probability that the difference could occur by chance' (Norman and Streiner, 2003: 44). Finally, it was decided to subject the data to more detailed statistical analysis.

Statistical Tests: Nonparametric Measures of Association Pearson and Spearman

It was suggested above that there exist a number of limitations when analysing data using the Chi-Square test, particularly as information can be lost because Chi-Square ‘only identifies the existence of an association and not its type or strength’ (Sapsford and Judd, 1996: 253). As has been stated above, Chi-Square tests do not treat the nature of information, which ordinal or ratio variables may disclose especially the strength or type of association. What is of importance is the nature of the association, known as correlation. A number of statistical tests have been developed to determine the nature of any correlation. The most commonly used are Pearson’s – particularly for interval or ratio data – and Spearman’s – for ranked ordinal or non-normal data (Sapsford and Judd, 1996: 253). The strength of any correlation between two variables is expressed as the correlation coefficient. Pearson’s test states that a correlation coefficient of +1.00 is called a perfect positive correlation while -1.00 is a perfect negative correlation. If either is found it can be suggested that it would be possible to predict the value of one variable ‘perfectly by knowing the value of the other variable’ (Jaeger, 1990: 66). Applying these thoughts to our study our null hypothesis would be that the introduction of the radio link had had no effect and that Pearson’s test would therefore, provide a correlation coefficient of 0, there is no correlation between the two variables. A correlation of say +0.8 would suggest a strong positive correlation and association between the variables but we would also be required to determine if the test is statistically significant, p-value. For any population the data is expected not to be normally distributed. Spearman’s test is often used in such circumstances to determine the correlation between data that ‘measures underlying variables at the ordinal level’ (Jaeger, 1990: 71). To ensure a complete analysis of the data, and to capture all variables, both tests have been applied to the chosen questions.
Thankfully, the Spearman correlation coefficient is interpreted in the same manner as Pearson's. In conclusion, the secondary analysis of data, shown in the appendices, becomes progressively more focussed from cross-tabulation descriptions to the application of Pearson and Spearman tests of respondents who have taken a radio – radio link users – against the chosen questions for the before and after surveys for the three experimental areas (no comparison is made with the control sites as they did not have radios).

Having decided to initially described the data, both in terms of the demographic profiles of the respondents and the crosstabulation analysis of the selected questions against the before and after surveys within the experimental sites, it was necessary to undertake more detailed statistical tests. Before undertaking such analysis it is necessary to determine exactly what it is we wish to test, what variables determine that undertaking and what statistical process will provide the most reliable outcomes from which inferences can be securely drawn. To review the nature of the undertaking therefore, this secondary analysis is firstly, seeking to determine if there are any statistical differences between the interviewees' responses to the chosen questions in the before and after surveys in the experimental site and between the results of the after surveys in both the experimental site and the control site. Secondly, the analysis will seek to determine if there is a statistical difference between the responses of the radio link users and non-users through testing the before and after surveys in the experimental areas.

As has been stated secondary analysis of the Home Office research was undertaken for this study. Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (1996) referring to the work of Durkheim and Marx wrote 'secondary data analysis has a rich intellectual tradition in the social sciences' offering the opportunity to review for 'comparative purposes' and through having a larger source of data 'greater scope and depth than is possible when using a single primary data research project' (1996: 305). The authors identified other methodological advantages: the opportunity for replication, where research findings are repeated; through expanding the 'scope of independent variables employed in the operationalisation of concept'; and in providing the opportunity for triangulation (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 1996: 306/7).
The work of Jupp (1989) shows that primary data is obtained, for the ‘specific purpose of addressing criminological issues in question’ whereas, secondary data are, ‘those observations collected by other people or other agencies with other purposes in mind’ (1989: 33). In the case of secondary data they may not therefore be influenced nor directed by the theory and ideas in which the researcher is interested. Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (1996) identified the same difficulty in using someone else’s data, namely that it may not exactly fit with your own study, as such analysis is likely to be an approximation as the data type is not exactly what is required to test the hypothesis. As they comment ‘here is an inevitable gap between primary data the investigator collects personally with specific research purposes and intentions in mind and data others collect for other purposes’ (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996: 308). However, secondary analysis may be the only available route available for studying certain crimes, Tombs, (2000: 64) utilised official statistics recorded by the Health and Safety Executive as a means of overcoming the absence of crime data recorded by the police and Home Office on safety crimes. In this study secondary analysis of the Home Office realistic evaluation of radio links offered a number of key advantages, those being, its direct relevance to the research and the opportunity for comparison with the qualitative data obtained from the focus groups and free association narrative interviews. Finally, and most importantly the independent collection of the data provides a fundamental base line against which to judge the data obtained from the individual interviews and focus groups, thereby guarding against bias.

Voices: Free Association Narrative Interviewing

The following section reviews the interview methodology utilised in this study, free association narrative interviews, Hollway and Jefferson (1997). This review is necessary for two main reasons, firstly to assist in understanding how this relatively new approach has been arrived at and operates and, secondly how an approach to studying fear of crime and anxiety has been adopted to analysing reassurance.
Hollway and Jefferson (1997) suggest that two main problems emerge from consideration of research into crime and of people’s perceptions, that is fear of crime is not solely related to issues such as disorder and incivility but with wider concerns, such as a the ever changing world in which discussions about order and control are key and that crime and fear of crime are always politically constructed – note the impact of 9-11. Secondly, and what is again of relevance, they seek to explore ‘the relationship between discourses of fear and individual biographies’ (1997: 257). Hollway and Jefferson (2000a) argue that anxiety and fear cannot be understood purely in terms of crime. In their article they explored the role of anxiety in fear of crime, for they suggest that:

‘Our hypothesis in starting our research was that the introduction of anxiety into the debate would assist our understanding of this paradox; [risk – fear] we assumed that people’s fear of crime would not be a direct response to risk of victimisation but would be mediated by anxiety and defences against it’ (2000: 31).

It is relevant therefore, to discuss the proposed theoretical relationship between anxiety and reassurance. As has been explained in the previous chapter a useful and simplistic comparison could be made along the lines of, anxiety – the non-specific risk and reassurance – the generic sense of well-being. Taking Hollway and Jefferson’s suggestion that fear of crime is mediated by anxiety and internal individual defences against it, then it is necessary to ask how can this be applied to reassurance? It is suggested that a reduction in an individual’s anxiety can be achieved through increasing their sense of reassurance. Thinking this issue through it can logically be suggested that any reduction in anxiety will naturally be influenced by that individual’s level of reassurance – the greater they are reassured or feel reassured the less they are anxious. Likewise, thinking about internal defences to anxiety we can conceive of people being by nature hopeful or optimistic – emotions supportive of reassurance – that will again influence any reduction in anxiety. The concept of the defended subject, having an understanding of the effects of defences against anxiety on people’s actions is supported by the observations of other researchers, for example Ferraro (1995) who stated ‘I see fear of crime influenced by knowledge and experience of criminal realities, environmental context, and biographical features’ (1995: 5) (Emphasis added).
Based upon their work it is suggested that an anxious, defended subject will react to both internal and external factors, internal through their access to a unique catalogue of anxiety-provoking life events and means by which that individual has managed them, and external because they are affected by the social world, people that individual influences and is influenced by and also because of their interaction with real events in the social world.

Hollway and Jefferson (2000b) considered the presence or absence of safety, a key characteristic present in an individual's life events and factors, such as their employment, place of residence, etc. and suggested that 'safety produces feelings of security' and that 'a person's (largely unconscious) ways of coping with external threats to safety goes a long way in understanding who they are' (2000b: 138). This is an important consideration because feelings of safety will directly inform – and reduce – an individual's and a group's feelings of anxiety and fear. Danger, its opposite, produces feelings of threat. It is suggested that the capacity to control danger, through the mechanism of a radio link, cannot be considered a solitary activity for it is always necessary to consider the level of group interaction. Taking the above it is suggested that neither a survey nor face-to-face interview will adequately offer an explanation for that individual's fears and anxieties unless the defended subject is understood. But how does that relate to the practice of actual research? The research conducted by Hollway and Jefferson (2000b) was based upon interviews with residents living on an estate, which was defined as being comprised of a low and high crime area. The interview schedule developed by them was therefore, premised upon the description of the area in which the interviewee resided, high or low crime. Relating their work to this study of participative reassurance it was proposed to structure the one-to-one interviews in such a way as to allow the discourse of individual's anxiety and fear of crime and finally to determine if they felt or received participative reassurance.

The original Hollway and Jefferson interview schedule was adopted to refer to before and after the introduction of the radio link and modified following personal communication with Professor Jefferson.
Before considering the specific questions it is worth referring to Patton (1990) who tells us that the process of interviewing is simply to ‘find out what is in and on someone else’s mind’ while ‘open-ended interviewing is not to put things in someone’s mind…but to access the perspective of the person being interviewed’ and essentially we ‘interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe’ (1990: 278). Were many people have to be interviewed about the same issue, in this case participative reassurance, there is the need to develop a standardised open-ended interview, which consists of carefully worded questions arranged with a view to taking ‘each respondent through the same sequence and asking each respondent the same questions with essentially the same words’ (Patton, 1990: 280). It is clearly important to ask the same questions in the same sequence of each of the respondents to minimise variation for not to do so would lead to firstly, loss of meaning with some respondents not answering fully as they do not follow the sequence of questions, and secondly, bias, with some respondents giving more information than others causing inaccuracies in subsequent data analysis (1990: 281). In conclusion, the basic characteristics of qualitative interviewing are that ‘the persons being interviewed respond in their own words to express their own personal perspectives’ (Patton, 1990: 287).

The interview schedule, utilised in this research, was as follows:

- Can you tell me about times when crime has impacted on your life since you’ve been living here?

- Can you tell me about unsafe situations in your life before you joined the radio link?

- Can you think of something that you’ve read, seen or heard about recently that makes you fearful? Anything [not necessarily about crime].

- Can you tell me about risky situations in your life since you’ve joined the radio link?

- Can you tell me about times in your life since you’ve joined the radio link when you’ve been anxious?
• Can you tell me about times in your life before you joined the radio link when you've been anxious?

• Can you tell me what it was like joining the radio link?

• Can you tell me if you are reassured through being involved in the radio link?

Drawing upon Hollway and Jefferson’s (2000b) work the questions were written firstly to mirror their instrument, exploring the subject’s fear and anxiety, referring to the introduction of the radio link as the key mechanism of change and finally asking if they were reassured. It is intended to offer an explanation for the rationale behind each question by reference to the original work of Hollway and Jefferson as well as to its use in this study:

Question 1 is a general one which ‘aims to elicit any associations with crime. The question was worded in this way so that it did not ‘assume victimisation’ (2000b: 38). As the research is located in three distinct communities and areas the relationship between these factors and the impact of crime upon the interviewee is questioned. The use of the word impact was intended to imply that there should be some measurable effect felt by the interviewee, even if they themselves were not the victim of the specific crime. This was thought to provide a boundary around the answer rather than it become a general discussion of all crimes that may have a minimum or limited effect upon the interviewee. Specifying the need to restrict their answer to when they were resident at that address was intended to assist the interviewee, both by focussing upon crime and its relationship with that location, and to help offer a structured beginning to the interview.

Question 2 and 4, were intended to ‘aim to elicit stories relating to safety and risk respectively, providing us with two routes to the same theoretical point’ (2000b: 38). Jefferson and Hollway through framing the questions this way did not want to assume fear but believe that the notion of being at risk is similar. Question 2 is theoretically able to elucidate some of the individual’s concern about their safety, based upon their life experiences, which may in turn provide a number of explanations, such as to their participation in the radio link. Comparison both by the interviewee and researcher to responses to question 2 and 4 will theoretically explore changes in their perceptions of being either unsafe or at risk after they have been involved in the radio link.
As question 4 specifically asks about risky situations occurring in their life, it is theoretically possible that there will be situations, which happen when respondents are not at home, and therefore, not involved in the radio link. It was intended that should such responses be given then the interviewee would reflect upon their feelings and compare them with their perceptions when they are involved in their radio link.

Question 3 explores any association between fear of crime and media representation of crime or other events. It is important to note the potential influence of the events of 11th September 2001 and the subsequent international focus on terrorism on an individual and community sense of vulnerability. This is particularly relevant to the BME community residing in Eastville, as it comprises a majority of Muslim residents. Other high profile incidents that were widely reported during the research period was the abduction and murder of the two girls in Soham, Cambridgeshire and the conviction of the Norfolk farmer Tony Martin for shooting a burglar. Question 3 also raises the possibility of respondents hearing something on the radio link and the scheme itself having an effect upon their levels of fear.

Question 5 and 6 are both concerned with anxiety. The time frames are based upon the life of the individual after and before they became participants in the radio link. The importance of an individual’s childhood trauma in ‘producing adult fears and chronic anxiety’ (Hollway and Jefferson, 2000b: 39) was opened for discussion during this question. While the questions sought to explore respondent’s perceptions of anxiety it was theoretically possible that either negative responses will be received or in the case of question 5 that membership of the radio link itself would be the cause of their anxiety. In this case the relevance of their involvement in the radio link was explored. Reference is made to the studies relating to Neighbourhood Watch, in which it was found that membership did not reduce fear of crime (Bennett, 1989; Hope, 1988). In addition question 6 provided a useful check upon the answer to question 2, and with question 5 upon 4. Any substantive difference between the two answers while not being critical, the interviewee could simply have not remembered an incident, would though have been of interest.

Question 7 sought to explore the individual’s initial reaction to participating in the radio link at a time some months after its launch.
This time was intended to allow the interviewee a period during which they could compare their experiences of being involved in the radio link, while still being able to recall their feelings prior to joining the system. It was thought likely that this would provide an occasion when their ability to compare their experiences of participating in the radio link to their memory of their earlier experiences will be at its greatest. In addition the initial few days experience of being involved in the scheme may have been memorable. It was hoped that those experiences may have set the tone for the schemes subsequent development and therefore, have been of interest to both the interviewee and researcher.

Question 8 was one that caused some reflection. It was questioned whether or not to ask the participants directly if they were reassured as this may have influenced their answer. In addition identifying a specific relationship between the radio link scheme and reassurance might again have influenced the responses, taking into account the above comments about the potential influence the author may have had on the interview. Set against these considerations was firstly, the belief that people would not be so malleable and secondly, the desire to ask a simple question directly and centrally relevant to the research. It was clear that if the respondents had said no, they were not reassured through being involved in the radio link, or yes they were, then that ultimately would be a key factor in assessing participative reassurance. To duck the issue, by not asking the question directly, would have been a wasted opportunity. On balance therefore, and weighing the likely influencing factors against the desire for clarity, the question was included. It was anticipated that introducing the concept of involvement would prompt consideration of joint activity and collective action thereby providing evidence of participation. This would, it was hoped, assist in developing responses, informed by biographies, which related to changes in personal feelings and beliefs. One of the areas of interest was what were the participants perspectives on reassurance, is it just an internal process or is also something that can be received, for example you may be reassured by the sight of a police officer in uniform, is that something you feel or is it ‘received’ from the officer? And again with anxiety, is that something that only exists as an internal concern or can it be projected, shared, with others thereby reducing its effects? Through the wording of this final question it was hoped to draw out these issues from respondents.
Pilot Interviews

To test the suitability of the free association methodology and interview schedule for residents involved in radio link schemes two sets of two pilot interviews were conducted prior to undertaking those in the research areas. The pilot interviews were undertaken with residents involved in two well-established radio link schemes in different high-crime areas of the West Midlands. The first area is a large sprawling estate comprised of multiple occupancy maisonettes and high rise flats, which is currently undergoing a modernisation programme. The second area is comprised of a mixed range of housing in a deprived neighbourhood close to industrial and commercial properties. All four of the respondents were women, the first two being younger than the second two respondents. It is not intended to consider in detail the individual responses to the questions but to conclude that the pilot interviews were undertaken to primarily test the appropriateness of the interview schedule with the questions having been adapted to assess the participant’s involvement in the radio link and sense of reassurance. The pilots were not designed especially to test the suitability of the questions in that the schedule was based substantially upon the proven Hollway and Jefferson (2000b) model. As such it was encouraging to find the questions elicited life histories, for example the two ladies in the first area and their experiences of stranger attacks. The responses also provided information about how the radio link operated at an individual and group level, for example one of the users agreeing to monitor the radio link and act as a ‘base’. The interviewees responded freely to the questions and there was neither hesitancy nor evasion, which indicated they felt comfortable both with the issues being raised, even those, which were quite personal such as cost of telephone bills and medical conditions, and it is suggested with the author as the interviewer. One of the earlier concerns was that the author being a serving police officer would unduly influence the respondents. In essence both pilot interviews elicited significant information about local policing, both positive and negative. It could be suggested that because some of the responses were quite critical of the police they felt no reluctance in being interviewed by the author. This may be an indication that any concerns over potential bias had either been reduced or were unfounded. In conclusion therefore, to elicit such responses and explanations for personal involvement and feelings about the radio links showed the appropriateness of the interview schedule, which was left unchanged and used in the research sites.
Discussion: Focus Groups

In our review of the relevance of focus groups for criminological research it is very relevant to begin by referring to the work of Ditton et al. (2000) (see also Jupp et al. (2000: 60), whose study of the crime survey methodology, utilised focus groups as one of its methods. Focus groups were used in two distinct ways: firstly to discuss issues raised during qualitative interviews and as a means of developing a questionnaire and secondly, as a means of arranging the type of responses to questions about criminal victimisation, into categories. In this regard the use of focus groups is not seen as the primary method of data collection but as a useful health check during the research. In their work on the subject, Krueger and Casey (2000) define a focus group as:

‘... a special type of group in terms of purpose, size, composition, and procedures. The purpose of a focus group is to listen and gather information...a carefully planned series of discussions designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment’ (2000: 4-5).

The focus group concept originated in market research where groups of customers were asked questions about issues, such as the price or type of packaging of products (Arksey and Knight, 1999). It has been stressed that ‘the results of these market research focus groups would not prove anything ... the number involved would be small and the generalizability would be quite low’ (1999: 77) (Original emphasis). In addition other factors would influence the validity of any findings, for example the fact some attendees would be paid or that influential or vocal participants would dominate the group (note the impact of the radio ham in the Northville focus group later). Notwithstanding, the above limitations the authors note that focus groups are useful in that they validate instruments – see Ditton et al. (2000) above – they are quite inexpensive and are a useful way of:

‘... getting the range of the informant’s perspectives and of getting some tentative purchase on who holds them. As long as the results of these groups are treated as material for thought, reflection and further investigation, they can be very useful and relatively inexpensive. They complement but do not remove the need to pilot and refine research instruments’ (Arksey and Knight 1999: 77).
In their work in Salford, Walklate and Evans (1999) utilised methodological pluralism – triangulation – as an approach to research the role of community and people’s relationships with their community as a ‘mediating factor in the management of their ontological security’ (Walklate, 2000: 192). The methods used included ‘walking and talking’ the area and with its people, conducting in-depth interviews, undertaking a criminal victimisation survey and focus groups. The research used focus groups for a variety of reasons for example, with selected representative groups of people such as police officers who patrolled the areas and with 13-15 year old children. But one use in particular is of specific note and that was to test the participants understanding of fear and safety, a distinction which Walklate compares to feminists victim and survivor classifications. The group discussion of crime, victimisation and the fear The results obtained through the use of focus groups led Walklate to conclude ‘that without the use of the focus group technique a good deal of subtle, nuanced understanding would have been lost’ (2000: 197). Focus groups also allow for the collection of data where the researcher wishes to obtain ‘an insight into the attitudes and opinions of groups, rather than acquiring specific information about individuals’ (Clarke and Dawson, 1999: 77). It is also suggested that when used in programme evaluation, focus groups have several advantages over individual interviews or self-completed questionnaires, for example they generate lots of data quite quickly, they allow participants to raise issues that are important to them and allow the researcher to observe ‘the social processes and dynamics of group interaction’ (Clarke and Dawson, 1999: 77).

The importance of this final comment within the context of this study cannot be overestimated, for the theory of participative reassurance suggests reliance upon group interactions. Therefore, any methodology that relied solely upon individual interviews would miss the essential nature of group activity. Rationalising the specific use of focus groups in this study raised a number of considerations. Initially they offered the opportunity to test out the theory of participative reassurance, was it a myth or reality, was there sufficient evidence arising from the group discussions to confirm or deny its existence?
It is again important to emphasise that participative reassurance is based upon participation in a social network, a group activity and the initial focus groups provided the only real chance to explore this theoretical position through the collective voice of the participants. On a more practical level the initial focus groups enabled access to be gained to interviewees, which helped arrangements for individual interviews. These decisions were obviously informed by the contributions of the participants, for example who had the most to say, who did not and who held interesting or contrary views. Again on a practical note the focus group enabled any technical or procedural issues, for example channel changes on the radio to be answered (note later the satellite interference in Westville) as well as clarifying any questions participants may have about the differences and links between the two research projects. These obvious advantages must be set against the clear difficulty that was considered before the focus groups were held, that was through asking specific questions, for example about concepts of reassurance they may have influenced the subsequent individual interviews. This will be addressed later but it is an important potential factor and one that should be considered. For the three areas focus groups were arranged to explore a broader range of topics than those covered in the free association narrative interviews. In addition it was thought that within a group environment issues such as participation and co-operative action could be more fully explored, for example opinions would be exposed to confirmation or rebuttal and incidents considered from differing participants perspectives, for example see later the Northville discussion regards the drunk driver. For the same reasons focus group discussions feature more prominently within certain themes. For Westville and Eastville only one focus group was held but two were arranged for Northville. The reason for only one focus group being held in the two areas was because of the lack of activity on the radio link at the time when the second set of focus group were being planned and the many practical difficulties involved in bringing people together.

In themselves these issues are important indicators of the extent or otherwise of participation and involvement in the radio link in these two areas.
The Three Sites and Operational Considerations

The three experimental sites were chosen for their markedly different social and economic contexts. An anonymised outline of the three areas is provided based upon the Ward profiles (Neighbourhood Statistics).

**Westville**

The Ward profile shows that in 1998, 16,000 people lived in the area, which represents some 5% of the local City’s population. The area in which the radio link operated represents just a part of the whole Ward, which also includes the City centre. In mid 1998 the Ward’s age profile when compared to that of the City shows: 21% were under 16 years (22%); 68% were between 16 and 59 years (58%) and 12% were aged over 60 years, (20%). This tends to indicate that the Ward, when compared to the City, has a younger population profile. The Ward is ranked in the low three hundreds in the Indices of Deprivation scale out of a total of 8414 and has the highest unemployment rate in the City. The ethnic profile of the Ward is: 64% white; 19% Indian; 4.5% Pakistan; 4.5% Bangladesh and 4.6% Black. The housing tenure is; 31% local authority; 14.8% housing association; 38.5% owner occupied and 14.5% rented. In the Ward 16% of the population claimed Income Support compared to 11% for the City and 8% nationally.

**Eastville**

The Ward profile shows that in 1998, 12,600 people lived in the area, which represents some 4.5% of the local City’s population. As with Westville the area in which the radio link operates represents just a part of the Ward which also covers the City centre. In mid 1998 the Ward’s age profile when compare to that of the local authority shows: 23% were aged under 16 years (22%), 68% aged between 16 and 59 (60%), and 9% aged 60 or over (18%). This also indicates that the population of the Ward is younger than that of the City.

The Ward is ranked in the low hundred in the Indices of Deprivation scale out of a total of 8,414, which means it is the most deprived of the three research sites. In the Ward 15% of the population claimed income support compared to 1% for the local authority area and 8% nationally.
Northville

In 1998 the Ward in which the village is located recorded a population of 24,000 some 5% of the local authority population. In mid 1998 the Ward’s age profile when compared to that of the local authority shows: 23% were aged under 16 years (21%); 60% were aged between 16 and 59 (60%) and 17% were aged over 60 (20%). This again tends to indicate the population of the Ward is younger than that of the local authority area. In 1998 some 5% of the population claimed Income Support with the local authority average being 6% and 8% nationally. The ward ranked in the high four thousands in the Indices of Deprivation scale out of a total of 8414.

There are a number of striking similarities between the three research sites and those described by Walklate (2000, 2002). She discussed a crime reduction initiative in a rural area of Cheshire and compared this to her own two research sites in Salford, Oldtown and Bankhill. Walklate goes on to compare the three areas, Oldtown, Bankhill and the rural community in Cheshire. Adapting her analysis it can be suggested that the three research sites studied here can be thought of as:
Table 2 Adaptation of Walklate/Evans Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding the crime problem</th>
<th>Westville</th>
<th>Eastville</th>
<th>Northville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insiders</td>
<td>Community outsiders</td>
<td>Outsiders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>Organised around Tenants and Residents Association and personal relationships with high levels of trust</td>
<td>Organised around common religious, cultural and ethnic bonds</td>
<td>Organised around village institutions, highly protective of villagers but fearful of outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female dominated</td>
<td>Male dominated</td>
<td>Mixed: male organised but active female participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social exclusion</td>
<td>Already excluded</td>
<td>Sense of inclusion when compared to asylum seekers</td>
<td>Inclusive but fearful of isolation from services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping mechanisms</td>
<td>Bonds of trust between active citizens</td>
<td>Sense of cultural solidarity and religious / ethnic identity</td>
<td>Economic and organisation strengths and ability to lobby for resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these areas was chosen so as to provide significantly different settings within which to identify the relationship between context and the potential mechanisms triggered by the introduction of the radio link scheme. The paired housing estates were matched in terms of size (number of houses and local population), economic profile (levels of unemployment and type of housing) and levels of crime (particularly rates of burglary, car crime, street crime and vandalism). These areas were selected from the central England area for a variety of reasons.

Firstly, the area provided a wide range of different residential settings, including those, which have relatively large ethnic minority populations. Secondly, selecting areas close to the researchers bases reduced costs associated with travel to the control and experimental areas. Finally, the researcher has strong links with local police forces and agencies thereby enabling access. In practical terms the approach to undertaking the research was to conduct the focus groups some weeks after the radio link was introduced and the free association narrative interviews after them.
This was intended to allow sufficient time for the schemes to become established and for participants to have formed or developed relationships with other scheme members through the medium of the radio link. It also needed to be a sufficiently short enough period of time to allow for effective comparisons to be made by the respondents with their experiences before joining the radio link. As the participants had already consented to being involved in both the Home Office research and this study, none of those asked declined to be interviewed.

All the interviews were tape recorded, with the consent of the interviewees, whose identity has not been disclosed. The locations have also been protected through being anonymised. Prior to the interview an explanation was given to detail the difference in research methods and structure from that being undertaken as part of the Home Office study. As the author presented himself as a police officer engaged in both this study as well as assisting the research being undertaken under the auspices of the Home Office. This approach was carefully considered in relation to potentially influencing participants, for as Patton (1990: 56) states in qualitative research ‘the human being is the instrument of data collection’ which requires ‘that the investigator carefully reflect on, deal with, and report potential sources of bias and error’. And ‘Any research strategy ultimately needs credibility to be useful. No credible research strategy advocates biased distortion of data to serve the researcher’s vested interests and prejudices’ (Patton, 1990: 55). He further suggests:

‘...the investigator adopts a stance of neutrality with regard to the phenomenon under study. This simply means that the investigator does not set out to prove a particular perspective or manipulate the data to arrive at predisposed truths’ (1990: 55) (Original emphasis).

Neutrality, Patton suggests, has another related meaning, that is that the ‘person being interviewed can tell me anything without engendering either my favour or disfavour with regard to the content of their response’ (1990: 317). The question of researcher as a police officer was resolved in that it was decided the author’s occupation should be disclosed as part of the preparatory meetings with residents and was also made known to the local police officers. It was thought that any attempt at deception, for example had the author attempted to suggest he was a researcher from the University would have run the risk of discovery had the scheme members later learnt the author was in fact a police officer.
Such discovery would have had a potentially detrimental effect upon the interviewees. In addition if the author had sought to deny or conceal his occupation that would have certainly created a false atmosphere during the interview process. The author believed that any personal discomfort would have significantly affected the interview and subsequent data interpretation. Any deception once discovered would undoubtedly undermine the scheme’s integrity and the whole research process, honesty was considered the most appropriate and only ethically acceptable policy. A further factor that has been mentioned above was that as the scheme originator there exist considerable potential for bias and distortion and it remained a constant consideration. Hollway and Jefferson (2000b) are quite clear that ‘as researchers ... we cannot be detached but must examine our subjective involvement because it will help to shape the way in which we interpret the interview data’ (2000b: 33). As this second issue was also troubling, the observations by Patton (1990: 47) were found to be both reassuring and accurate. He argues that the:

‘... professional comportment of many evaluators who purposely project an image of being cool, calm, and external and detached. Such detachment and lack of personal involvement is presumed to contribute to objectivity and to reduce bias. However, qualitative evaluators question the necessity and utility of distance and detachment, assuming that without empathy and sympathetic introspection derived from personal encounters the observer cannot fully understand human behaviour’ (1990: 47) and ‘In short, closeness does not make bias and loss of perspective inevitable; distance is no guarantee of objectivity’ (1990: 48).

It is hoped that having addressed and disclosed both issues, occupation and scheme originator, everyone who took part in the research would be able to be honest about what they believed. However, certain features of the research process assisted in guarding against any potential for bias. The first of these safeguards was the involvement of the doctoral supervisor who was involved in both studies and was obviously very aware of both of the above potential sources of bias. A second safeguard was that all the tape transcription were undertaken by typists employed by Wolverhampton City Council, who had no involvement whatsoever in the schemes. Finally, the findings from the Home Office study, undertaken by the independent researcher, have allowed opportunities for data comparison, which has highlighted both differences and similarities in findings.
Having positively addressed the issues that could lead to bias and data distortion, having been open and honest with everyone involved in the research process and finally having taken specific steps to prevent such influence, it is suggested that as far as possible the results obtained are as accurate a record of events as possible.

**Evaluation: Making Sense of the Data**

The three research methods, described above numbers, voices and discussion have produced a significant amount of both quantitative and qualitative data. The obvious next step is to take that data, subject it to analysis and draw appropriate conclusions. In essence to simply conclude, for example that a numerical percentage of residents reported one factor or that the focus groups discussed another issue would be insufficient and inappropriate.

An approach needed to be designed that would compare the numerical indicators of change and opinion against the detail of the individual interviews and within the context of the group discussions. A helpful beginning is again provided by Patton (1990), who states that when one is engaged in any examination or judgement of the accomplishments and effectiveness of a process and that is conducted 'systematically and empirically through careful data collection and thoughtful analysis, one is engaged in evaluation research' (1990: 11). The main purposes of evaluation are to inform decision-making, and apply knowledge to solve human and social problems. The same intentions as originally expressed when seeking support for this research, to test the theory of participative reassurance and assist in informing decision makers. As Patton (1990) observed ‘applied evaluative research is judged by its usefulness in making human actions and interventions more effective and by its practical utility to decision makers, policymakers and others who have a stake in efforts to improve the world’ (1990: 12). Clarke (1999) suggests that evaluation is a unique form of social enquiry, which emphasises the practical knowledge gained to aid decision and policy-making. One of the earliest tasks of an evaluator is to understand the theory that sits behind a programme, which will include having an appreciation of the beliefs and assumptions underlying the planned intervention.
This emphasis upon programme theory is important as we ‘need to know what it is, why it is important, where it comes from and what its major attributes are’ as well as differentiating evaluation research from say auditing (1999: 31). Clarke (1999) in emphasising the importance of a theoretical approach states:

‘Under the theory-driven approach, the evaluator seeks to ‘actively search for and construct a theoretically justified model of the social problem’ (Chen and Rossi, 1981: 43) so as to help to specify the mechanisms by which a programme can be expected to produce change. Thus, developing a programme theory is a step towards clarifying the relationship between a programme’s activities and its effects. Using theory in this way helps to structure an evaluation’ (1999: 32).

It is submitted that this evaluation of three residential radio links accords with the general theory-driven approach advocated by Clarke (1999) above and reference is made to ‘grounded theory’ developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). The social problem, which forms the subject of this enquiry is, how are people reassured through being involved in a radio link? Referring to the theory-driven approach it is suggested that what is of importance to the various parties involved in this study is outcomes-based, has involvement in a radio link led to residents being reassured? The mention of parties’ involvement – stakeholders – requires that an acknowledgement be made of the social context within which any evaluation is undertaken. The interests of organisations such as the Association of British Insurers, Home Office, Regional Government Offices, police forces and individuals such as the radio link participants and the researcher. While it may be the case that stakeholders could exercise considerable influence over an evaluation, for example through withdrawal of funding, this has not been the case with this study (Clarke, 1999: 16). It is suggested by Smith and Cantley (1985a) that one method by which an evaluator might address the different interests in any study is to undertake a pluralistic evaluation, in particular through use of both qualitative and quantitative research methods (Clarke, 1999:19).

Smith and Cantley (1985a) note that data sources are interest-bound insofar as they represent the views and interests of a particular set of stakeholders, which has particular meaning for evaluators when deciding upon which research methods to utilise. In simple terms it is suggested that hard factual outcomes, for example percentage reductions or increases in radio link user’s levels of fear of crime might be highly relevant to policy makers.
If that is the case then it can easily be seen that policy makers would favour a quantitative methodology more likely to produce such outcomes, whereas, for participants themselves a more qualitative outcome, such as residents reported feeling reassured or not reassured through being involved in a radio link, might be a sufficiently substantial outcome. A pluralistic evaluation therefore, has a number of advantages, not just in addressing the issues above, but through ‘not only...reveal[ing] different ways of determining and measuring success, but it also provides information that helps in accounting for why success or failure occurs in a particular context’ (Clarke, 1999: 20).

In summary therefore, the methodological approach of this study is based upon three approaches: numbers – a secondary analysis of a realistic evaluation producing quantitative data; voices – individual free association narrative interviews; and discussion – focus group interviews. These individual methods have been utilised in three research sites with three distinct communities to test the theoretical suggestion that individuals participating in co-operative action with their neighbours with whom they are able to talk to and listen out for will feel a sense of participative reassurance.

**Conclusion: Reliability, Validity and Representativeness**

It is proposed before concluding this chapter to address the criteria outlined in McNeill (1990) to test the strengths of the proposed methodologies. McNeill (1990) refers to the test of reliability as being ‘if a method of collecting evidence is reliable, it means that anybody else using this method, or the same person using it at another time, would come up with the same results’ (1990: 14). Reflecting upon the above it is clear that another researcher could not repeat the realistic evaluation in the exact same locations, as it is logical to assume that the existing residents and radio link users will for some considerable period of time unduly influence any subsequent enquiry. However, if another researcher or those involved in these studies repeated the same evaluation of a radio link in other similar residential areas would the results be the same? It would be inconceivable to suggest that the exact same specific outcomes will be achieved if the same research methods were used in a study of other residential radio link scheme, primarily because each individual participant’s life experiences will be so different.
Neither can it be assumed that future events, such as another September 11 or Soham murders will occur or even if they did that they would have the exact same affect upon the general population’s sense of vulnerability. In other words the base line of community anxiety might be radically different. Notwithstanding, these observations it has been found that there have been a number of similar outcomes throughout this study (see later) that suggest future studies might produce findings from which generalised conclusions can be presented.

However, Silverman (2000: 9) quoting Hammersley (1992) cautions that there are specific issues with qualitative research and reliability. He suggests that reliability ‘refers to the degree of consistency with which instances are assigned to the same category by different observers or by the same observer on different occasions (1992: 67)’. As Silverman (2000) observes one of the main problems with qualitative research is that authors seldom expand upon the results obtained, they amount to no more than ‘brief, persuasive, data extracts’ (2000: 10). Taking McNeill’s (1990) second test, that of validity, he tells us that ‘validity refers to the problem of whether the data collected is a true picture of what is being studied’ (1990: 15). Is it really evidence of what it claims to be evidence of? The problem arises particularly when the data collected seems to be a product of the research method used rather than of what is being studied. This again is a weighty test for if participants report feeling reassured or not reassured is that actually what they believe and feel or can it be attributed to the research method itself?

In addition there is a need to ask if other factors are present, for example an expression of need to be positive about the project, a direct response to a leading question which has already be pre-framed in individuals minds, a sense that it is the right thing to say rather than being believed, and even being unconsciously influenced by the researcher. Mayhew (2000) refers to the factors that may influence respondents, for example the fact that the police sponsor a survey will tend to indicate that participation is required, a factor which is directly relevant to this study. Secondly, the order in which questions are asked may influence respondents who could become ‘sensitised to crime issues’ or reminded of ‘the mundanity of most criminal victimisation’ (2000: 110-1).
It is worthy of consideration and reflection that the residents in the three research sites may have been over interviewed, as such their responses, in say the focus group may have reflected what they were asked in a questionnaire. In conclusion, Mayhew (2000) comments ‘it is clear that measurement can be sensitive to question position’ (2000: 112). Acceptance of the possibility of influencing responses is not enough to prevent it happening and it is beholden upon the researcher to not only seek to reduce such influence but also be seen to do so. The most effective methods by which to overcome these concerns was to cross reference findings between the three research methodologies and at all times critically assess data for undue influence and bias. Silverman (2000) who in quoting Bryman (1988) again addresses the issue of a paucity of data in qualitative research:

‘There is a tendency towards an anecdotal approach to the use of data in relation to conclusions or explanations in qualitative research. Brief conversations, snippets from unstructured interviews...are used to provide evidence of a particular contention. There are grounds for disquiet in that the representativeness or generality of these fragments is rarely addressed’ Bryman (1988: 77) quoted in Silverman (2000: 11).

Silverman (2000) raises the issue of ‘anecdotalism’ in that he questions the validity of much qualitative research and goes on to state quite explicitly that ‘validity is another word for truth’ (2000: 11). He also addresses his thoughts to the strengths of data, theory and concepts and their validity. What is important is that any assessment of a piece of research will critically examine the extent of ‘independent critical thought’ (2000: 57). As such three procedures are believed to contribute to being able to demonstrate independent critical thought:

- developing a concept and/or a methodology
- thinking critically about your approach
- building on an existing study.

Applying those tests to this study it is suggested that: the development of participative reassurance as a theoretical concept amenable to research, satisfies the first test; secondly, it is believed that critical examination has been undertaken, for example about the role of researcher as officer and when utilising Crow’s (2000) evaluation of radio links; finally that this enquiry can clearly be seen to have built upon both the Home Office PRG and Masters Degree research.
It is respectfully suggested therefore that evidence can be found to support the existence of independent critical thought. In summary Silverman (2000) states that validity can be framed as a credible claim to truth and 'it is in these terms that Denzin and Lincoln (1994) discuss the approach of what they call conventional positivist social science to disciplined enquiry (2000: 91).

Denzin and Lincoln (1994) define validity, reliability and objectivity as:

'... internal validity, the degree to which findings correctly map the phenomenon in question; external validity, the degree to which findings can be generalised to other settings similar to the one in which the study occurred; reliability, the extent to which findings can be replicated, or reproduced, by another enquirer; and objectivity, the extent to which findings are free from bias' (1994: 100) (Original emphasis)

In our final assessment of the internal validity of this study reference is made to Clarke (1999: 43) who quotes Campbell and Stanley's (1963) tests of, selection, maturation and attrition:

- Selection – validity is called into question when an observed effect is considered to be due not to the treatment or intervention but to differences in the kinds of individuals or cases in the different experimental groups.

- Maturation – where an observed effect is due to something other than the treatment. For example, the effect would have been experienced over time anyway.

- Attrition – where treatment groups become dissimilar as time passes because they mature at different rates. For example the loss of subjects from the experimental group rather than the treatment itself produces an observed effect.

Applying these tests to this study, to assess the internal validity of the research suggests that for, selection there was a deliberate choice of different residential areas but that the nature of the scheme – residential radio link – was the same and therefore it is proposed this test is satisfied. Taking that of maturation it is suggested that again this test is satisfied, as it is highly unlikely anything similar to radio links would have been experienced by the residents.
Finally, with attrition it will be seen later that one area in particular suffered a significant reduction in number of participants and that may have had an effect upon the data obtained from that specific group. However, the overall nature of the schemes remained the same and it is possible to suggest that the research was able to compare like with like.

The final test is that of representativeness, McNeill (1990) simply suggests that the individuals or circumstances being studied are typical of others. If they are it can be assumed that what is found with this group is also true of other similar groups ‘we can generalise from the example that we have studied’ (1990: 15). The three areas were chosen for a variety of reasons, location – being accessible for the researchers, different – being different in terms of socio-economic, neighbourhood, ethnic and cultural makeup and typical – in that it is suggested they appeared to be similar to a number of other communities. In many regards the areas were specifically chosen on the basis of their being typical, similar to and therefore representative of residential communities. This is not to suggest that this research is in anyway without fault, as has already been made clear it constitutes a number of compromises, neither is it proposed that improvements could not be made to subsequent similar enquiries. Perhaps the final comment should be left with McNeill (1990):

‘It is my view that sociology does not and cannot provide final answers and ultimate truths about the social world, for they do not exist. Sociology is a way of looking at the world, which tries to develop new insights by approaching familiar questions from an unfamiliar angle. There is no single reality waiting to be discovered, no one right answer waiting to be found. The test of sociology is how far it helps us to understand the social world, for understanding and knowledge are the foundations of effective action’ (1990: 131/2).
Part Two

The Research
Chapter Four

Radio Links, Reassurance and Research Results

Introduction

In this chapter it is intended to detail and discuss the findings derived from three sources: the secondary analysis of the results of the Home Office study; analysis of the individual free association narrative interviews; and consideration of the focus group responses. As this enquiry was undertaken in three separate locations, comprising three distinct communities and utilised three research methods, which in themselves involve multiple sets of questions, it has been necessary to carefully organise and structure the data analysis. The first part of the chapter will concern itself with the secondary analysis of the realistic evaluation before and after questionnaires, please see Appendix 1. The quantitative analysis will set the context for a number of the subsequent findings and provides a baseline against which the qualitative analysis can be judged. The focus group and free association narrative interviews will then be considered together but within a number of distinct themes. Within each theme, for example residents’ experiences of crime and fear, findings from both the focus groups and free association narrative interviews for all three areas will be introduced and discussed. As with any process of enquiry some sources of information proved richer in detail and as a consequence more relevant to the study than others. In addition some of the residents held positions either of influence within the group or within the wider community, for example being members of a TMO or Parish Councillors. As a consequence what they had to say was sometimes of greater interest, and perhaps more relevant, than other respondents.

Secondary Analysis of Quantitative Data

It is necessary before seeking to undertake any analysis of the data to firstly describe in general terms the nature of the findings. The Home Office supported realistic evaluation comprised before and after interviews in three experimental and three control sites. In total 638 separate interviews were undertaken and questionnaires completed, which were later categorised into 335 variables, see Appendix 1.
Demographic profiles of respondents were first obtained utilising SPSS and are detailed in Appendix 2 and crosstabulation analysis of the questions for the experimental site before against after interviews; please see Appendix 3, complete the detailed description of the data. As has been described above, specific questions were chosen not only to make the process of analysis more manageable but more importantly on the basis of their direct relevance to this enquiry. In the following section it is intended to detail and discuss the statistical analysis for each of the questions. These statistical tests comprise: Chi-Square; One-Way ANOVA; and Pearson/Spearman. In addition analyses of tests of correlation are shown for the two key variables of gender and ethnicity. This final analysis has been undertaken as these variables have been identified as key factors in understanding a number of concepts, such as sense of community and fear of crime.

**Extent of Inter-Personal Relationships**

The first question chosen for analysis is question four, ‘how many people do you know (at least to say hello to) in this neighbourhood?’ This question specifically measures the number and any changes in inter-personal relationships between radio link users and within the community.
Table 3 Number of People Respondents Know to Say Hello To

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Aggregate Score</th>
<th>Percentage of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville¹</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville²</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville³</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from the above that for the residents of Westville the number of neighbours they know to say 'hello to' in the range 0 – 5 and 16+ has not changed significantly, between the time of the surveys while the number in the ranges 6 – 10 and 11 – 15 have increased and decreased respectively. As will be discussed later the introduction of the radio link may have led to a significant change in the nature of relationships within the area and a loss of trust among the TRA members and other residents. It can be suggested that the data above may be reflecting a perceived loss of wider neighbourliness across the estate. For the residents of Eastville it can be seen that there has been little change other than an increase in the range 6 – 10 which may be attributed to the introduction of the radio link and/or the process of public involvement that was associated with the intervention. For the residents of Northville we can see an almost opposite effect as that found in Westville with an increase in the range 11 – 15 and decrease in 6 – 10, again suggesting an increase in the number of neighbours residents would know to say hello to. Again it can only be suggested that this may be attributed to the intervention. What is clear though is that the low p-value (p-value is less that 0.05) from analysis of this question for the experimental area before and after surveys and the experimental and control area after surveys shows a significant statistical difference.

¹ Westville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 21.853 \ p = .000$; Westville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 19.935 \ p = .001$
² Eastville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 49.345 \ p = .000$; Eastville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 20.824 \ p = .000$
³ Northville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 137.196 \ p = .000$; Northville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 118.239 \ p = .000$
It is proposed therefore, that there is evidence to support the hypothesis that there is an association between the intervention and changes in extent of inter-personal relationships.

**Table 4 Number of People Respondents Know to Say Hello To**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong></td>
<td>F = .028</td>
<td>F = .475</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 66</td>
<td>df = 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .867</td>
<td>p = .493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong></td>
<td>F = .038</td>
<td>F = 2.415</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 111</td>
<td>df = 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .846</td>
<td>p = .124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northville</strong></td>
<td>F = .204</td>
<td>F = 1.311</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 141</td>
<td>df = 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .653</td>
<td>p = .254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above test we are seeking to analyse the extent of variance between the populations created through the introduction of the radio link in the three experimental areas. It can be seen that for all of the above tests the F ratio is quite small indicating that any differences have occurred more by chance than as a result of the intervention. In contrast to the Chi-Square tests it can be seen that there is no example of any of the results proving to be statistically significant. A probable explanation for this finding, at this stage in our analysis, is that the numbers of each population, especially those who have taken radios in Eastville and Westville, are so small.
Table 5 Impact of Involvement in Scheme and Number of People Respondents Know to Say Hello To

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westville</th>
<th>Eastville</th>
<th>Northville</th>
<th>Test Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation = - .026</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = .234</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = .112</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .900</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .177</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = - .011</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = .300</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = .073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .956</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .080</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final detailed statistical test relates to the Pearson and Spearman tests for correlation. These tests have been specifically applied to seek to determine if there is any correlation between question four, and the three variables: ‘taken a radio’; gender; and ethnicity. Table 5 shows the results of the analysis of question four against the variable ‘taken a radio’. This analysis sought to test if there was any correlation between the specific population of radio link users and extent of inter-personal relationships. It can be seen above that none of the tests are statistically significant and that there is no evidence to suggest a strong correlation. For the variables, gender and ethnicity, the tests of correlation were applied to both the experimental before and after and the experimental after against control after surveys. For question four it was found that there was no correlation and none of the findings were statistically significant, (see Appendix Six).

Level of Trust between Neighbours

The second question chosen for analysis is question nine, ‘do your neighbours tell you if they are going away for a few days?’ This question seeks to determine the extent and any change in trust amongst the radio link members and within the local community.
### Table 6 Neighbours Inform Respondent When Going Away

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yes Percent</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong>&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong>&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northville</strong>&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of question nine shows little real difference between the resident’s responses from the three areas with there being a reduction in the number who believe their neighbours would tell them if they were going away and an increase in those who would not. Based upon these findings it could be suggested that the introduction of the radio link may have caused two opposing effects; on the one hand residents may believe themselves to be safer and therefore not needing to let their neighbours know they were going away; or they could have felt distrustful of their neighbour and again not inclined to let them know of their absence. It is important to note the high Chi-Square values for the Northville areas, suggesting a strong degree of association.

With the exception of Westville experimental area after, against control area after, what is again found is that the findings are statistically significant.

---
<sup>4</sup> Westville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 17.324 \ p = .000$; Westville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 7.000 \ p = .030$.

<sup>5</sup> Eastville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 30.655 \ p = .000$; Eastville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 48.694 \ p = .000$.

<sup>6</sup> Northville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 151.315 \ p = .000$; Northville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 103.000 \ p = .000$. 
Table 7 Neighbours Inform Respondent When Going Away

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>F = .135</td>
<td>F = .366</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 66</td>
<td>df = 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .715</td>
<td>p = .547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>F = 1.476</td>
<td>F = .843</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 111</td>
<td>df = 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .227</td>
<td>p = .361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>F = 1.659</td>
<td>F = .688</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 141</td>
<td>df = 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .200</td>
<td>p = .408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above One-Way ANOVA test we are again seeking to analyse the extent of variance between the three radio link populations. It can be seen that with the exception of Eastville and Northville before against after results the F ratio is quite small indicating that any differences have occurred more by chance than as a result of the intervention and that none of the findings are statistically significant.

Table 8 Impact of Involvement in Scheme and Neighbours Inform Respondent When Going Away

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westville</th>
<th>Eastville</th>
<th>Northville</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation = - .288</td>
<td>Correlation = - .101</td>
<td>Correlation = - .074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .154</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .562</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = - .337</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = - .090</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = .095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .093</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .605</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the Pearson and Spearman statistical tests for the variables ‘taken a radio’, gender and ethnicity again show a low positive result suggesting that there is little or no correlation or association between the variables. In contrast to the results from the Chi-Square tests it can again be seen that subjecting the data to more detailed statistical tests fails to find clear evidence to support the hypotheses relating to the radio links having had an effect. This in turn suggests that the impact of increased levels of communication between neighbours is not having a positive impact on the social networks within that area.

**Levels of Trust in Neighbourhood**

The third question chosen for analysis is question fourteen, ‘in general do you trust the other people who live in your neighbourhood?’ This question again seeks to determine the level and any change in the nature of trust within the neighbourhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No - none of them</th>
<th>Some of them</th>
<th>Most of them</th>
<th>All of them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong>(^7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong>(^8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northville</strong>(^9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^7\) Westville Experimental Before v Experimental After \(\chi^2 = 26.235 p = .000\); Westville Experimental After v Control After \(\chi^2 = 27.419 p = .000\).

\(^8\) Eastville Experimental Before v Experimental After \(\chi^2 = 42.333 p = .000\); Eastville Experimental After v Control After \(\chi^2 = 17.810 p = .000\).

\(^9\) Northville Experimental Before v Experimental After \(\chi^2 = 90.014 p = .000\); Northville Experimental After v Control After \(\chi^2 = 99.134 p = .000\).
Analysis of question 14 shows that in general terms residents from all three areas reported feeling they could trust and rely upon their neighbours more after the intervention – it is important to note however, the reduction in number of respondents, particularly in Westville.

Thinking through the results from Westville, those reporting they do not trust any of their neighbours and those who trust all of them, suggests that there appears to be a more positive relationship between the neighbours in Westville after the intervention. These findings are not consistent with those found during the interviews, see below, and may have been achieved because of the effects of a smaller number of respondents in the second sample and the fact that a number of those will probably have been radio link participants. With regards the results from Eastville it may be suggested that the responses could have been influenced by the events of September 11th with this particular BME community considering they need to be more self-reliant and therefore, more trusting of those from their own religious and ethnic background, but note the reduction in number of residents who trusted all their neighbours. Again please note the high Chi-Square value for the Northville areas and the fact the findings are statistically significant. A possible explanation for the high Chi-Square value for Northville is the larger number of respondents.

Table 10 Trust of Neighbours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>F = .812 df = 66 p = .371</td>
<td>F = .793 df = 60 p = .377</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>F = .100 df = 109 p = .752</td>
<td>F = 10.228 df = 82 p = .002</td>
<td>Exp After v Cont After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>F = .218 df = 141 p = .641</td>
<td>F = 15.457 df = 132 p = .000</td>
<td>Exp After v Cont After</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the One-Way ANOVA test for question 14 again shows no clear difference between the three experimental sites before against after surveys. However, the results for the Eastville and Northville experimental after against control after show a high F ratio and are also statistically significant. It could be suggested that as these results have been found in two of the areas then one of the possible explanations is the effect of the radio link. But the One-Way ANOVA test results provide less certainty with regards findings of association that those from the Ch-Square analysis.

Table 11 Impact of Involvement in Scheme and Trust of Neighbours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westville</th>
<th>Eastville</th>
<th>Northville</th>
<th>Test Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.184</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.244</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = .055</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .367</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .164</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = -.148</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = -.198</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = .068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .469</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .261</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pearson/Spearman tests for the variables taken a radio, gender and ethnicity again provide no clear evidence of correlation. What is thought worthy of note is the higher negative correlation value, between -.414 to -.489 for the Pearson/Spearman analysis for the variable ethnicity, which are also found to be statistically significant. This finding indicates the strength of the variable ethnicity against the respondents understanding of how trustworthy their neighbours are. It may be surmised that within the context of September 11th and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq BME residents understanding of identity and ethnic origin may have been strengthened and expressed in terms of trust for each other.
Reliance on Neighbours

The fourth question chosen for analysis is question fifteen, ‘in general can you rely on people in your neighbourhood if you need help or assistance?’ This question seeks to determine the extent and any change in social relationships and networks amongst radio link members and within the community, as expressed through levels of neighbourly support and reliance.

### Table 12 Reliance on Neighbours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No – none of them</th>
<th>Some of them</th>
<th>Most of them</th>
<th>All of them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong>¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong>¹¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northville</strong>¹²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of question 15 follows our earlier consideration of question 14, which may not necessarily be a surprise as they seek to understand related issues. The results show that in general terms residents from all three areas reported feeling they could rely upon their neighbours more after the intervention, in particular in Westville and Eastville. It is important to note however, the reduction in number of respondents, particularly in Westville, which may account for such findings. These positive results are not consistent with those found during the interviews, see below, and may have been achieved because of the effects of a smaller number of respondents in the second sample and the fact that a number of those will probably have been radio link participants.

¹⁰ Westville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 19.647$ p = .000; Westville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 19.806$ p = .000.

¹¹ Eastville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 54.643$ p = .000; Eastville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 20.381$ p = .000.

¹² Northville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 42.979$ p = .000; Northville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 78.418$ p = .000.
However, the high Ch-Square figure from the Northville areas is again found as is the fact the result is statistically significant. This is important in that the numbers of radio link respondents in Northville who participated in both surveys would lend weight to the suggestion that the results found may be due to the intervention.

**Table 13 Reliance on Neighbours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>F = .127</td>
<td>F = .036</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 66</td>
<td>df = 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .723</td>
<td>p = .850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>F = 4.268</td>
<td>F = 8.628</td>
<td>Exp After v Cont After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 110</td>
<td>df = 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .041</td>
<td>p = .004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>F = .088</td>
<td>F = 2.267</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 141</td>
<td>df = 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .767</td>
<td>p = .135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above results of the One-Way ANOVA tests again follow the findings of those from the previous question and are summarised above. In Eastville the results for analysis of experimental after against control after show a high F ratio and the fact that it is statistical significant. It is again suggested that this finding provides another indication of the fact that residents from this BME community felt a greater sense of need to rely on their neighbours. The reason for this may be because of the external ‘threat’ they felt to their community.
## Table 14 Impact of Involvement in Scheme and Reliance on Neighbours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westville</th>
<th>Eastville</th>
<th>Northville</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation =</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation =</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation =</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) =</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) =</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient =</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient =</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) =</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) =</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tests for correlation between the variables ‘taken a radio’, gender and ethnicity for question 15 follow those for the previous question 14.

Again it is worthy to note the higher values of the Pearson/Spearman analysis of ethnicity and the fact the findings are statistically significant, please see Appendix Six. It is suggested these findings further confirm the above analysis regards the impact of ethnicity, obviously in Eastville, and belief in being able to trust and rely upon neighbours.

### Feeling Part of the Community

The fifth question chosen for analysis was question eighteen, ‘do you feel part of a ‘community’ where you live?’ This self-explanatory question seeks to determine the extent and any change in perceptions of community and the extent of supportive social networks in the neighbourhood.
### Table 15 Feeling Part of the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville(^{13})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville(^{14})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville(^{15})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from the responses to question 18 suggest that with the exception of the Eastville residents the respondents experienced a loss of sense of community following the introduction of the radio link. This clearly suggests a weakening in any social network and a reduction in levels of participative reassurance. The Eastville residents may again be expressing a strengthened sense of identity in response to perceived external pressure on their community.

---

\(^{13}\) Westville Experimental Before v Experimental After \(\chi^2 = 9.941\ p = .002\); Westville Experimental After v Control After \(\chi^2 = 4.738\ p = .030\).

\(^{14}\) Eastville Experimental Before v Experimental After \(\chi^2 = 52.469\ p = .000\); Eastville Experimental After v Control After \(\chi^2 = 27.429\ p = .000\).

\(^{15}\) Northville Experimental Before v Experimental After \(\chi^2 = 87.383\ p = .000\); Northville Experimental After v Control After \(\chi^2 = 71.824\ p = .000\).
Table 16 Feeling Part of the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>F = 4.872</td>
<td>F = 2.223</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 66</td>
<td>df = 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .031</td>
<td>p = .141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>F = 4.644</td>
<td>F = 16.725</td>
<td>Exp v Cont significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 111</td>
<td>df = 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .033</td>
<td>p = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>F = .090</td>
<td>F = .315</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 139</td>
<td>df = 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .765</td>
<td>p = .576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The One-Way ANOVA results for question 18 are very similar to those for question 15. In particular the high F ratio for Eastville experimental after against control after is again found to be statistically significant. In this particular question further strong indications are found to support the suggestion that residents from Eastville felt an increased sense of community.

Table 17 Impact of Involvement in Scheme and Feeling Part of the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westville</th>
<th>Eastville</th>
<th>Northville</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.138</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.006</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.002</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .502</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .972</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = -.138</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = -.006</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = -.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .502</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .972</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pearson/Spearman analysis provides no finding of association or correlation for the variables, ‘taken a radio’, and gender and ethnicity, (see Appendix 6).
As has been stated above the low response rate among residents in Westville and Eastville may be a factor in this regard. What though may be a truer finding is that when questions related to community and reliance were posed to the Eastville residents they responded more positively than those from Westville or Northville. It has been suggested that international events may have caused these responses.

**Extent of Worry**

The sixth question chosen for analysis was question fifty, ‘how worried are you that certain things might happen to you in the next 12 months?’ This detailed question seeks to determine the extent of the respondents’ worries and concerns, and any changes, related to crimes against them and their property as well as issues of nuisance and anti-social behaviour. Two specific sub-questions have been chosen, those being a) worry about a resident’s house being broken into and property being stolen or damaged while they are at home and k) worry about walking along a street in daytime in a resident’s area when a group of youths are either walking towards them or are hanging around the pavement. The rationale for this choice has been explained above but in essence the two sub-questions specifically relate to residents concerns about criminal acts that may affect them, burglary and youth related anti-social behaviour.
Table 18 Extent of Worry (Burglary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Aggregated Degree of Worry*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Worried</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Worried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Aggregated score = 1-3 Not Worried 4-7 Neutral 8-10 Worried (NB – difference in scales and missing values, see Appendix Four)

Analysis of the Chi-Square results from question 50 a) for the three areas shows that in each of the cases the majority of respondents were not worried about the crime of burglary. What is also of note is the consistency of the responses for all three areas for the before survey, the only exception being Northville worried. It is necessary to highlight issues regards the data not only in relation to errors within the process of aggregation but also the missing responses and different scales (see Appendix 4). Examination of the data shows that the respondents in the second survey reported being both less and more worried. The significant finding is that the number of residents who fell into the neutral category diminished with residents apparently being more certain as to the extent of their worry. It can be surmised that the existence of the radio link within the three areas may have provided a more accurate picture as to the nature of local crime.

16 Westville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 69.333 \ p = .000$; Westville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 46.065 \ p = .000$.

17 Eastville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 225.894 \ p = .000$; Eastville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 75.659 \ p = .000$.

18 Northville Experimental Before v Experimental After $\chi^2 = 222.000 \ p = .000$; Northville Experimental After v Control After $\chi^2 = 173.746 \ p = .000$. 
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That in turn may have achieved two outcomes, firstly either having reassured or worried the residents but, secondly informed them so that they reached a more accurate decision. This supposition could be supported by the fact that the residents of Northville tended to be less worried while those in Westville and Eastville became more concerned, perhaps reflecting the level of local crime. The Chi-Square values are particularly high for all three areas and again the findings are shown to be statistically significant suggesting a strong level of association.

**Table 19 Extent of Worry (Youths)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Aggregated Degree of Worry*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Worried</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Aggregated score = 1-3 Not Worried 4-7 Neutral 8-10 Worried (NB - difference in scales and missing values, see Appendix Four)

Analysis of the results from question 50 k) for the three areas shows stronger evidence that in each of the cases the majority of respondents were not worried about anti-social behaviour, as expressed by concerns relating to groups of youths. Please see in particular the results for Northville and contrast these with findings from the qualitative interviews and focus groups below. As with the findings from question 50 a) the number of respondents choosing the neutral option is again reduced. This finding may support the suggestion that residents became better informed as to the local nature of crime and disorder through the introduction of the radio link. Having highlighted those facts we can also suggest that residents in Westville are more concerned with youth related disorder than those from the other two areas.

19 Westville Experimental Before v Experimental After χ² = 47.800 p = .000; Westville Experimental After v Control After χ² = 51.288 p = .000.
20 Eastville Experimental Before v Experimental After χ² = 122.727 p = .000; Eastville Experimental After v Control After χ² = 89.810 p = .000.
21 Northville Experimental Before v Experimental After χ² = 426.746 p = .000; Northville Experimental After v Control After χ² = 319.881 p = .000.
This may relate to differing levels of community disorder across the three areas with the vice area in Westville perhaps being the cause of such worries among residents. The Chi-Square values are again high for all three areas and are also statistically significant, suggesting a strong level of association.

Table 20 Extent of Worry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings P&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>a) F = .035</td>
<td>a) F = .443</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 64</td>
<td>df = 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .852</td>
<td>p = .508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k) F = 1.500</td>
<td>k) F = 2.494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 63</td>
<td>df = 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .225</td>
<td>p = .120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>a) F = .105</td>
<td>a) F = 1.822</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 111</td>
<td>df = 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .747</td>
<td>p = .181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k) F = .913</td>
<td>k) F = 1.931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 108</td>
<td>df = 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .342</td>
<td>p = .168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>a) F = .037</td>
<td>a) F = 3.048</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 141</td>
<td>df = 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .847</td>
<td>p = .083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k) F = .467</td>
<td>k) F = 3.152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 140</td>
<td>df = 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .496</td>
<td>p = .078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the above Chi-Square analysis the results from the One-Way ANOVA tests for both sub-questions, a) worry about burglary and k) worry about youth disorder, shows no clear association. The results provide low figure F ratios and none of the findings are statistically significant.
Table 21 Impact of Involvement in Scheme and Extent of Worry About Burglary and Youth Disorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westville</th>
<th>Eastville</th>
<th>Northville</th>
<th>Test Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Pearson Correlation = .023</td>
<td>a) Pearson Correlation = -.031</td>
<td>a) Pearson Correlation = .016</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .852</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .747</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Pearson Correlation = -.152</td>
<td>k) Pearson Correlation = -.092</td>
<td>k) Pearson Correlation = -.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .225</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .342</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Correlation Coefficient = .009</td>
<td>a) Correlation Coefficient = -.019</td>
<td>a) Correlation Coefficient = .003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .945</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .844</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Correlation Coefficient = -.166</td>
<td>k) Correlation Coefficient = -.138</td>
<td>k) Correlation Coefficient = -.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .185</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .149</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = .908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pearson/Spearman test results taken together for question 50 a) and k), burglary and youth disorder, provide no clear evidence of association or correlation. It would be reasonable therefore, to suggest that the null hypothesis remains true, that statistically the variable we have tested, ‘taken a radio’, has not had an effect when analysed against question 50. The tests for correlation applied against the variables gender and ethnicity further fail to show any strong degree of correlation.

**Impact of Crime**

The seventh question chosen for analysis was question sixty four, ‘do you think that crime, or how you feel about becoming a victim of crime has an impact on your everyday life?’
This question sought to determine internal perceptions of the impact of crime, and any changes, within respondents and gauges their levels of reassurance.

**Table 22 Impact of Crime**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yes – Definitely</th>
<th>Yes – to a certain extent</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From consideration of the responses to question 64 the most obvious difference that appears is the increase in definite perceptions amongst residents in Northville of the impact of crime on their everyday life. This is perhaps unusual as when compared to Westville and Eastville; the village is a community that does not suffer high levels of crime. What may be suggested is that the daily involvement by residents in the radio link, and knowledge of its existence among non-radio link users, and with the police may have had an impact on their lives. The effect of directly participating in a scheme they perceived as being a crime reduction initiative may have actually raised their levels of concern about crime, see Crawford et al. (2003) for a similar outcome.

Another obvious change is in the residents of Westville and Eastville who responded more positively and suggested that they were not affected by perceptions of crime or fear after the introduction of the radio link. This change may again be attributed to the reduction in number of respondents for the second sample.

---

<sup>22</sup> Westville Experimental Before v Experimental After χ² = .029 p = .985; Westville Experimental After v Control After χ² = 8.271 p = .016.

<sup>23</sup> Eastville Experimental Before v Experimental After χ² = 12.400 p = .002; Eastville Experimental After v Control After χ² = 8.228 p = .016.

<sup>24</sup> Northville Experimental Before v Experimental After χ² = 65.133 p = .000; Northville Experimental After v Control After χ² = 54.149 p = .000.
It may however, be an indication that the radio link had had a positive influence on residents and radio link participants in particular. The p-values for this area for this question are different from those of the previous Ch-Square analyses, with for example no statistical significance being found for the Westville responses. This could be attributed to the reduction in number of respondents.

### Table 23 Impact of Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>F = 1.318, df = 66, p = .255</td>
<td>F = .109, df = 57, p = .742</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>F = 1.202, df = 103, p = .276</td>
<td>F = 1.382, df = 77, p = .243</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>F = 2.903, df = 141, p = .091</td>
<td>F = .687, df = 132, p = .409</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The One Way ANOVA tests applied against this question provide no clear evidence of association, please note in particular the low F ratio values, and none of the results are statistically significant.

### Table 24 Impact of Involvement in Scheme and Impact of Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westville</th>
<th>Eastville</th>
<th>Northville</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation = .317, Sig. (2 tailed) = .114</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = .118, Sig. (2 tailed) = .499</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.106, Sig. (2 tailed) = .428</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = .319, Sig. (2 tailed) = .112</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = .120, Sig. (2 tailed) = .491</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = .035, Sig. (2 tailed) = .796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final detailed statistical test is that of Pearson/Spearman for question 64 against the variables 'taken a radio', gender and ethnicity. In summary none of the tests shows that there is no evidence of association and that the various tests are not statistically different.

**Secondary Analysis Summary**

The Home Office funded realistic evaluation provided quantitative data that particularly related to the intervention of the radio link. Analysis of that data, specifically with regard to questions, such as extent of worry and sense of community was undertaken to try to determine if there was any evidence to suggest the existence of participative reassurance. It is suggested that the findings have not proved to be conclusive; there is no clear and unambiguous evidence to support the suggestion that the intervention of the radio link had a measurable effect and none to support the theory of participative reassurance. On the other hand the data analysis, particularly from the Chi-Square tests showed a number of clear examples of association. In many regards the quantitative data will exactly mirror the findings from the qualitative analysis, that there is some evidence to suggest the introduction of the radio link had a number of discernable outcomes, some of which were positive in terms of community benefits while others were not, and yet such evidence was not sufficiently robust or extensive to be considered conclusive. Looking at the questions that relate to trust and support it is interesting to note the strength of the relationships within Eastville and between both the experimental and control BME sites. It was suggested above that external pressures, perhaps the events of September 11th and thereafter, may have caused these specific communities to seek the trust and support of their neighbours. It is suggested that the statistical tests provided some evidence to support this suggestion. Having undertaken the secondary analysis of the realistic evaluation data and finding no clear evidence of there having been an effect from the introduction of the radio link there is equally no statistical support for the theory of participative reassurance it now remains for the respondents themselves to relate their experiences. As stated above, the qualitative undertakings, free association narrative interviews and focus groups, have been collated and ordered within specific themes. Finally, it is important to note that the residents responses have been transcribed verbatim and their meaning, particularly those from Eastville, may not initially be clear.
Resident’s Experiences of Crime and Fear

Westville

An interview with a younger resident from the estate highlighted the changing nature of crime with the respondent referring to ‘the crimes sort of up and down’ but with the presence of a vice patch on the estate – an area in which prostitutes solicit for sex work – there were associated problems of ‘a lot of drugs and prostitutes’. During recent times the resident had noticed a change in local crime with the drugs problems having initially been addressed but over the last two years the drugs dealers had begun using firearms. However, the resident thought the problems associated with prostitution had remained constant over time. The residents attributed recent changes in crime to the introduction into the area of a number of Kosovan refugees, but felt that although the crime problems had affected other residents she has not been affected, partly because she felt she was younger but also because there was nothing she could do to change the situation. The first respondent located their feelings of being unsafe in a specific spatial and temporal setting ‘walking through the flats at night’. The flats are located in an area through which the residents had to walk to get to local shops and other amenities and had recently be used by the Council to house the Kosovan asylum seekers. The respondent however, suggested that through:

‘... being joined up with the radio link you sort of feel a bit more secure, you sort have got the radio out and I think if you carry it as your walking round and you’ve got it in your hand as well that’s a deterrent as well, because they don’t think they know what it is’.

An older resident when asked about the impact of crime spoke about having been the victim of a burglary and robbery (mugging) ‘having my house broke into didn’t bother me, being mugged did bother me’. The resident while having a significant amount of property stolen during the burglary stated ‘that didn’t bother me, I was insured’ but being having been mugged some 12 years previously had a far greater impact as ‘I was frightened of the bloke, three times he came back to me and he knocked me out to get my handbag’. The effect of the crime was such that the resident would not carry a purse or handbag and limited her travel to the local doctor’s surgery.
Encouragingly, the lady stated that 'I think I am just about getting over it now and this was 12 years ago, you know but they, the walkie talkies have helped me'. Another resident had a number of direct experiences of crime, for example living within an area used for drug dealing, her son being assaulted and having a brothel and then a drug dealer move into the flat above her own. The problems with local drug misuse were such that 'we couldn’t walk through the estate ... I mean if you just had to walk through the entry and you would be high on it because there was that much stuff being smoked down there'. Another resident again described the relationship between a perceived unsafe location, crime and fear when she spoke about having to visit the local shops, an area known locally as the ‘frontline’ and one frequented by ‘all the drug dealers’. The effect upon the resident of visiting the shops was ‘frightening’ and divisive in that:

‘...you are judging people who aren’t going to do you any harm really, but you know always fearful, suspicious you know and probably they are just chatting you know’.

While the residents had themselves been subject to a wide range of offences, from burglaries to personal violence the reality of living in an inner-city estate is that crime in all its forms is an ever present factor in people’s lives:

‘...one of the prostitutes just at the back of this road here was found more or less dead being battered by one of the clients probably and then of course we had the murder case at the bottom of this road here as well where they found a body dumped and you know things like that do, sort of at the time, think oh golly right on the doorstep’.

Incidents such as these understandably caused the respondents to be fearful, for example living within a vice area they were afraid of the violence that often accompanies such activities. While the residents cited extreme cases such as these the routine nature of crime ‘the drug dealers’ and ‘a lot of the muggings that have happened’ are also causes of fear, as one lady said ‘I always look behind me before I walk down the entry’.
Eastville

The residents also experienced problems associated with drug misuse and anti-social behaviour, for example one respondent said ‘people are scared to move freely anywhere they would want because everywhere you go around the estate you have a gang of youths who are involved in some sort of activities like pushing drugs, anti-social behaviour’.

Another resident spoke about problems associated with car crime, vandalism and burglary but stated ‘well before all this started there was quite a few you know before we joined the scheme, yes, there was a few but after that it was very rare’. As with Westville, another resident spoke about the problems associated with groups of young refugees, in this case Somalian, being housed on the estate and causing noise and anti-social behaviour. The difference in cultural beliefs between the two co-religion communities is best highlighted when summarised by a respondent’s reference to their lack of respect for older people and the value of education:

‘...the youngsters like Somalis have made it worse now...They just don’t want to go to school and what’s happening is they just don’t give a damn what they do here. There is no one will listen and you know the abusive words they use to you and there is nothing you can do and when you are complaining to the school they just say one thing “it is not our job” call the Police’.

The resident’s frustration with the inability of the school to deal with the Somali children is compounded by their perceptions of the local police officer not dealing with the problem and not returning the resident’s telephone calls. However, for the other respondents crime is as one resident stated ‘normal...we do still suffer with the drug business and kids selling drugs to kids’. For this particular community what is reported on the news, especially after the events of the 11th of September, has had a very specific impact upon their levels of fear. One female respondent stated that ‘the things that come on the news, Afghanistan, the war and err all the things like America’ resulted in:

‘... sometimes when you hear the news, it does frighten you sometimes, when you hear the news, is it safe to go out, you know, someone might attack you, you being a Muslim like’.
While the young lady and her family had ‘been living in this country for so many years and I really never experienced anything’ she still felt that ‘every time we used to go out we used to have that fear inside us’. It may never be possible to truly determine the impact of the events of the 11th September on the level of fear felt by residents in all three areas however, for this resident of Eastville it is clear that these events did have an effect. When the focus group was asked about the crime situation on the estate the residents believed that crimes such as domestic burglary and robbery were not such an issue ‘they escape us fortunately but we got rid of that problem’. They did however; highlight ‘this problems are making from the youth. Anti-social behaviour, joy riding, drug pushing, right’ and ‘we have a serious problem with the youth and we just don’t know which way to turn’. The residents believed that because youth problems are not police priorities ‘they said their not doing any crime and we have a problem with that and a very serious one for that matter’. The young people use the estate as a place to meet and to go to and from a local college. Even when the police were called to incidents of disorder the residents felt dissatisfied with their response ‘few kids in the estate and was fighting and they stopped the car and they talked from the car, they didn’t bother to get out’. The group felt that ‘police can’t do anything’ but referred to the radio link saying ‘I mean I find this system is very good’ and ‘really it’s good’. However, the group did report that there were problems with a lack of activity on the scheme, particularly with nobody responding to calls made by users. A resident in response to the discussion about youth problems described an incident:

‘... in their block I think four or five of them have radios on their block right and they had a constant number of youths who were harassing them occupying the landings, they got together with the radio huh and they got that shifted and shifted so in a way they did use the police but the radio help them and they got rid of the problem obviously it re-occurred but it’s not that bad now it’s improved’.

A particular problem experienced by the residents was youths opening the dustbin areas in the maisonettes and setting fire to the bins. This type of incident was not only clearly dangerous but was the source of considerable ongoing concern to the group. As a consequence a number of the radio users had ‘a few time you know we catch the boys and its quiet now’. While they did not describe in detail what had dissuaded the boys one resident stated that following an incident involving youths behaving in an unruly manner he had run at them which had caused the young people to run away.
It is understood from these responses that some of the residents used the radios to organise a response amongst themselves to incidents which were of concern to them. The response was chasing the children away from the radio link user’s homes.

**Northville**

The village was far from immune from the impact of crime with a number of residents describing offences of theft, burglary and car crime. They also spoke about the problems associated with local youths, such as drunkenness, vandalism and litter. The minor nature of these issues when compared to the crime impacts described by residents in Westville and Eastville did not prevent residents from seeking additional police resources. One resident provided a detailed catalogue of crimes suffered by herself and her family and repeatedly emphasised that the police had not responded to the original call, recovered the stolen property, arrested the perpetrators nor informed the victims of any outcomes. While being critical of the police she concluded by suggesting that ‘we have always been helpful to the police, we have always had a great respect for the police and I am not blaming the average policeman, I’m blaming the Home Office’. This comment may well be a reflection of two beliefs: the expression of a group of people who traditionally are supportive of the police but which clearly flies in the face of the evidence – it was not the Home Office that failed to recover her stolen property; and secondly knowledge that the interviewer was a police officer may have led to a basic extension of courtesy to a visitor.

Another resident who was also the Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinator and a Parish Councillor approached the question as to their risk of criminal victimisation from the perspective of how the radio link had altered his exposure to risk. He believed that because of his position in the village he felt he was expected to physically respond to incidents of crime or disorder, in essence to attend the scene of the event and intervene ‘to a certain extent I think I felt safer before I had the radio because I wasn’t getting involved’. The resident gave two examples, one where ‘somebody had set fire to one of the waste bins in the village’ and the other ‘confronting youngsters’.

In the first case they utilised the radio link to inform the other villagers, one of whom put the fire out with a jug of water but in general he felt that having to respond had made him ‘feel more vulnerable’.
That level of involvement also extended to being alerted by one of the villagers to a police officer being seen in the village and the respondent going out to not just talk to them but also ask why the officer was not using his village radio. The officer replied ‘Oh I’ve got it with me but I haven’t got it switched on because I wasn’t sure how you used them’ at which the resident said ‘well normally when the officers come into the village with the radios, they just announce that they are coming into the village so that we are aware he is there’. It is suggested that this one exchange highlights the difference between the relationship of the villagers of Northville and their police and that of Westville and Eastville and the local police officers. The residents of Northville were in the main a more confident, articulate and assertive group than those from the other two experimental sites. They were also more socially and economically advantaged and these factors perhaps explain the ease with which they challenged the quality of local policing, to the extent of instructing the police officer how to ‘police’ the village.

The relationship between the timing of personal and national events and the interview process was perhaps best illustrated when asking a lady about issues of crime. This had occurred at a time when the lady’s only daughter was about to leave for university. She made specific mention of the Soham murders and that of Milly Dowling, saying ‘the biggest thing I suppose that makes me fearful…the recent Holly and Jessica, and of course Milly, I find that absolutely horrifying’ particularly as she thought those events had occurred ‘in an area which I would have thought would be considered quite safe’. It is suggested that the respondent had identified with the village community of Soham and therefore, with it being similar to her own area.

She may have felt that if such crimes could be committed in areas she conceived of as being secure then they could equally occur in her own village. This perception, added to which her daughter was now leaving the safety of the home, may have created within the resident a belief that she faced an additional level of risk. It is believed that the combination of these two issues: one, the fact her daughter would be away from her immediate care and the second, the impact of serious crime on rural community’s sense of security and safety, had had a significant impact on this resident. The strength of her feelings about the threat posed by paedophiles was summed up when she asked ‘why somebody doesn’t say let's just do sufficient chemical castrations to stop this happening again?’
The image of the idyllic country village may well conjure up different thoughts in the minds of people but one which may well be conceived is its association with Englishness. This concept was clearly expressed by a respondent who felt that being present with people of a different race was fear inducing. On a recent visit to a nearby city he stated he:

‘... felt uncomfortable like if I was going to India I feel uncomfortable then because I am out of my own country, in ... it seemed as though you were out of your own country. You just don’t see anybody white down ... Road and all the shops were catering for the black population of that area’.

He attributed his fear to the fact that ‘they’ve allowed the people to congregate in one area instead of integrate’ and therefore, ‘that’s what’s frightening that’s why I felt frightened when I went into that area’. This rather distasteful perspective echoed the views of a number of Eastville residents’ regards the presence of Somali refugees on the estate. These two specific exchanges placed the author as a researcher and police officer in a difficult position to the extent that he found it necessary to challenge both the Northville and Eastville resident’s views. Another national event that had meaning for a Northville resident was the case of the Norfolk farmer, Tony Martin, who in seeking to address a spate of crimes against his farm shot two intruders one of whom subsequently died. Martin was later sent to prison but had his sentence of life imprisonment reduced on appeal. A female respondent suggested that she found ‘it frightening that the man in Norfolk who defended his home was sent to prison’. In an unfortunate use of terminology she stated ‘it was perhaps a bit of an overkill to send him to prison for life’.

When questioned as to why this caused her to be fearful she responded that believing herself unable to defend her home and being unsure what she would do in such circumstances was frightening ‘I don’t know personally how I would react to that, I think that’s what frightens me’ because ‘how much you would be able to control yourself as well if that ever happened’.

In the first focus group one resident explained how the radio link had been used to address an issue of children throwing stones in the churchyard. As the villagers were discussing the incident over their radios another nearby village, who also had a radio link operating on the same channel, overheard the exchange and directed a local police officer who was with them to the scene.
This discussion led a resident who is a teacher to comment that ‘there seems to be quite a bit of prejudice against some of the young people in the village’ she believed that as there were no leisure facilities for the young people her involvement in the radio link had caused her to be ‘much more aware of that feeling – quite a negative feeling perhaps – towards them...partly their own fault but also possibly some prejudice’. In this one of the more interesting exchanges, which concerned an issue of direct and real relevance to the village and radio link members, the teacher stated:

‘I think we forget that the kids of the village are our kids for starters if they are not ours individually, they are our kids, they live amongst us and their parents live amongst us and I really have to say that there is no real crime from kids...we don’t get muggings, we don’t get steamings, we don’t get vehicle crime, we don’t get abuse, we don’t get vandalism to the point that beyond the pale, so they don’t make life unattractive here, there are just the nuisances’.

During a subsequent exchange a resident who was a Parish Councillor stated that ‘I think the radios have helped’ he explained how some of the women in the village felt intimidated by the sight of groups of youths but suggested that ‘having had radios it has given them a greater confidence’. This led one of the group to relate how when there was a report of youths causing trouble ‘I went out to investigate it. I went to the parent’s house of one of the youths’ and as she knew the parents ‘I said what was going on and said ‘your son was there – do you think you could perhaps see what’s happening’ at which the youths parents said “I will talk to him when he comes home”.

The group was very dismissive of the attitude of the parents ‘it’s just annoying though that the parents know what the child is doing ... and then don’t do anything about it’. When pressed on this point a resident from the group responded by stating that the parents ‘don’t want to know’ and ‘sweep it under the carpet’ with another resident saying ’[the parents] say well it’s not just my child down there’. The teacher stated that ‘young people are getting very wary of the radios’ she explained that on two occasions when there were reports across the radio link of youths causing problems she had approached the groups. At one of these incidents the group actually saw the ladies mobile phone in her pocket but mistook it for a radio ‘and they immediately beat a retreat. I think the radio sort of made them wary anyway’. 
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A resident informed the second focus group of an incident where one of the female radio link members had called late one evening when she had people banging on her front door 'she was too scared to go out'. The resident being the only person who responded 'took my husband out with the dogs to check everything was alright and nobody was listening'. When asked what the lady’s reaction was the resident said ‘she phoned me twice to thank me for sending my husband out to check’. Another resident proposed that as everyone had her telephone number that while she may not necessarily have her radio switched on, for example if she had gone to bed, she was ‘quite happy for you to telephone at that time of night’.

Perceptions and Causes of Anxiety

Westville

During the interview with the lady who had been the victim of the robbery she was asked about her sense of anxiety. While the question clearly sought to understand anxiety since the introduction of the radio link the respondent immediately stated that ‘I’ve always been anxious since I got mugged’. The trauma suffered by the lady was obvious even when being interviewed and recalling the event. Another resident again interpreted the question differently and stated that ‘I just talk to ... sometimes about ... if I’m a bit down I talk to ... sometimes’ she explained how she used her radio to call another resident who was a long-term friend ‘then she will get on her phone [radio] and I’ll go on the phone [radio] and speak’.

When reflecting upon this answer it is suggested that the respondent had chosen to pick up upon the word ‘anxious’ and through relating this to her sense of well-being had disclosed that she occasionally felt a ‘bit down’. This particular respondent is a widowed white lady who had lived below the brothel and whose son had been seriously assaulted and who had previously been married to a Muslim man. It is further suggested that she picked up on the use of word radio and tied the two concepts together – feeling a bit down and the use of the radio to talk to a friend. In itself this is a significant contribution to our understanding of the resident’s use of the radio link system. It has been suggested that in the context of psychotherapy and professional counselling that:
‘...much of the benefit you can get from therapy is indistinguishable from what you might obtain from confiding in a reliable, understanding and intelligent friend’ (Persaud, 2003: 20).

The article further suggests that the dramatic growth in counselling and therapeutic services might be a reflection upon the ‘breakdown of relationships in our society and the decline of conventional coping mechanisms, such as religion and the nuclear family’ (Persaud, 2003). In this specific exchange it was found that the radio link provided some comfort to the respondent by being a ready means through which to establish contact with and talk to a friend.

For another resident being anxious meant when ‘I got followed one day ... that made me anxious’ but ‘I mean I’d got my radio on me anyway’. Reading into this answer it could be assumed that the resident – who had been walking through the local flats – was clearly unnerved by the thought of being followed but she goes on to say that she had her radio with her at the time. This use of the radio link by the residents when moving around the environs of the estate and being monitored by others while at home was clearly something that the resident felt was of benefit and helped in partly addressing their sense of anxiety. For another resident the presence of groups of youths caused them anxiety:

‘...oh there’s a gang there, you know felt scared to walk past them or anything like that, because once you’ve been living round here for a while you see you get used to it and you just keep your eyes on them and sort of walk by them prepared if you know what I mean’.

Anxiety for this resident is a state of preparedness when faced by the apparent threat of gangs of youths, but this means being prepared to be either attacked, robbed or abused. This respondent, an elderly lady who uses a walking stick, clearly rationalised the extent of her vulnerability and sets that against the likelihood of her victimisation ‘they don’t frighten me but I’m just wary when I walk by if they’re all sort of in a bunch and that I won’t sort of say oh excuse me I find my way round’ however, she also stated ‘it did make a big difference when your radio was working’. This was a specific reference to technical problems experienced by the radios in Westville. It was thought they were receiving satellite communications or some other form of interference in the early hours of the morning and disturbing the residents. In addition the interference affected their confidence in the radios technical capabilities.
In earlier interviews reference has been made to the environment within which people live as being fear inducing. This issue elicited two strong responses from residents who explained how the estates design and relationship to local amenities affected perceptions of safety. The first respondent returned to consider her anxiety when walking through the block of flats, which had also dominated her earlier life ‘when I was a student I felt more vulnerable and fearful because the only way … the only way you could get a bus was to cut through the flats to the college I was going to’ with the level of concern being greater when it’s dark ‘a lot of time I was coming home at night, its not so bad in the day its night time’. Recent environmental improvements to the estate had involved removing overgrown bushes and erecting fences with locked gates ‘since the fences, all the fences have gone up, all the gates its been a bit more, more secure’. However, the respondent when asked about any incidents, which may have caused her to be anxious, replied ‘Yeah shootings, drug dealers, rapes, muggings’. The rather flippant manner in which the list of serious crimes was related indicated both a degree of bravado – we live in a really bad area but we can cope – as well as an almost resigned acceptance of the multiple problems faced by the residents, as she said ‘talk about cheerful’.

Another resident described the overgrown bushes and general environment before the installation of the fences and gates ‘there used to be a lot of bushes and that down there and there was, used to feel a bit, you know your heart would start pattering as you walked past that like’. The sense of conflict over an area considered by the residents to be their property and the youths occupation of the bushes to misuse drugs ‘they’d be having the dope and stuff’ was set against two key factors: firstly the need for residents to walk past the bushes to reach local amenities; and secondly, ‘there’s been quite a few of the older ladies two or three from our church have been mugged down there had their pension and that took off them you know but, and one lady had her arm broke things like that’. The relationship between the residents and drug users and the conflict in use of the area heightened resident’s fear of walking around the estate. As with the flats it is suggested the area by the bushes became associated with disorderly behaviour, drugs misuse and criminal victimisation targeted at a similar group of residents, creating a perception of that location being a place to fear.
It is suggested that the manner in which an environment signals its threatening nature is a complex relationship, which involves issues such as the perceived vulnerability of the individual and the potential or actual presence of criminal occupiers.

The focus group discussed their perceptions of crime on the estate and described it as a ‘big, very big’ issue for them. The lady who was robbed stated ‘well I’m frightened to walk about, if anybody is behind me I turn round and have a good look at them, that’s how bad it is’. She stated that:

‘I got mugged and I was fighting back, I wasn’t letting my bag go. I mean if that had been anybody else I would have said just let them take it but it were mine it were my property I reacted different to what I would tell anybody else’.

This led the residents to describe the area of the estate as dangerous and comment that ‘I mean a lot of people are scared to walk … since the Kosovans have come in’ and ‘there has been an increase in crime … since they have been here’. One resident believed that ‘even the prostitutes are getting mugged and raped’. The group seemed to accept the fact that the reputation of the area was poor ‘everybody knows … I think there will always be prostitutes and there will always be porn and drug dealers’ but they related how a policing operation some five or six years earlier had reduced the level of crime, but ‘like now since they are putting the refugees in. We seem to be going backward’. It is too simplistic to dismiss these comments as being racist, firstly because the resident who made them was of mixed race and secondly, two of the other residents present at the focus group and who concurred with the comments had mixed race marriages and children. The sense of their unease through the introduction of large numbers of refugee families into the area was best illustrated when one resident said ‘they make you feel really paranoid’.

The issue of policing was also discussed and the focus group unanimously felt that the estate would benefit from the presence of foot patrol officers or the construction of a local police base. Over previous weeks the residents had seen an increase in policing numbers but felt that this was because ‘their problems have been highlighted, because of the muggings’ they felt aggrieved that the police ‘have only started doing that because there have been a lot of muggings…it annoys me because they are so bad, they sort of react on something’. The desire for local police patrols was strongly supported but the residents had not enjoyed a consistently positive policing service.
They recounted that while some individual officers were ‘brilliant, he used to come here and get some curries, he was just down to earth and the people knew him’ while others ‘I wouldn’t stand and talk to some of them … I wouldn’t even say hello to some of them, they are so arrogant and yet we have had some nice ones’.

**Eastville**

For one resident the radio link itself was perceived to be a source of anxiety:

‘...the radio in most cases has worked during the evenings and err I have noticed that some people have actually been calling or alerting others and there are problems in specific areas and that has made me anxious’.

This observation is similar to those of the Northville Parish Councillor who through being made more aware of incidents of disorder in the village felt anxious about the expectations of the other radio link users and their exposure through being involved.

Another resident also felt that the radio link was a source of some anxiety, a young woman, with children; she felt that ‘maybe somebody might have messed around and you know said things on the radio’. This meant that she thought ‘that somebody might you know disturb you during the night’ meaning that ‘I did have a bit of that fear in me that somebody might say something or if you're talking to someone, someone might hear your conversation’. For another resident the lack of involvement by the local police was a cause of some anxiety with them suggesting that ‘what's missing there is I feel that we needed a buddy you know’. They did not expect their neighbours to ‘come and save me or solve the problem’ but did look for ‘a buddy for us, just one police officer that we could rely upon, like a buddy’. The resident thought that the ‘buddy’ system would work where ‘there are petty thefts round here, petty things, small things people get worried over little things and there are times when you feel you should communicate with a police officer and explain to him that you know there is a problem’. The desire to be able to seek ‘advice or talk you know … Talk freely and explain things’ would, it was suggested, assist in not only resolving the immediate problems – the petty things – that people were anxious about but also in improving relationships between the residents and the police: ‘I think that's very important that if we have just one officer that deals with this particular section of the community...’.
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A resident whose daughter was a victim of an incident of indecent exposure used the radio link to demonstrate the actions being undertaken by the community and in so doing sought to reassure her:

‘When I had the phone [radio] with me ... it really made me proud ... I felt I had got something and whereas you know talking to my daughter and it made her feel oh we have got something at least now you know anytime something happens we can always press that button you know the message will go and somebody will just come straight away and you know as soon as you are talking you can hear the voice, everybody answering back. Where are you, yes ok, so whoever is there can see you and the voice is also going into their ears. Hold on there is somebody calling down somebody. They are just running off somewhere, so it makes it more interesting on that side of the scale’.

The issue of youth problems was also considered by another resident who suggested that ‘the crime is err done by kids, you know, teenager[s]’ but he felt that with the residents using the radios the youths ‘think if they have got a phone [radio] they contact police’. He felt that as a result ‘when you’ve got the radios, the children who are causing a nuisance, if they see you with a radio they just run away’ because ‘they are going to call the police and they will call all people who got link radio’ a situation he summarised as being ‘big benefit from that’. This perceived link by young people between the radio and the police is similar to that found by residents in Westville who dealt with a similar problem, see later. It is suggested that such misperceptions among disorderly young people could be based either upon their knowledge of how retail radio links operate in nearby city or town centres or through their association with the use of radios by the police. There will obviously be a vast range of situations that may have caused people anxiety and yet one that was of particular concern for one respondent was the sight of a group of police officers.

This particular respondent had outlined his thoughts on a police buddy scheme and felt that ‘you know in this area there are lots of police coming all the time and you think I don’t know what’s happening you know’. The fact is that:

‘... the way they used to come it wasn’t just one or two they would come like you know four or five altogether with dogs and everything and you would think oh you know what’s going on’.
It is believed that for many people the sight of a police officer in uniform will be reassuring however, when a group of officers are seen together it can be deduced, from the above comments, that this has had the opposite effect. Reflecting upon the residents’ comments it is clear that not knowing both what the cause of the officers visit might be and its potential implications for the resident, creates a sense of anxiety. For example, it could be suggested that a group of police officers visiting a nearby home means that there must be a significant risk, as determined both by the numbers involved (with a police dog) and the fact that the reason for their visit was located in their neighbourhood.

Having regard to these comments and the suggestion made by this particular respondent that the police should appoint a buddy for local communities there are a number of implications for community based policing, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

**Northville**

Within the village a number of the radio link participants owned dogs, which meant that dog walking became an activity that had quite a lot of social meaning and offered a number of opportunities for community interaction. A lady respondent explained that the ‘only time I suppose you feel any sort of concern is maybe walking alone down...Lane’ she believed that ‘like most people you go out with your dog ... I suppose it could be a vulnerable area because you're quite a way from the village’. However, the respondent stated ‘the radio link has made me feel happy about ... because it does give you instant contact’. In what is considered to be a particularly interesting incident, dog walking formed a central part in a potentially serious event. A lady while dog walking was informed via her radio ‘that there was a car that had nose dived into a ditch’. Another resident driving to work, but having her radio with her, had passed the car and had asked if anyone near the car ‘could check whether there was someone hurt in it’. As the respondent was ‘half way down the lane towards it anyway’ she looked in the vehicle and found that it was unoccupied. Notwithstanding, she ‘was able to give the registration number to someone else in the village ... and they reported it to the police’.
The lady felt that the system ‘works so well … I mean it was three people involved and we actually did something about something and had someone been hurt we could have got an ambulance there almost immediately, so I thought that was pretty good’. The respondent went on to describe how as the messages were being passed across the radio link another resident asked if they could help out and that in the evening the resident who had originally passed the car used the radio to enquire what had happened. When asked what she felt when she was approaching the car the lady said:

‘I mean I didn’t mind, I did wonder if someone would be hurt, I tell you what I did think almost instantly, I wished to goodness I’d had some first aid lessons because I wouldn’t know how to cope with someone that was badly injured’.

The one Parish Councillor recalled an incident when he was caused some anxiety because of the radio link. He stated that one evening he had received a telephone call at home, which informed him of the behaviour of a group of youths. He responded to the call and took his radio with him. He found a group of ‘seven or eight youngsters and I put a call out on the radio’ but received no response. In fact his handset was defective and was not receiving any messages for as soon as he returned home and explained to his wife that no one had answered his messages, she said ‘there are half a dozen people responding to your call’. He suggested that if he ‘put a call out…can I rely on the radio, you know’ because ‘I don’t know whether people are listening or not and that was a real concern to me’. This can be thought of as the acid test of any radio link – if I call will someone answer me?

The level of confidence in the radio link and conceivably trust in the other participants will quickly dissipate if calls are routinely ignored or requests for support go unanswered. In some regards the creation of the ‘base’ concept, were one resident agrees to monitor the radio link, found in the second pilot interview area goes someway to meeting this demand. However, having a resident willing to perform this function in every case might not be realistic. Another resident described the interface between the residents and beat officer through use of the radio link. She recalled an incident were she was walking her dog in some nearby fields when the local beat officer ‘wanted to speak to me over an incident what had happened to see if I knew anything about it’ he:
'... radioed me to ask me if I knew anything, he just said “Are you at home” I said “No, I’m up in...Lane with the dog” and within minutes he was with me so it shows that it can happen and somebody can be with you, that’s why I take it with me, oh yeah, it’s with me all the while’.

In other cases being confronted by crime and criminals was also considered a cause for concern:

‘...we did find a stolen vehicle one day ... a new Volvo was hidden by branches and I decided that we would go to the farm and ring the police and as we were walking we actually met three young men who were walking towards us and I spoke to my friend ... just don’t make eye contact, just keep talking to me and we will just carry on ... I was a bit anxious then about meeting these three, because they were quite big fellows’.

When relating this story the resident stated ‘with the radio of course that would have been wonderful’ she explained herself by suggesting that ‘I think your police ... probably take more notice now, you know that perhaps we are not exaggerating or that we are looking out to be helping rather than just you know crying wolf’. The respondent believed that through her membership of the radio link she would be recognised by the police as being supportive of them and as such any information she might give would be given greater credence.

Concepts of Safety and Community: Resident’s Understandings and Experiences

Westville

A resident spoke about the impact upon her well-being through suffering three burglaries ‘it really made me ill, I wasn’t going to bed at night, I was sitting up all night just waiting for them to come and break in again’ as a consequence she applied for and was granted a transfer to sheltered accommodation. The extent of emotional impact of repeated criminal victimisation has been described earlier indeed for this one lady she stated ‘I was living on the end of my nerves; I didn’t want to go to the shops in case they’d been in...it was terrible’. A constant theme throughout the pilot interviews and interviews with residents in both Westville and Eastville was the impact of drug use and drug dealers on priority or high crime areas and respondent’s lives.
The focus group was also asked to consider how the radio link may have affected their perceptions of safety 'more safe, yeah' and another resident agreed 'oh yeah, definitely'. The resident described how when she had been the victim of a violent robbery and suggested that:

'I was petrified, there was nobody about ... but if I had a radio then I would have stood still and rang [radioed] on it because I was in such a state I didn’t know which way I was going home. But if I, you know could have rang [radioed] somebody I needed somebody at that time'.

The focus group was also asked to describe what they thought constituted neighbourliness 'if you’re ill, doing things for you ... check on you, see if you’re alright' and ‘yeah, going up to see her with some fags’. What is of particular interest and importance in these comments is the reference to maintaining personal relationships through social support. When asked if knowledge of individuals is a prerequisite for neighbourliness the group thought not ‘no’ and ‘well no not really’. They each gave examples of how they looked out for and assisted elderly neighbours even though they did not consider them to be friends ‘if you don’t see somebody you know say for a couple a days, check on them’.

The focus group discussed the problems being experienced by residents through satellite interference and the issues that had arisen between the committee members and the other residents:

‘...when there was just the committee ... Everything was brilliant but now since the other have had them its just ringing all day and all night yet nobody’s speaking, you’re answering it but you’re getting no answer back’.

The coincidental occurrence of the interference, which happened in the early hours of the morning and the issues associated with lack of involvement and relationship with the ‘other’ residents’, seemed to have created severe problems for the radio link. While the early impressions were favourable these issues caused the system to implode with a number of participants returning their radios and withdrawing from the research. The focus group was asked if the introduction of the radio link had in anyway changed their views of community and neighbourliness.
One resident stated ‘yes, I think so, I think it shows that people don’t care really’ they explained how ‘everybody come, they wanted them [radios] when they first come … something for nout’. The division between the members of the TRA ‘committee’s used them properly’ and the ‘outsiders’ was shown in the comment:

‘…since the outsiders came in like, we’ve had these problems because they either don’t know how to use them or they’re just playing with them like a toy instead of using them for what they’re supposed to be used for’.

Consideration of these responses suggests that the introduction of the radio link created a situation within which the divisions in the community, between the TRA committee and the other residents, were highlighted. The research process had involved people, who were not committee members, in the realm of estate management and community safety, people whom the committee both did not trust and, it could be speculated, resented for their unprofessional approach. As one member of the TRA said about the radios ‘I mean they are brilliant … its just they’re not being used properly’. When asked about concepts of community the group suggested it involved ‘trust, respect, friendship, helping each other, being aware of one another’ and ‘being aware what’s going on in your community’ as well as intergenerational contact. The specific reference to trust as the first response highlights the importance of this issue for the residents of Westville.

Taking these thoughts of neighbourliness and community together with the resident’s perceptions of safety, suggest that in this priority neighbourhood the bonds that tie neighbours are fragile indeed. In essence resident’s perceptions of community and safety may be just that, perceptions.

_**Eastville**_

It is to be expected that unsafe situations will mean different things to different people. Within this multi-cultural community individual resident’s personal experiences varied considerably. One resident, who was a community activist, felt that their safety had been partly compromised through working alongside the statutory agencies. In contrast another resident when reflecting upon levels of community safety in the area recalled living in Zambia ‘there they use guns you know people carry guns and try to shoot at you’.
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When the focus group was asked whether they felt there was a community in Eastville they suggested there was but ‘there are problems within that community’ which they suggested was characterised through a lack of participation in the radio link. As a result a number of the users wanted to ‘give up’. One resident stated that there was a need to re-build a sense of community on the estate as ‘over the years very many new people have come along and things have changed’ this led them to believe that the new arrivals were ‘not as neighbourly as people who are first on the estate’. This comment related to the relationship between the existing Muslim community and the recently arrived refugee families, particularly those from Somalia.

The sense of community derived by the Eastville residents through the strength of a common cultural and ethnic background was illustrated when one resident said:

‘...him him him all of us, you would ask him his from Malawi although I don’t know him but I know his family there is that connection that we came to know very long ago, she’s from Malawi, his from Malawi ... I am from Malawi so that connection that bonds are from Malawi’.

But those cultural and ethnic ties may also prove problematic in that they may create barriers to wider community cohesion. A resident suggested ‘some people who are from India … we not bond to them’ and ‘you see there are those problems but it doesn’t look mean we can’t overcome them as it’s just hard to overcome’.

When pressed to explain this issue one of the residents suggested that the Indian community ‘want to distance themselves’ which was agreed upon by the group ‘hundred percent right’. When asked if the Indians had wanted to establish a radio link would the Eastville group support them? The residents agreed ‘absolutely’ and ‘I mean if they want to do in their way then at least their help to us as well’. A resident explained that ‘we like Malawi’s you know we know each other we can bond together and those who can’t bond together they bond themselves with their community’.

**Northville**

In one of the earliest interviews in Northville one resident when asked about unsafe situations said ‘I’ve had a lot of unsafe situations but they’ve been in the coalmine’. This comment followed on from him describing a number of crimes he had suffered but which he dismissed ‘I wasn’t too perturbed about that they did a hell of a lot of damage £2,000 worth’.
He sought to project an image of criminal victimisation being not quite as bad as incidents he had experienced in the mines ‘I have been in some frightening situations as I say with work’ but ‘these situations you know you accept things, you can’t alter and do something about those that you can’. In Hollway and Jefferson (2000b) an interview was conducted with a resident named Phil, (2000b: 119). Phil had experienced a number of misfortunes in life, which he coped with by ‘throw[ing] himself into activities on behalf of others’. Aspects of his life experiences included safety at work and trade unionism, which had caused him to invest a lot of time in community safety projects. In many regards there are similarities between Phil and the Northville ex-miner who had established a pattern of walking – patrolling – his neighbourhood and actively challenging people acting in a suspicious manner.

The ex-miner had adopted a defensive structure based upon protecting his neighbourhood and engaging in community activities. These community and protective activities were best illustrated in one incident, which he related during the interview. To raise money for the village church he had placed decorative Christmas lights to the front of his home and had secured a cash-box to a post inviting donations for the church. A group of local youths had vandalised the lights and he had gone after them. He challenged the youths but they had denied their involvement.

Being unable to prove their wrongdoing he had taken a string of Father Christmas shaped lights and put bleach in them so if they were stolen again there was a chance the bleach would spill and ruin the children’s clothes. This rather extreme form of protective behaviour is perhaps evidence of what he had expressed, you accept those things you cannot do anything about – proving the youths involvement – but do something about those you can influence – ensuring that if the lights were stolen again the bleach would spill onto and ruin the thieves’ clothing.

The first focus group discussed a wide range of issues, some prompted by questions and other raised through discussion. The group were asked their thoughts as to what constituted a community with one resident suggesting it is comprised of the various associations, societies and groups that exist within the village. Another resident suggested community was comprised of:
‘...mutual respect and you only get respect when people cease to be anonymous and so the more people know each other and know the people in the community, the safer and kinder the community becomes, and suddenly anonymity goes’.

The question was asked of the group how would they define knowing people, was it knowing their appearance, talking to them and knowing their names or just where they live. One resident thought it was knowing a persons name while another believed it might just involve knowing the name of that person’s dog. This led the group to discuss the circumstances under which people meet and through which they get to know each other. One resident disclosed how they had met other women in the village through attending school events and through their children. For another resident village societies and organisations were obvious meeting places but they thought that some villagers ‘who don’t join the societies and don’t get out, and just get home and just lock the door, they are missing out’. When pressed on whether knowing people was an essential part of living in a community one resident who was a radio ham disagreed ‘I like my anonymity…I thought about joining this because I thought it was important to me in the sense that it does establish community’. However, he thought that:

‘...there is nothing wrong with anonymity, if you don’t want to participate and you don’t want to join in, you can still survive and still be part of the village’.

The man went on to state that ‘I think you can still be yourself without having to dive in and be submerged by the community’. This response was immediately challenged by some of the group who stated ‘I didn’t know you, but I knew your wife and your dog’. The subject of membership of the community caused some disagreement and what became a feature of this and the second focus group was the stance taken by this one resident, the radio ham, being in opposition to the views of the remainder of the group. He summarised his thoughts as:

‘I don’t think that it’s particularly special here...honest, this is a bed and breakfast community village, this is a village used by people for no other than it’s a nice place to live, it’s handy for all the major cities and it’s fine when the time comes to move on’.
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When asked about the active support for village events such as Gala Day he again suggested that there was a lot of people in the village who apart from visiting the public house and church ‘just sort of plod along’. Notwithstanding, the remainder of the group felt that such inter-personal relationships and a sense of community was reassuring. When the focus group was asked about the contribution membership of the radio link had made to their sense of community one resident suggested that it increased the number of people they knew. This key observation was agreed with by a number of the residents one of whom explained that the radio link could be viewed as being similar to other societies or village organisations ‘it extends the number of people who you come into contact with … it is a group rather than the radio’. This suggestion led another resident to suggest ‘the radios been a catalyst’ an observation agreed with by another who said ‘without that, I wouldn’t have spoken to you probably’.

It is suggested that what was meant was that although the two residents had seen each other in the village and ‘at the school at different things’ they had not met nor spoken before notwithstanding one saying ‘I’ve lived in the village for 19 years’ and both agreed that the ‘the radio is the key’. Other residents commented that the radio link had ‘help[ed] to bring the community back and get the village back really’ and ‘it’s been very useful in a lot of different ways’. In another key exchange during the focus group one of the residents related how they had found a stray dog – a problem in a farming community with cases of livestock worrying – and had returned the dog to its owner. As the resident related how the owner felt:

‘What she didn’t like and what job was it and who were these people talking about her dog on the radio and what business was it and she had come to live in this community because she wanted some privacy and she was getting none here … she just said she didn’t want big brother watching her and she’d sort her own dog out’.

When asked what the residents thought about this comment one suggested that ‘I don’t think she thought it through, big brother it’s in her interest, so what’s she got to fear?’ this was followed by another resident stating they would not help the lady again and in fact if she lost her dog they would ‘take a piece of string, tie it up and call the dog warden and she could pay forty pounds to get it back’.

184
This connotation of Big Brother (Orwell, 1949) in the mind of the lady who had lost the dog is clearly an expression of concern over the perceived intrusive nature of the radio user’s surveillance of the village and interference with her privacy. The fact the residents stated they were actually concerned with sheep in the fields and the dog causing a road traffic collision, factors that were possibly not expressed by the radio users nor understood by the lady. The fear of intrusive surveillance and the use of the term Big Brother have most commonly been used in connection with CCTV. As with the response of the lady there can be contrary perspectives. In a study of CCTV systems within a retail environment it was found that ‘nearly three-quarters of staff welcomed or did not mind covert surveillance’ (Beck and Willis, 1995:192) and:

‘Visible crime prevention measures such as CCTV have a built-in deterrent potential. Part of their justification lies in the way in which ‘conspicuous presence’ alone may add to store security. There is also the possibility, however, that their visibility may be off-putting to customers – the ‘Big Brother’ syndrome (Beck and Willis, 1992). Honest shoppers may feel that they are under suspicion…’ (Beck and Willis, 1994: 189).

It can be suggested that the beliefs of the shop staff may mirror those of the radio link users and those of the honest shopper the owner of the lost dog. The difficulty of reconciling safety and privacy has been commented upon earlier (Bauman, 2001) and is perhaps neatly illustrated in this one incident. In trying to understand the lady’s feelings the residents stated they had not expected such a reaction when they had joined the radio link and felt that ‘people were wary, they thought you were in neighbourhood watch and being nosy’. This comment caused one of the residents in the focus group to suggest that the radio link and Neighbourhood Watch are different in that the radio scheme participants were ‘more noticeable’ and while he was not able to define why that was, the resident concluded ‘but the radio seems to become a problem’. This was challenged by another resident who recalled how Neighbourhood Watch members had ‘accosted several people … walking around the village’ and by one of the members who felt that ‘there may be some people who react badly but that doesn’t mean to say that everybody does … there may be isolated cases’.

The second focus group was asked about their thoughts on whether the radio link might promote acts of vigilantism, which led one resident to reply ‘not at my age’ and repeated comments of ‘no’.
Another resident suggested they did not ‘want to tackle anybody’ but that they might intervene if ‘it’s a matter of life or death, because you would feel obliged to’ however, in ordinary circumstances they would ‘remonstrate or you might call other people’. However, one resident did suggest that a local resident, not involved in the radio link, was suspected of having tried to set fire to a wooden bus shelter, used by the young people as a meeting place.

The discussion was extended to ask if the residents felt that membership of the scheme made them in anyway vulnerable. One resident replied ‘no, no’ and explained ‘it is all about how careful you are about how you approach really. If you want to approach, do it politely and properly’. The second focus group were asked if being members of the radio link had in anyway changed their perceptions of community safety to which a number initially replied ‘no’ and then ‘personally, no’. However, one resident reported that ‘there are one or two youngsters in the village who are aware of the radios and you can get some rather coarse comments’. This comment obviously suggests that the young people are not only aware of the identity of the radio link users but also through their response what they think about them and the scheme, an indication perhaps of the radio link creating separate communities? A number of other residents felt that while they are aware the young people know they are members of the radio link they themselves had not experienced any problems ‘they’re not disrespectful to me’.

The group was also asked if their level of awareness had changed, do they pay more attention to things going on within the village, through being involved in the radio link. A number immediately agreed ‘yes, definitely’ with one resident suggesting the reason is they are ‘looking for somebody to report I suppose!’ This comment could be a reference to their desire to be seen by the other users as actively protecting the village or more practically to having something to enter into the event diaries they were asked to complete as part of the Home Office research. One resident thought the radio link was ‘bringing the village back together’ a reference to her impression that in the 1970’s residents from different parts of the village did not mix ‘it seems to be that everybody is coming back round and they you know they do actually talk to each other’. Other residents either were not in the village at that time or were not aware of the issue.
The group returned to consider the question of awareness with one resident stating that ‘I’ve started walking around more aware perhaps of what is going on’ and while they explained they were not looking for just anything to report on the radio link they did feel they ‘are made more aware of your surroundings’ and ‘I now keep my eyes open’ rather than prior to joining the radio link when they were ‘aimlessly wandering around’.

**Risky Situations: Causes and Perceptions**

*Westville*

The first respondent who described herself as an ‘old granny with a walking stick’ described the local vice area as risky because ‘the only problem around here you know you get accosted all the time if you want business’. She described that even when waiting to cross local roads or for a bus ‘you get them coming and asking you if you wanted sex’ with the situation being so commonplace that ‘we get it all the time, we’re used to it’ and it being ‘twenty-four hours a day’. However, ‘if you ignore them or shake your head they’ll walk away you know they’re decent like that’. What does this mean?

While the respondent clearly meant that the men, the punters, were ‘decent’ she had also spoken about attacks upon prostitutes by clients – clearly men who were not decent. She had said that she never went out at night due to her being fearful and it can be assumed therefore, that the men who were approaching her during the day where not in her mind the types of people responsible for the murder and attacks upon prostitutes. It could be the case therefore, that to make sense of the situation she thought of the type of men who frequented the area during the day as ‘decent’ while those at night might be far from such. This classification helped rationalise her fears and prevented the situation developing where she felt unable to go out at all, particularly as she said the vice area operates at all times. One of the residents, who had been violently mugged, again felt that such incidents of personal violence in the locality constituted risky situations. She spoke about ‘a lady mugged in the broad daylight you know and she was elderly’ and categorised having to go out at night as being of particular risk.
Ironically she declined to attend police organised events ‘I used to go to police liaison and I told them when there was a meeting here the reason I didn’t go because it was at night time’ however, referring to the radio link she suggested that ‘but now that we have got the radios … I daresay I would go now’.

_Eastville_

For some residents on the estate the behaviour of young people was the cause of perceptions of risk to individual and community safety. A community advocate who was a radio link user commented upon the role of challenging unacceptable behaviour, particularly by young people on the estate and felt that because of this he was at risk. He suggested that ‘I do feel very vulnerable and I feel scared but not…anything serious during the time the radio system started’. A resident who described some fifteen youths hanging about on the landings of the maisonettes again commented upon the problems associated with young people’s behaviour. It is worth considering the issue of young people at this point as it arose on a number of occasions in the research sites. The interviewees were all householders with a tangible and vested interest in the enjoyment of their homes by themselves and their families. As such it can be suggested that any activity that would in anyway impinge upon such enjoyment, for example noise, litter, vandalism etc. would, for this group, be censured. As such, for the Eastville residents, young people represented a perceptual risk to them and their community. The resident when faced with some fifteen youths was worried so used his radio to call for some support ‘I went out, tried to use the radio link, it's too late, it's about 12 at night, nobody would respond’. This example of the type of problem that could be faced by radio link users, when they need support and asked for it: the fact no one answers, may be the single greatest cause of dissatisfaction with the scheme.

Simply put, any faith or trust invested in a communications system that does not facilitate dialogue will quickly dissipate. It can be thought possible that in turn a false belief in the radio link providing increased levels of safety may lead residents to placing themselves at greater risk than they would have done prior to being a radio user.
Northville

For the rural community a situation arose quite early after the schemes launch when a distressed woman was found near the village. One of the residents found herself responding to messages passed on the radio describing the situation and unsure what to do felt unhappy that more was not being done for the woman.

Her discomfort arose partly because the residents discussing the situation on the radio were not able to agree a course of action ‘people said well she’s entitled to be sitting there and doing whatever she’s doing … but I thought we should be doing more’. Eventually the respondent approached the woman who refused any help, she later walked off into some nearby fields and having been found by a farmer was taken in the farmhouse for her own safety. What was of interest in this situation was how the residents used the radio to discuss the problem ‘I put it on the radio to find out what anybody thought about the situation’. What does this one incident tell us? It is suggested that the reticence of the residents to become too involved with the woman may have been because she clearly was not so ill, for example unconscious, bleeding, etc. or so vulnerable such as elderly, mentally ill, young, etc. that a decision to involve the emergency services was unavoidable. Secondly, as Shapland and Vagg (1988: 104) suggest the risk of embarrassment, of getting it wrong and either being blamed or ridiculed, was also so great that it prevented any intervention. Reflecting upon the respondent’s answers it is believed that if she had not been swayed by the opinions of the other radio links she would probably have involved the police or ambulance service, as such the radio link was probably more of a hindrance than help.

Another female respondent and mother of teenage sons when asked about risky situations recalled when a radio user reported ‘trouble down at the bus shelter’ which she reacted to by driving to the scene, but as she said ‘it was just kids and it was people here overreacting’. Within the village there was somewhat of a divide between those residents who perceived the younger people to be the source of crime and disorder and those who felt the village itself was partly to blame through not providing sufficient recreation, leisure and sporting facilities. In broad terms the former group was comprised of retired householders without children in the village and the latter who either had children still at home or who worked with children.
As this particular respondent, when referring to the radio link, suggested ‘my son doesn't like it. My younger son. He's one of the ones who walks the streets, and whatever, thinks we're spying on him’. It is perhaps relevant to put the issues involving the young people in the bus shelter in context, particularly having considered the type of incidents in the two other areas. One resident a Parish Councillor also referred to this one incident when asked this question and related the story in more detail:

‘...myself and another radio user, we walked round and there were some youngsters in there again drinking and I had a word with them and there was some litter round. I picked some up and I asked them not to drop litter around and if they wouldn’t mind putting the litter in the rubbish bin and not in the bus shelter and they were reasonable, there was no hassle or anything like that, and the second incident was just a summer incident where I had a phone call and I went out again with another radio user and we just spoke to the youngsters and the youngsters said “Well do you want us to go and apologise to these people” and we said “no, I don’t think that’s a good idea, I think that would just inflame the situation, so I just said be quiet and behave yourselves and then there isn’t a problem’.

During the second focus group the participants were asked to discuss the incident with the car in the ditch, which had been raised during one of the individual interviews. In what turned out to be the most emotionally charged and fraught discussion throughout the whole research period, the group in essence divided. What was not known was that since the individual interviews had been undertaken, another car had been found by a radio user in a ditch. In this case the driver, a villager, was found slumped across the driver’s seat and there was a clear suspicion that he had been driving after having drunk alcohol. The resident being unsure what to do had informed other radio link members of the incident and sought their advice and assistance. The initial stages of the discussion concerned the first car in the ditch, an incident described by a resident as one ‘that worked absolutely brilliantly’ but which caused the dog walker who responded to the call some concern for if they had ‘found someone in the car I wouldn’t have known what do have done, but it worries me’. At this one of the dog walkers stated that they did have another incident with a car in a ditch, a response which was greeted with embarrassed laughter by the group. The lady explained:
‘Well, I was walking on one Saturday afternoon and there’s a lane off the road, and the man was drunk but he wasn’t driving the car, he was sitting in the car and I got the two dogs and I couldn’t get him out, but I knew him, he lived in the village, so I radioed for help and … came, brought my husband and another radio user and his son-in-law came and there was a bit of a meeting about what we should do and the bloke agreed to get out of the car and they took him home and certain other radio users said that we should have instantly called the police … we had no evidence that he hadn’t drunk sitting in the car, he hadn’t, as far as we know he hadn’t driven on the road, we hadn’t seen him drive on the road, so we thought we’d get him out of the way and I still think that we did the right thing’

The exchange that followed highlighted the clear divisions that were appearing in the group with the radio ham stating:

‘…for the record, I was the one who objected to this, I think that they should have phoned the police without any argument because … you’re sending out a wrong message, what you’re saying is it’s okay to get drunk in the village and if you get caught by one of your neighbours or the radio group they’ll support you in being drunk in charge of a car and I don’t think its on, I think that you made the decision and the decision was agreed to by five of you that it was I think … the wrong decision’.

The group entered into a particularly heated and emotional debate about the incident with the radio ham being highly critical of the rest of the group. Those involved reiterated their view that he was not seen to drive and even suggested ‘at the time you think well this guy is ill’ while others prompted to contribute suggested that ‘my husband…went further to say if in the future this guy is to go and knock a child over then how would you feel about it?’ While another said they had later found out ‘he drove from the pub’. The exchange continued for some minutes with the radio ham stating ‘a man who drives a car drunk today has driven a car drunk yesterday and will drive a car drunk tomorrow’ and those who had been involved in the incident suggesting that they had not seen him driving and that ‘with life we all have to make instant decisions’. A point, which clearly does not fit with the facts as the residents had discussed the incident. The radio ham then disclosed:
‘I’m wound up about this because it’s personal. I lost a son in a motor accident. Now when you’ve lost someone to a motor accident you have a different view and my view is very, very critical. I don’t trust you with things that I really think are important because of this one incident. I am angry, deeply angry, about it because you let somebody walk who could quite easily kill and that is not on’ (Emphasis added).

The radio ham went on to repeat ‘I don’t trust the radio group’ and when asked what he meant by this said ‘I don’t trust people so much now’. It is suggested that he clearly felt that the radio users had decided not to involve the police, in effect they had protected the man another villager from possible prosecution and that their judgement was questionable.

The references to trust as a key factor in the relationship between the users is of particular importance and will be discussed further in the next chapter, suffice to say the whole atmosphere of the focus group – and probably thereafter within the radio link – was spoilt by the incident and its discussion. It can be suggested that the rationale for the radio ham having, throughout the discussions distanced himself from the group, was because of his distrust of the others, and yet he had appealed to them to trust his judgement over technical issues (see page 211 below).

**Radio Links and Reassurance**

*Westville*

The introduction of the radio link to this high-crime neighbourhood led to a number of dramatic and unforeseen consequences that have serious implications for agencies, particularly the police, when considering supporting the implementation of such initiatives in priority communities.

The initial responses from residents were simply expressed ‘you know at night when it’s dark since I’ve got the walkie talkie, I don’t, you know, I don’t know what it is, I just feel safe with it’. Another adopted a more practical stance ‘I couldn’t even use a what are these phones [radios]. I’m not one for new fangled things’. The lady explained that her friend – the one she would talk to if she feels down – had left her keys in her house, had locked herself out of her home and walked round to her friends house to ask for help.
Together they had visited the local caretaker but he was not available at which they split up, the respondent to visit another neighbour who might have had some keys and the friend to wait for the caretaker. Knowing that her friend had her radio with her and not being able to find her she returned to her home to collect her own radio and ‘foxtrotted’ her – f for foxtrot from the phonetic alphabet being one of the call signs for the scheme. Her friend immediately answered stating she had now met up with the caretaker and had a spare set of keys at which the respondent said ‘I would have just wandered around the estate looking for where she was, if I hadn’t had that, so that was really very useful and that made me realise to carry it [radio] all the time’.

During the time this incident was taking place the residents were ‘foxtrotting … she wasn’t in, her voice carried over and this fella was looking round to and I says to her he must think we are under cover police (laughing)’. The immediate thought of the resident that anyone would mistake two elderly ladies for under-cover police officers was obviously amusing to her but does that comment perhaps provide an insight into her understanding of the scheme?

It is conceivable that the use of code words ‘foxtrot’ to identify callers, rather than using names, and the use of radios is immediately associated with the police but at the particular time the residents were using the radio link to solve a non-police issue, finding a spare set of keys, keeping in contact with and locating each other. It is thought that there may be some confusion between the perceived objective – crime reduction and policing, ‘safety use’ of the radios – with its actual use – community contact and reassurance, ‘talk use’. This potential confusion, summarised as being between safety and talk, taken with the comments of the residents, regards the scheme implementation, offer, it is suggested, the context within which to explain how this particular radio link scheme imploded.

The scheme was developed through a randomly selected number of residents agreeing to participate in the research and hold radios. It is suggested they did not wholly know or trust each other and after an initial enthusiastic use of the radio link some of the scheme members ceased to be involved. It is thought that there may have been a lack of clarity as to the objective of the scheme, was it safety or talk? If there were no or few incidents or crimes to report and discuss on the radio link, safety use, then some of the residents may have felt there was nothing to talk about.
As such those residents who were not involved in existing community organisations may have felt either unable to contribute or excluded from the talk use of the system. The number of residents involved in the scheme therefore, fell off and in essence the scheme reverted to being used solely by the members of the TRA, those who perhaps felt most at ease and trusted with the talk use. The younger resident, who found walking through the flats a source of anxiety, thought the radio link ‘a good idea’ but that ‘it’s just a shame that the people don’t do it properly’. She suggested that the scheme offered a source of reassurance:

‘I think it would be brilliant, you know if whole areas sort of had a go at it, I think it would stop people from fearing too much as well, you know when they are coming from town’.

When asked about the method used to implement the scheme – residents being invited to have a radio when interviewed as part of the Home Office study – she said ‘I think really you should have sort of left it to the Committee’. The original CATCH schemes (Wright, 1999; McAllister, 2003) were established through the police approaching local tenants and residents groups or Neighbourhood Watch schemes and inviting them to develop radio links. In these cases the police did not select participants nor offer guidance to the TRA about who to include or exclude (see Toolkits in Gibson and Wright, 1995). The young resident’s comments indicate that she felt it would have been preferable if the TRA committee had developed the scheme rather than a relatively unknown group of neighbours had self-selected their participation.

It is suggested that the committee members through their work on the estate shared a number of key characteristics: a knowledge of the issues affecting the area; existing contact with agencies such as the police and the housing association; knowledge of other residents; and a willingness to undertake unpaid work for and on behalf of their neighbours. In essence they were existing community activists; and probably most importantly within the context of the neighbourhood, they knew and trusted each other. To reinforce the young resident’s perceptions of some of those who initially wanted radios but quickly resigned from the scheme:
‘...my impression is that people just ain’t interested sometimes, just that they’ve got better things to do, just like even if you get interference [radio interference from the satellite] a lot of people are ready to give up straight away they just can’t face dealing with it. They’ve had enough, it’s like you know they think everything is going to happen and change over night, but it doesn’t’.

Perhaps for this resident an absence of trust in the other radio link users was a critical issue in such a high crime estate, which lacked the same cultural, religious and ethnic ties as Eastville or social capital as in Northville. For example, if a radio user was also the local burglar it is clear they could easily have capitalised upon the situation where one of the residents had locked themselves out of their flat.

The residents of Westville have every right, in light of the crime profile of their area to expect agencies will, when seeking their involvement in any community based initiative, not only consult with them and seek their advice, but do everything possible to safeguard them. In this case the research process singularly failed to do so. For the resident living in the sheltered accommodation the first few days of the scheme saw ‘everybody was on ‘em every five minutes calling each other and talking about just all sorts of things and it wasn’t really to do with it they were just testing them out I think like a new toy’. After the initial burst of activity ‘it you know gradually faded off and there was only just the one or two calls’ interestingly these calls were all crime-related ‘somebody phoning [radioing] through about a chap selling furniture going knocking at the doors selling’ and again with ‘one that was about somebody that said they were from the electricity board but being up in the flats you see we don’t get that sort of thing’.

The issue of bogus official or distraction burglaries is clearly highly relevant for elderly residents:

‘Unless anybody that’s stupid opens the door to them you know which they have done we’ve had a couple of money disappearing out the flats when they’ve let them in they’ve said they’ve been from the water board and the electric board’.

When asked about the scheme, the resident stated ‘apart from say the dropouts and that the few of us that’s left its fine’. Turning to the reason for the dropouts she said ‘whether it was because they were having trouble using the ... radio’.
She also felt that people had taken a too parochial attitude saying ‘...it was a waste of time because it concerns the flat; the estate more than our flats ... which I think is the wrong attitude to take anyway. If your supposed to be in the community we’re in the community we should still carry on and work with it every day’ and concluded by saying ‘I’ll carry on and see it through although being up in the flats I’m not really too much risk so I’ll carry on with it anyway’.

The actual involvement by residents in incidents and their use of the radio link as a means by which to enforce social control was highlighted when discussing this question with the one of the residents. She described how a group of some 10 youths had driven onto the estate and were acting in a manner that was perceived as threatening by some of the residents. The estate caretaker had asked them to behave and leave but they had refused. At this time the members of the radio link became involved and the younger resident approached the youths ‘I asked them to move and they were laughing and I said you can laugh as much as you like I’ll call the police’.

The youths again refused to behave and leave the estate at which:

‘Foxtrot 4 went into her house, got the radio and as she went into the house I said to them then Foxtrot 4 came out of the house with the walkie talkie we stood talking to the other tenants for a while and then erm I took the walkie talkie, walked past them, Foxtrotted 3 and just to say there was a group of young lads outside their cars in the Close but I think they thought I was calling the police. And within seconds got in the car and went. So it just proves that even though they don’t know nothing about the walkie talkie they obviously think they are linked, you know to the local police, they must have because they soon went’.

When asked if she felt reassured through being involved in the radio link she simply replied ‘yes’ with another resident being equally brief ‘Oh yes, very much, yes’ she also suggested ‘I think we should have more people try it ... advertise it more, you know, with responsible people not people that would mess around’ (emphasis added). In this comment it is suggested there is in the use of the word responsible a recognition of the trust that needs to exist between radio link participants.
The younger member of the scheme also agreed she was reassured but returned to consider the nature of the schemes implementation ‘I think if it was left with the Committee [TRA] it would be great’ she thought that one of the failures was through the involvement of too many individuals and the type of people ‘if you involve too many people there will be a lot of you know...’ and while she did not finish the sentence it is assumed she did not welcome ‘outsiders’ involvement in the scheme. She also felt that the police and housing association staff should carry radios ‘the Police are supposed to be involved with us, we haven’t heard a thing from them.

Nothing at all’. In conclusion she pictured a future in which:

‘I think it’s a good idea I think it should be sort of well spread over the City specially when its done properly, in proper hands and those that take their tenants association seriously and back it 100%’.

The final respondent again said she was reassured through being involved in the radio link but expressed concerns over the satellite interference and the fact her radio was not functioning properly. She described how she takes her radio with her when walking to church and delivering leaflets around the estate. In what became a feature in a number of interviews the lady stated ‘for the senior citizens association which I’m a member of the committee ... I do all sorts you know I’m involved in a lot of things to do with the community’. Such local community activism was found in Northville through membership of the Parish Council or Neighbourhood Watch and in Westville it was through supporting the TRA or the local church. What does this tell us about the other residents?

The respondent thought that:

‘...this is where we have a problem, you try to do things for them, you set things up for them and then they don’t respond to them they, they say want this and they want that ... but you try to do things to help them but they don’t respond ... we only usually sort of set things up then we help them sort it out you know’.

With a number of responses, in particular those in Eastville, there existed a desire for more communication and activity on the radio link. For community activists this challenge may not be too difficult, for example organising charitable runs or litter pick-ups in Northville but for those people who perhaps seek a quieter more solitary existence the thought of such involvement in a radio link may be off-putting.
As such it is suggested that people will tend to be drawn to communal activity if that is an arena in which they feel comfortable and in which they feel they can contribute. For others this is clearly not the case if they feel they have nothing to submit to the group or gain from their involvement. For the residents in Westville they may have seen their involvement in the radio link as a natural extension of their existing community activities. Notwithstanding, these difficulties the residents were using the radios, for example when a ‘man was reported going round knocking on doors trying to sell furniture’ which came about when one participant ‘come over the radio and said that there was a strange car in the close. She took the number plate’.

The presence of capable guardians (Cohen and Felson, 1979) has been described as a contributory factor in the prevention of crime. It has also been suggested that ‘surveillance (or the appearance of surveillance) is part of capable guardianship’ (Painter and Tilley, 1999: 1). It is possible to suggest that this example highlights how a radio link can support both community surveillance and capable guardianship. The use of the radio links for ‘talk’ rather than ‘safety’ reasons was illustrated when two residents described how they ‘used to phone [radio] up for you for if you wanted anything off the shops’. They also spoke about their support for the radio link, with one resident saying ‘they’re good they are good’ and another ‘they are good’. In a concluding remark one lady stated ‘I know, they are handy to have’ and ‘used properly they are brilliant’. Another described how:

‘...you know like when you have some pervy [perverted] person behind you in the bushes and you see them you can like come on that, say to everybody and everybody will be aware then or just say like you know’.

When the focus group was asked if they used the radio link to address the problems associated with the vice area they responded ‘no, it’s not that sort of problem’. The residents explained how they had involved the local authority environmental health department as ‘there’s prostitutes at the back of my house, there’s prostitutes go in my gate...I mean my front door has condoms there, they are all hanging on the bushes’. The preferred solution was to motivate the Council to cut down the bushes because ‘it’s a prostitute area at the back of me with all the gaps and they come in the gateway so with the bushes all over it hides them’. It is thought that the issue for the residents was that the sex trade had become an everyday – and all day – activity which they did not believe they could address through the use of the radio link.
Why phone the police to report the activity of prostitutes when they knew of the problem already? The outcome they sought was to distance the impact of the vice area from their homes and this was achieved through removing the cover of the bushes. When the focus group discussed whether their involvement in the radio link had affected their feelings of being reassured or not, the residents suggested that ‘yes, I was, it made everything look as though we going somewhere as well’ and ‘you know that you knew there was always somebody on the end’.

**Eastville**

For the residents there were expressions of support for the radio link but recognition that not everyone was as involved in the scheme as they believed themselves to be, for example the community activist said ‘I played very positive in terms of saying yes’. Another said:

‘I thought it would help us a lot and in ways it has … after a while people give up or what but we didn’t have like a lot of respond … I think it helped a lot ‘er like you know we weren’t that scared. I wasn’t that scared of things or if I went out, I would go out of my door leaving my door open you know the latch open and I know that I have got some neighbours who have got the radios as well’.

Notwithstanding, the positive response other residents also felt that there was a lack of involvement by some participants ‘I actually thought that it was a very good idea…but the problem is that some people are okay, some people just ignore the whole thing’. The resident attributed the lack of involvement to ‘people in the community that possible can't speak or are too shy or they don't want to use it, or lazy...we use it but you will find a few guys who do respond.’ A lady resident with young children saw the benefits as being:

‘…with me being on my own and like others, it would be convenient because if anything happened I could contact someone, like a neighbour ... by the radio, I could get help straight away but that's it you know’.

Another resident described the developing situation with the Eastville radio link:
‘...it started off very well, like contacting one another, but what’s happened now, because its started most of the youngsters started to know that oh hold on there is something fishy going on here. Everyone has got radios, you know, like in the beginning we started to get in touch with one another, we knew everybody’s address and those who had phones [radios] and everything but since then it has cut down but what has happened now is that because it has gone dead like, it is restarting, coming back again’.

Analysing the resident’s comments it is suggested that, as with Westville, there was an initial burst of activity with users talking to one another and learning the location of each other homes. This activity had an obvious effect upon those people they perceive to be problematic – youngsters.

The young people obviously became aware of the resident’s collective activities and probably being apprehensive of this new initiative either stopped their behaviour or more likely moved to an area away from the estate. The single issue that initially prompted the group’s collective actions may, once it was either reduced or removed, have left them with literally nothing to talk about. It is perhaps inevitable that with the perceived reason for talking and working together removed the group would suffer some decline but the final comment above suggests that perhaps that had been recognised and was being addressed. This single issue leading to scheme failure has been discussed earlier with regards to Neighbourhood Watch where the initial concern with crime, often domestic burglary, leads to the schemes creation but through inactivity its subsequent demise. The focus group was asked if they felt when using the radio they would be vulnerable, the residents believed not ‘no’ and ‘no no I don’t think they would’. They were also asked if they felt safer being involved in the radio link ‘up to now yes’ and simply ‘yes’. They also suggested that if the ‘whole community get get together that’s the main thing’ then this would be the single most effective deterrent to crime and disorder on the estate. The reason given was:

‘The people who have got the radios like if I contact them and if they get respond me and those kids or whoever if they think I have the system and somebody else respond me, they will get scared ... to come in that area’.

But the same resident thought that ‘if I show them a radio and if I call someone and if I don’t have a respond, you think I’m talking into a brick wall’ the limitations of the radio link came at a time when the residents felt that the police were failing to provide an adequate presence on the estate. One resident suggested that:
‘...the sad fact is that erm we have time and again raised the issue that policing by means of a car or by means of a motorcycle is not gonna help and that’s been a very big problem. The officers who are are are covering our area on most of the occasions are covered with other things and they are taken off’.

The difficulties experienced by the residents were exacerbated by the fact that a CCTV system installed throughout the estate and paid for through Single Regeneration Budget funding had also failed to prevent crime and disorder:

‘Sadly it appears that in the way the tenants have looked around and they have actually witnessed this young people causing problems, they probably on the camera, but they’ve not been apprehended or done anything’.

The specific example given was the fact that some of the cameras were used to monitor local telephone kiosks which ‘they smashed possibly every day’ however none of the youths responsible for damaging the kiosks had to the knowledge of the residents, ever been prosecuted. The group was quite dismissive of the CCTV system highlighting the fact that a number of cameras were fixed rather than being pan, tilt and zoom and that the control room was not responsive to the resident’s concerns. When asked about police participation on the radio link the group stated there had been none, which they felt was a serious omission ‘the main thing we want and whoever got the radio if I contact if they contact me back then I know got that feeling that somebody is there for me’.

For the community activist he also felt reassured but was critical of the absence of support from agencies such as the police. In essence the respondent felt that ‘if they play a role then I will be more assured although I am assured but I will probably be more assured’. A lady resident felt that reassurance came from knowing that people would be there if they called for help ‘if there was something I would call the police, it would take time for them to come or something … if I used the radio there would be somebody here. Because they are neighbours’. To evidence what she had said the lady went on to say ‘I think it has made things different, I mean every summer we have so much police and that this summer … there wasn’t as much as we do as always you know. I mean it has really helped’. Other residents also commented upon the ability to call other people ‘Yes, I was reassured that there was something there for me if I needed something’ and another said ‘Yes it makes me feel reassured’.
For another reassurance could come through potential outcomes ‘I feel that if this scheme works and everything, people join into it maybe will be free of crime on the estate’. The issue of participation was again highlighted:

‘...it is very hard to bring them altogether ... normally like err Housing Tenants Association Meeting every month, everybody gets an invitation to attend ... but at the end of the day maybe only 2/3 people will be there’.

The focus group were asked about the origins of the scheme and what they expected from it, which caused one resident to reflect that ‘I think what probably would have been the fact in the first instance was maybe the expectations were much more than what eventually transpired’. One of the main expectations being that ‘maybe if they have a radio once they ring, the police will be there, this will happen, that will happen, this thing you see the expectations were very high’. The expectation of police involvement, monitoring and response was met by the realisation that the scheme involved ‘you know to speak to each other and get together, use that as a community resource’ which was offered as an explanation for ‘those sort of things and I think maybe that’s one of things that’s how that’s come about that erm maybe, oh no use to them, maybe they expected something more and its not transpired’.

There was also some disagreement with the use of the system, the safety versus talk use: ‘I’ve been hearing people talking what bus you catching today’ and ‘I’m gonna shop in that shop I don’t want to hear that’ whereas what the resident did want was ‘to hear whose my friends are in trouble if they need the help’.

Northville

One of the earliest interviews touched upon an issue that has been reported as being of concern to rural communities, the withdrawal of policing services. The lady believed that the radio link ‘was a good idea because I appreciate that we were perhaps in part substituting the lack of police presence in the village’. She suggested that away from the interviews and focus groups there had been sizeable criticism of the scheme even amongst participants but her view was ‘that something is better than nothing’. The lack of reported activity on the radio link when ‘absolutely nothing happens’ was not of concern to her for ‘if there is a time when it is useful then that one time is important’.
The respondent felt that the scheme was beneficial ‘what I found is really good about the radio is knowing that there is someone there’ and dismissed the usefulness of a mobile phone ‘even if it is programmed they are probably not in and then how many do you have to try … Whereas I know that if I use this [radio] someone is going to answer me’.

The focus group was asked if they tell other people in the village that they are members of the radio link, one resident replied ‘close knit people near me, you know my neighbours who don’t have one – yes’ and another resident ‘only close people’. The group pointed out that they have placed signs on the entrance to the village that advertise ‘it’s a community radio covered area’ but one resident felt that they would only tell ‘immediate people or people I trust’ that they were members. The issues of trust being yet again a recurring element in determining relationships between neighbours and within the social network formed by the radio link.

For another respondent their rationale for participating in the radio link was for ‘selfish reasons really’. The lady explained that she often walked in the fields outside the village to exercise her dog and being on her own away from other people was of particular concern ‘I walk out in the fields a lot and it would be quite good to be able to call somebody if I needed to. That’s basically why I joined it’. And for another they found themselves involved through personal contacts and friendships ‘I was saying I would like to join Neighbourhood Watch and he said well there’s another scheme going on, I’ll put your name forward and he did’. The issue of friendship ties and associations was raised by another resident when commenting upon a core group of community activists who seem to be members of various organisations, such as the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Watch. He stated:

‘I personally feel like I’m a bit of an outsider like we live on the edge of the village and we’re not known to the rest of the people, so there’s this nucleus that’s involved in everything, they know one another, chat amongst themselves and you go to a meeting and you seem to be on your own as it were … you try to get to know them but em’.

It is suggested that a key issue for the radio link users in trying to energise the scheme and promote discussion may have been to overcome the sense of exclusion, isolation even, by those who were not part of what can be described as the core group, a feeling summarised by another resident:
‘...although I think I'm a fairly sociable person, I'm not this chitty chatty coffee morning type, you know. I go out to work and I tend to, keep my distance, because we've got a doggy walking fraternity that you know chats a lot’.

It is to be expected that participants would draw upon their personal and professional experiences when considering the scheme and its function, one man felt that ‘if it was me as a business proposition I would blow it out the water. Because I’d say we’ve spent that amount of money and what have we achieved from it’ and asked ‘What are we doing now more than would have been done without radios?’ When pressed the resident went on to explain that activities undertaken to curb the youths anti-social behaviour would have been undertaken anyway and what was ‘not being done is the parts that reporting to everybody in the village what is happening’. The effective operation of the radio link would be where:

‘...if something happens tonight, somebody breaks into our house and steals something, tomorrow sometime all of the village should know or a good portion of the village should know, they should be aware of what’s going on, they should make sure they lock everything up, change the locks’.

He concluded by proposing to the radio link members that ‘we should have a bulletin at 7 o’clock each evening so that if anybody’s got anything to say they would say it at 7 o’clock so that anybody who wants to listen in then would know what’s happened during the day’. This eminently sensible idea was actually adopted by the scheme in Northville allowing those who worked during the day to catch up on news from within the village. It was not known if this had assisted in encouraging greater dialogue among members. In the interview with the Parish Councillor he was asked to make a comparison between the radio link scheme and existing community based crime reduction initiatives, in particular Neighbourhood Watch of which he was the co-ordinator.

He expressed a hope that through the radio link ‘it would bring a group together on a regular basis ... communicating by radio that could be every day or whatever’ whereas the Neighbourhood Watch had difficulty in attracting people to meetings which meant that ‘we didn’t communicate necessarily so I saw it as taking over from the Neighbourhood Watch in as much as the group hopefully would communicate’.
As a consequence of concerns over a lack of communication he had written to each of the other radio link members regards their involvement in the scheme. A problem he identified was that:

‘...you can see people put calls out and you may only get one response, then you find out later, well I heard that, I heard that, or you know, I think what’s happening if you are not careful what people think is that err as he responded therefore I don’t need to respond, so you don’t know who’s listening’.

In what was considered to be a particularly interesting series of comments the Councillor went on to compare Neighbourhood Watch with the radio link:

‘...Neighbourhood Watch is a “behind the curtains” activity so to speak where you know you are in your house and you just watch what’s going past your window, erm so if your not at your window, you don’t see what’s happening, it’s meaningless and unless you have somebody with the time to cajole people into attending meetings there isn’t necessarily a direct relationship with one member of Neighbourhood Watch to another member of Neighbourhood Watch, if we all spread around the village but unless you actually meet in the street so to speak then in essence there is no communication whereas with the radio provided you’ve got your radio on whoever’s calling then you can pick up that call from wherever in the village you can respond to it and it has been useful in as much as whenever we have a meeting once a month err I put a call out to inform everybody of the meeting and I’ve been able to use it again from a Neighbourhood Watch point of view in as much as I get messages from the Neighbourhood Watch central co-ordinator by voice-mail [Ring Master voice messaging service] whatever, so any messages I get if I think they are relevant I will put that over on the radio’.

The effect of that information dissemination was highlighted when he passed on a message regards car thieves operating in the area ‘I heard later that one of the radio users said that after the call, it just suddenly reminded me that I had left the car open, so they went out and locked the car’. He compared the passing of information by telephone with that by radio:
‘With Neighbourhood Watch err so I think you feel less inclined to phone people up, especially, I mean if you have got 20 people within a group you have either got to have a system where it sort of cascades, you know one phones one and then the other…but I think if you are doing that you feel that perhaps you are imposing more so than just picking up a radio and broadcasting and whoever picks it up … you are hoping … that people are listening and I think it’s less imposing on them … it’s obviously instantaneously, whereas again phone calls…one person has got to try and phone round 20 people which I don’t think is really on whereas this its free’.

The radio link had created a certain tension between those who felt the system procedures should be more professional and those who did not, as one resident said ‘to hear some people talk radio call signs and all the bore that goes with, I just feel like smacking the thing over their heads’. This argument is perhaps associated with and similar to the safety against talk use. It is thought that those who believed in a more relaxed, less professional, use of the radios would be more supportive of the talk use. The lady believed that ‘as far as the girls using it to talk to each other, at the end of the day that’s what the link is…if the girls are out walking around the people know we’ve got the radios, and if they want help’. She also explained how the residents had been asked to lend their radios to other villagers to assist with the organisation of a charitable run in aid of a local girl who had died of cancer ‘And quite right we gave the radios up to do that … And that to me was part of the community help talk to each other very much’.

She summarised her thoughts ‘to me that's what the radios were for. And for people to talk to each other. Okay for chit chat, don’t listen. It's making a difference … the more people use it, the happier they're gonna be when they have to use it’ and ‘having peace of mind knowing that somebody else was there sharing’.

An incident that provided another useful example of the talk use of the scheme concerned a bottle of methylated spirits. The lady who worked as a school teacher and had teenage children said she was ‘very keen to join it because I was a bit out on a limb to the village working out … long have gone are the days when I was pushing the pushchair round the village and talking to lots of people, so I was quite keen to get more involved with the village’ she also believed that ‘I've made more friends and acquaintances and people have helped me out like the other evening when I had a crisis on the methylated spirit front’.
In essence her daughter was due to take part in a long-distance walk as part of a Silver Duke of Edinburgh award and did not have sufficient fuel for her cooker. The lady put a call out on the radio ‘It was really helpful within 2 minutes. You know, I had people scurrying up to their garage and within minutes somebody had come back and helped’ she summarised her story by saying ‘I feel safer, more included, not that people exclude you, but you know its easy to be a bit out on a limb’.

Another lady who was also a Parish Councillor spoke about the process that led to her involvement in the scheme ‘because I’m on the Parish Council … we had been talking about it with [the local police officer] for quite some time anyway so we had kind of made a decision um on a political level on behalf of the village … so it wasn’t a major step for me’. She went on to explain her initial reaction to the radio ‘the first few times I used this I kind of sort of jumped back’ and succinctly suggested that it had two potential uses ‘crime or incidents within the village but also as a social means’, safety or talk. She also, when asked, spoke about her involvement in the scheme:

‘…the Parish Councillors that are involved it gives us another forum in which we meet with other people in the village so we understand some of their concerns … nobody ever comes to Parish Council meetings and if they do they could just say look well we are having this problem we could try and do something about it. And so yes I think we are better informed’.

The Councillor having raised the issue of local politics was quite candid about the level of involvement by villagers in the Parish Council and thereby its value as a form of representative forum.

As such the unspoken debates within the radio link: activists and outsiders; professionalism versus informality; and safety against talk can, it is suggested, be seen as a microcosm of village life and a reflection of wider social and political engagement in rural communities. As they involve the same people in the same location this is not a surprise as in essence a radio link is a part reflection of that community. For the former miner he believed that the radio link offered no reassurance ‘well no not particularly because I always phone the police it makes no difference’ but he went onto to be very critical of the police ‘I dial 999 you know and quite honestly when your talking to these co-ordinators for the police they don’t know where the hell we are they’ve no knowledge of the vicinity at all or the area’.
The apparent contradiction in him not being reassured through participation in the radio link but is by the ineffective 999 system was not explained. In light of his previous comments about his work as a miner and experiences it is suggested he either was not afraid of crime, and did not require to be reassured, or he felt he needed to project an image of being unconcerned when interviewed.

A dog walker believed that ‘Yes. I take it everywhere if I’m going out walking, yes, it’s good’ she went on to say that ‘I find it very, I suppose, comforting to a degree, to have it. I suppose what’s worrying is when you put calls out you don’t get too much response but maybe that’ll improve’. The resident thought that one of the reasons for the lack of response was ‘if you were in trouble and if I said I needed help I think you’d probably pick up more calls, listen to them, check that we’re safe perhaps…not too major, so maybe doesn’t make people respond to you’. For another dog walker they initially felt the opposite ‘I don’t think I needed any reassurance. I think the only time I would be reassured if I had got it, if I am out walking the dog on my own’. The lady then went on to explain how a few years ago she had met a man acting strangely when she was walking and when asked if having her radio with her when she goes walking offers her some reassurance she responded ‘Yes, I think it does, because there’s always somebody in all day’ and ‘You know, yeah, I do think it is quite reassuring, yeah’. When pressed to explain what she meant she said ‘at least I’ve got a back up and if somebody sees you talking into it they are not to know whether anybody’s heard you or not are they?’ The respondent then challenged the author by asking about his perceptions of village life compared to working in the West Midlands; she said ‘We’ve got nothing to worry about have we?’

She suggested that:

‘...the thing about the children with the drinking and the drugs, if you don’t nip it in the bud then it’s much more noticeable in a small place and why should people have their lives blighted by bad language’.

Another resident also agreed they were reassured ‘I think it’s been brilliant and as I say it’s there to use, there, knowing that somebody else is on that phone [radio] who are not far away … they are talking to you and like even if you’ve got it and somebody has seen you talk into it, I think it is a deterrent’ and ‘It’s a help-line’.
Interestingly, the same description was used by a retailer in an earlier study (Wright and Gibson, 1995). When asked about activity on the radio link a resident at the first focus group stated that they ‘have said if you don’t hear anything it’s pretty good really’ which led the Parish Councillor to propose that ‘I would prefer to use the radios for community use rather than crime use’. This clear preference of talk over safety use is thought to be of significance, particularly in such a low crime area ‘the thing about the dogs [dog walking] that is a community thing, it’s not a crime’. This led a lady to state:

‘...if we don’t hear anything in a sense then there has been no crime committed and then we are using the radios as a community, just to announce dog’s missing or things like that. I think then the village would feel more secure within the village. So the fact that we are not hearing anything I think is a good thing’.

When asked at the focus group what additional measures would improve the safety of the village the group responded by asking for a greater police presence ‘more highly visible policemen’ and ‘a special [Special Constable] located in the village a special policeman’. Despite their desire for a greater police presence the group were critical of the level of police effectiveness and were dismissive of the Neighbourhood Watch telephone dialling computer [Ring Master] system ‘every time they rang we just wish to announce the police consultative committee meetings ... oh shut-up, you know’ and ‘what an absolute waste of time’. The residents did though think that the relationship between themselves and the local police had been altered through the introduction of the radio link ‘I think it’s better’ and ‘I feel more at ease talking to [name of local police officer] ... I feel easier with myself calling the police out’. The resident suggested that calling the officer on the radio helped in that ‘because you’re a member of the radio scheme ... I feel we know him’. This prompted another resident to suggest ‘it gives us credibility’ but this was challenged by a member of the group who replied ‘it didn’t seem to mean very much before – did it?’

It has been suggested (Wright, 1999) that in contrast to the desire by the police for communities to know their local officers what is in fact important to residents, particularly community activists, is that the police know them and recognise their contribution, (see chapter one above).
Here the residents believe that membership of the radio links provides them with both a degree of legitimacy and recognition by the police, to the extent they have overcome some reluctance to talk to the local officer. When asked if the group would advise other residents to develop a radio link they responded positively ‘yes’ and ‘yes, definitely’.

One resident suggested that ‘you can talk to everyone at once, to save picking the phone up, and they are out’ and another ‘I always feel more secure that I have got it with me’ an opinion which was agreed with by a number of the group. A resident challenged this and asked ‘wouldn’t you feel more secure with a mobile phone?’ to which they replied ‘No, because I only have to touch a button on that and I can speak. A mobile phone, ok – they might not be in’. A resident suggested that members of a new scheme should consider carrying a disposable camera to photograph people or incidents and another that the scheme organisers ensure there are inaugural meetings. They said ‘I think we are lucky as a group that a lot of people … knew other people within the group’ in what may be a summary of the problems faced by the Westville radio link, the Northville resident said:

‘…it is important to have meetings so they get to know each other, if it’s a different community who aren’t connected so to speak … So I think that is important for anybody setting up a new system, you get to know each other as a group’.

The second Northville focus group began by reporting that the village and radio link had been particularly quiet since their last meeting. They stated that some youths had accessed the radio link and passed messages across the network, which was a shared frequency with a nearby village. Notwithstanding, this intrusion the two villages radio link groups still communicated.

In an early exchange the radio ham asked one of the female dog walkers what it was she discussed in the morning on the radio link. The lady answered:

‘Well, we (laughter) are you in the vicinity well we walk together you see and … helps me to check the stock, we’ve got sheep and cows or the gates or whatever, so if I can’t see her in the morning I just say where are you? Are you in front of me or behind me, basically? I mean (laughter) don’t we?’
The response was presented in an almost embarrassed manner with the lady giving the impression she felt the use of the radio link in this context was either inappropriate or that their contacting each other was somehow silly or ridiculous. Reflecting upon this exchange, it is suggested that this embarrassed response was probably more because of the character of the radio ham. In addition through him assuming to question the lady he arguably placed himself in a position where she felt defensive and unsure of herself.

The radio ham went on to almost lecture the group as to its failings ‘sorry, people still seem to me to be afraid to actually use them [radios] and use them just easily … I think that’s sad really’ he stated that the solution was ‘to break down this militarism … you’re more militaristic than the military in actual fact’ and felt that the use of call signs, for example was inappropriate and off-putting for people. It can be suggested that his expressed support for the informal or talk use of the radio link was in fact the type of use the dog walkers had described.

After this exchange one of the Parish Councillors pointed out that some people might feel uncomfortable using names and wanted to continue with the anonymous call signs. At this the radio ham again adopted a position of seniority over the group by stating ‘trust me. I’ve got the equipment to check you … within 60 miles of here nobody is using that frequency and nobody is likely to be listening to you’ his views were accepted to which the ham again said ‘trust me’. This conversation was again of interest in that the radio ham used the word ‘you’ implying that while he was supposedly part of the radio link group he spoke as if he was not. In addition his appeal to the group to trust him is of significance as during the discussion of the drunk driver incident; see above, he expressly stated he did not trust the group, see above. The Parish Councillor returned the discussion to consideration of the issue as to whether the scheme should retain radio communications with its neighbouring village. He suggested that a possible consequence would be to expand the scheme into other villages ‘so that the information is passed from one village to the next village and so forth so that we do have an idea of what is actually going on around us’. This is a similar aspiration to that of the young resident in Westville who also wanted other areas to adopt radio link schemes.
The group felt unable to depart from the discussion as to use of call signs with one of the dog walkers proposing a compromise ‘if we want to say something significant that perhaps crime related then we’ve got anonymity but I like the idea of perhaps in the mornings …’ at which she tailed off and did not complete the sentence. Here again it is suggested we have the debate between safety and talk use now appearing over anonymity – when there are safety issues, and personal names – when it concerns community matters. It was further proposed that the active users of the radio link ‘ring [radio] up somebody different every morning and get this familiarity going’. At this the radio ham countered that the lack of use and familiarity was caused through use of call signs ‘people start having anonymity because anonymity creates a wall’. This may have been an entirely valid point but one which the group declined to accept, possibly because of who said it!

At this point another resident who had not tended to contribute much to the discussion stated that she rarely spoke on the radio as ‘you’ll very rarely need me, but I listen avidly when I can’ a comment which was supported by one of the dog walkers ‘it’s nice to know that you’re there’. It appeared to be accepted by the group that certain members would be ‘there if necessary’ and this seemed to settle the issue, perhaps because ultimately the group found the thought of the quieter members listening in and being both interested and available to offer assistance if required of some comfort. However, the radio ham while agreeing with the points raised stated ‘there’s no need to contribute’ added that ‘it’s pointless … to talk trivia, I don’t mean that derogatory’. While it may not have been his intention to be rude the group sensed he was again being critical of them, which caused him to add ‘I realise what I’ve just said then’.

One lady, perhaps in reference to the Neighbourhood Watch stickers displayed in houses, stated ‘I don’t think I’d want a little picture of the radio on the kitchen window in fear of somebody could (laughter) brick’. The issue of whether the group felt reassured through being involved in the radio link was discussed and while one of the residents thought ‘as a group I think folk feel reassured’ there was concern expressed over there being no-one listening out for radio messages ‘you don’t feel as if there’s any back-up’.
One of the dog walkers thought that the nature of the call would determine the level of response ‘if I was in trouble I would say I need help, I wouldn’t just say is anyone listening, and … you are going to [get] a bit more response’. Another resident said ‘I find it reassuring’ and explained how she goes out at night with her radio to three neighbours homes to ‘shut curtains and turn off lights’ and added ‘I’d rather have the radio with me than my mobile phone because I think you’d get a better response even quite late at night and more immediate response than if you took a mobile phone’. Another resident felt that:

‘I’ve found several people who are going on holiday will say I’m going on holiday, can you just keep an eye out for things, you know, because they know that I’ve got the radio’.

The resident explained that the neighbours had not asked them to look after their homes previously. It is believed that the neighbours associated membership of the radio link by the resident as being a form of official accreditation that offered a degree of security and credibility sufficient for them to now trust the radio user. This led onto a discussion as to whether other villagers feel the radio link members were in effect now the Neighbourhood Watch scheme. A member of the group thought that ‘we have taken the place of Neighbourhood Watch haven’t we, you know, it’s defunct’. The Parish Councillor who was also the Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinator pointed out that while the Watch scheme had not ceased to exist in effect with the radio link it was ‘one and the same’ and ‘I mean most of the people who are in Neighbourhood Watch are in the [radio link] group’.
Chapter Five

Reassurance, Policy, Policing and Practice

Introduction

This thesis has sought to test the theory of participative reassurance through the use of radio links. It has suggested that it is necessary to consider the nature of interpersonal communication when seeking to understand the implications of crime prevention and community safety activity at a neighbourhood level. Further that the importance of such communication has not previously been fully acknowledged either as part of academic studies nor policies in this field. In this study such systems of inter-personal communication were enabled through the use of simple two-way radios. The research findings indicate that the nature and extent of communication between an individual and their neighbours should be considered a key determinant of levels of social integration, cohesion, support and control. Secondary analysis of data, obtained through the realistic evaluation, utilising SPSS software and standard statistical tests has shown that there is some evidence of the intervention having had an effect on the residents. It is also suggested that the residents' responses to the free association narrative interviews and focus groups again indicate some evidence of individuals deriving participative reassurance through interacting in social networks with trusted others, but it will be concluded that there is insufficient clear evidence to state the theory is robust enough to be considered proven, particularly in light of the findings from the secondary data analysis.

This research has been conducted at a time of considerable change within the context of crime reduction policy and policing. The acknowledgement by policy makers that agencies other than the police have a key role in achieving reductions in crime can perhaps be evidenced by the continuing development of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP’s) for example, through the recent extension of responsible authority status to Primary Care Trusts and merger with Drugs Action Teams (DATs). It is also argued that there has never before, in the history of public policing, been such an emphasis placed upon the diversification and plurality of public policing services.
There has been considerable growth in the extended police family, now termed mixed economy, not just in terms of the number of personnel involved but also the variety of providers, for example local authorities employing Neighbourhood Wardens, Street Crime Wardens, etc. It is clear that the fundamental outcome sought from changes in both policy and practice has been to achieve reductions in levels of crime and in the public’s fear of crime. Measures taken to reduce the level of fear of crime have primarily relied upon two main endeavours, firstly assisting the public to accept that crime levels have fallen and that they are less likely to be a victim of crime, for example through media or information campaigns or through environmental improvements and secondly, through increasing the number of personnel in uniform patrolling public areas offering visible reassurance. It is suggested that neither policy nor policing change has considered nor addressed the importance of improving levels of inter-personal communication within communities or participative reassurance. This study offers both a new, but unproven, theoretical position in the form of participative reassurance but also an opportunity for those involved in the development of policy and policing programmes to consider the importance of developing supportive social networks as a means by which to reduce the fear of crime.

This thesis began by providing a review of the development of radio links, those systems of communication utilised in the research (Gibson and Wright, 1995; Wright, 1999 and 2000). It considered the available literature and studies undertaken into such systems within the context of a case study and provided an historical account of the development of radio link systems. As such it explains why this study was undertaken and the background to the theory of participative reassurance. The review of relevant literature considered the key areas of fear of crime, concepts of community and systems of electronically mediated communication. The chapter began by offering an explanation for and definition of participative reassurance, namely:

‘The reassurance derived by individuals through their participation in supportive social networks’.

It discussed the importance of Giddens (1991) definition of ontological security and how it related to participative reassurance.
The literature concerned with uniformed patrol and visible reassurance was considered and it was suggested that expectations that such patrol activity would deliver significant levels of reassurance are misplaced – the myth of visible reassurance – especially in case of crimes such as domestic violence. Consideration of radio link systems was set against the context of public reassurance and policing policies. It was argued that there is a failure by policy makers and the police to engage with the public’s widespread use of mobile communication technologies and that there is an over-emphasis placed upon visible reassurance, both of which factors have limited the capacity of agencies, particularly the police to offer the public reassurance. Consideration was given to the literature related to fear of crime and to a number of factors, which may influence an individual’s fear, such as age, gender, race, and sense of community. The importance of community was discussed with specific attention being given to concepts of trust and social support and control. The chapter then concluded with a review of the literature relating to electronically mediated communication, specifically cellular telephones and the Internet and with a review of some of the early studies of Neighbourhood Watch.

In the third chapter the research methodologies were described and discussed. The three methods used as part of this study were: numbers – a secondary analysis of quantitative data produced as part of a realistic evaluation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997) funded by the Home Office; voices – individual free association narrative interviews (Hollway and Jefferson, 2000b) with radio link participants; and discussion – focus group interviews with radio link users.

The preceding chapter detailed the study findings undertaken in the three sites, named Westville, Eastville and Northville through use of the three research methods. A number of statistical tests have been applied to the data, namely: Chi-Square; one-way ANOVA; and Pearson and Spearman’s correlations. The interview and focus group findings were organised into key theme areas such as, resident’s experiences of crime and fear, perceptions and causes of anxiety, concepts of community and safety, risky situations: causes and perceptions and radio links and reassurance. The key findings from the three areas are summarised below. Reference is made within each of the three areas to the suggested positive and negative outcomes originally discussed with Tilley. (see page 105 above).
Westville

The residents report living in an area that has a sustained level of criminal activity, in particular violence, street robbery or muggings and domestic burglary were thought of as being of concern. Such crimes were specifically associated with the presence of sex work and drug misuse on the estate. While mention was made of gun-related violence no evidence came from the research to suggest this had a direct impact on the residents, for example from drive-by shootings. This level of criminal activity created an environment within which the residents perceived they were at risk and under threat. That risk was manifested in locations and groups of individuals. Specific locations thought to be where residents faced an increased risk were when walking through the estate where overgrown bushes intruded onto the footpaths, the nearby high-rise flats and when visiting the local shops, the ‘Front Line’. Individuals who were thought to pose a risk were local drug misusers and the Kosovan refugees who had been housed in the flats. One of the residents sought to rationalise her fear by suggesting the men seeking sex workers – punters – during the day were decent but not those who visited the area at night. The resident’s accounts of being victims of criminal victimisation are, it is suggested, harrowing and their experiences as victims of repeated burglaries or of a street robbery left them in fear.

There were a number of adverse outcomes for the residents and the research through failures in the implementation of the radio link. These will be discussed more fully later, suffice to say issues associated with the random selection of radio users led to the members of the main community group on the estate, the TRA committee, being unable to determine the trustworthiness of other radio users. In contrast to the development of earlier schemes the radio link was not established on the back of existing relationships with the residents being left unsure of the strangers who were introduced onto the scheme. During the schemes implementation there were also problems with the technology in that there was significant levels of radio interference that led to an additional loss of confidence in the scheme. The fact that police officers did not patrol the estate on foot nor involve themselves in and support the radio link, notwithstanding having been given a handset, was criticised by the residents of this high-crime estate.
Discussions with Tilley suggested two potential outcomes for this inner-city high crime area, firstly that the introduction of the radio link would help overcome social isolation and facilitate understanding leading to residents overcoming differences and establishing social solidarity, and secondly the intervention aggravates elements of distrust between residents leading to residents fears of intimidation increasing and social solidarity being reduced. It can only but be submitted that following the implementation failure the second scenario was found. The radio link being distributed to residents who did no know, nor trust, each other created division within the community and reduced social solidarity. It was also suggested that for a mixed age group of residents comprising families with children and teenagers and retired people into which a radio link is introduced, which facilitates communication and greater understanding leading to improved social solidarity and reductions in youth related nuisance through a sharing of parental responsibilities or it fails to facilitate communication and leads to reduced levels of tolerance and social solidarity. In the case of Westville it is believed that the radio link through causing a division in the local community had reduced the opportunity for sympathetic supervision of local youths. As was seen the residents used the radios to dissuade local youths from staying on the estate.

**Eastville**

The members of this cohesive community are of Malawian origin, with a distinct identity in respect of their religion and ethnicity. They live within a diverse and changing area whose wider community comprise a number of other ethnic groups, including other established communities, such as Indian together with newly arrived communities, such as Somalian refugees. The Somali refugees were a source of local anxiety regards their behaviour and apparent lack of respect, particularly to their co-religion Malawians. One of the residents reported that they felt at risk from an adverse reaction to the events of September 11th and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq particularly as her dress and appearance identified her as a Muslim. As with Westville all those who expressed an interest were given a radio however, due to the nature of the community, its ethnic origins, the level of individual knowledge of each other and most importantly having a shared language, meant that there was little or no risk of strangers being involved in the scheme.
What is though important to note is that through accessing this neighbourhood through only one ethnic group in essence established the radio link in only part of the whole community. Eastville appears to be a cohesive community where the radio link initially worked well offering the residents some success in addressing incidents of concern but after a while the scheme went into decline. The residents reported there were incidents of crime on the estate but largely spoke about problems associated with young people, drug misuse and disorder. The lack of a local point of contact for the police – described by one resident as a buddy – was a cause of some dissatisfaction. The community wanted such a facility to be able to discuss local issues, particularly those that might not require a formal or enforcement response. It was also felt that the sight of large numbers of officers, those with dogs, etc. was a cause of anxiety. The fact that officers did not spend time patrolling the estate on foot nor involved themselves in the radio links was, as with Westville, an issue subject of criticism by the residents. Again looking at the predicted outcomes Tilley suggested two potential end-results, firstly within an ethnically divided and fractured community a radio link is introduced and facilitates dialogue and discussion among residents leading to, greater understanding and the establishment of social solidarity and secondly, the radio link fails to facilitate dialogue and leads to the means by which to perpetuate their differences and further divide the community. In the case of Eastville the radio link was limited to one ethnic group, those originating from Malawi. The scheme was not extended, neither by those involved nor the researchers, to other ethnic groups, such as the Indian or Somalian communities and it is not clear therefore, what may have been the outcome. Within the ethnically homogenous Malawian community there was evidence to show that the introduction of the radio link initially eased communication between individuals and families, thereby enhancing levels of social integration and co-operation however, this positive effect appeared to dissipate over time, perhaps leading to a loss of individual engagement and social contact.

Northville

This village community has a number of economic and social advantages over Westville and Eastville. The residents were in general articulate, organised, motivated, and able individuals.
The radio link, as a social network, complimented a number of existing community organisations within the village, such as the Parish Council, Neighbourhood Watch as well as less formal networks such as societies and clubs. The radio link came to be seen as part of these village structures, for example the radios were used to help facilitate a charitable run and transformed the Neighbourhood Watch. It was found that the use of the radio link, especially within the village, fell into two general categories that have been described as, safety and talk. There was some discussion among the radio users as regards how appropriate the talk use was and also if the scheme required to be professionalised, particularly in response to its perceived safety use.

Membership of the radio link and the relationship between the users and other residents in the village was found to be a source of anxiety in itself. Some of the users, especially those who held positions of responsibility, felt themselves under an obligation to address incidents reported on the radio link, in effect to self-police their village. That coupled with the fact that other residents, in particular young people felt anxious about how the radio link was being used, in some cases against them. The radio link raised resident’s awareness, which was seen as being positive but also proved a cause of anxiety – is ignorance bliss? The issues regards young people will be discussed later and was certainly a feature in all three of the areas. However, in Northville the views of the young people themselves were partly expressed through their parents, some of whom were members of the radio link. Some of the responses and discussions concerned a comparison between the radio link scheme and the existing arrangements for Neighbourhood Watch with the importance of communication systems being highlighted.

It was also suggested that Neighbourhood Watch, as practised in the village, was premised on quite a passive ‘peeking behind the curtains’ approach, while participation in radio links led to residents being more effective in addressing incidents through ‘patrolling’ and responding to incidents. The impact of national events on the residents and hence the research has been touched on above regards September 11th. Two other national events had some significance for a number of the residents in this rural community, those being the abduction and subsequent murder of the two young girls in Soham and the case of Tony Martin who shot and killed an intruder at his farm.
It was apparent from the residents that there were features of the cases that they found similar to the circumstances within which they lived, for example both being located within rural communities. As some of the residents were parents and all were house owners they were anxious about the possible implications of these cases for themselves and the village. The residents were an organised group of individuals able to lobby for and demand resources, such as additional policing. They even had the confidence to stop a patrolling police officer and request he use the radio link, even instructing him how to operate the handset. The irony is that Northville is an area with the least need of the police and yet it is the one in which they were the most involved and supportive. Finally, the outcomes discussed with Tilley suggested a number of potential results, firstly Northville being an affluent but mobile professional community into which a radio link is introduced assists in accelerating personal contacts through communication and establishing shared understanding thereby, leading to an increase in social stability and community participation and secondly, the intervention fails to engage residents who are otherwise so committed as not to be bothered to communicate with others and who, should the risks increase, will move away from the area, leading to a failure to establish any community. Understanding the residents responses would tend to indicate that while there had been tensions among the younger, professional participants, for example the school teacher with the older members over the response to young people, in general the radio link was seen as an opportunity to interact within the village community. For residents who perhaps did not have young children or dogs participation in the radio link provided an opportunity to engage. Another prediction was that for a long established residential community of predominately mature and retired residents the introduction of the radio link would either facilitate additional communication and shared understanding leading to a strengthening of social solidarity or become dominated by interest groups whose norms and values are not shared by others leading to a weakening of social solidarity. Again thinking about the radio link in Northville we can suggest that the debate over talk and safety has created two potential interest groups. While it is clear the groups within the radio link are still communicating the debate may have the potential to create division, particularly if some really strong characters, such as the ex-miner or radio ham were to seek to take the scheme in a particular direction.
To make sense of the research findings and more importantly to translate the detail into useful outcomes it is proposed to discuss what the research has discovered in terms of: reassurance; policy and practice. Within each theme specific issues have been addressed, such as young people and trust.

**Reassurance**

There can be few who would dispute the contention that residents living in high-crime areas such as Westville and Eastville require reassurance. The adverse effects of criminal victimisation, as evidenced by the experiences of the women in Westville who had been repeatedly burgled or violently robbed, need to be addressed not just by preventing the repetition of such crimes but also by offering reassurance to the victims. The experiences of other residents, even those who had not been victims of crime, were informed by living in a vice area as in Westville or one frequented by drugs dealers as in Eastville.

These experiences taken with the uncertainties caused by the introduction of refugee families, Kosovan in Westville and Somalian in Eastville, suggest that there is a need for agencies to support community-wide reassurance. For the community of Northville the events of September 11th might not have had the same meaning as they had for the Muslim lady in Eastville, even if they were frequent flyers. However, other national events such as those in Soham or those related to the Tony Martin case may have been equally influential in informing the resident’s sense of anxiety. As a consequence there appears to be a very real need for more not less reassurance. This observation requires we answer a rather important question, is participative reassurance part of the answer to that need and therefore, is it a concept in theory alone or does it exist?

The findings from the research suggest that participation in the social network that is a radio link, the immediate access to and availability of other people, friends, relatives or neighbours was reported by participants to be a source of reassurance. It is important to note that while this may have been expressed during the interviews and focus groups the application of the variable radio user to the statistical test for correlation did not provide evidence to support its finding. What does this mean?
At a very basic level the theory of participative reassurance suggests that as social beings we feel safer and thereby, reassured when supported by people who have an interest in our well-being. In turn our belonging to, participation in and membership of that social network reinforces our sense of value and usefulness, which feeds our self-belief and worth. The joint effect of our receiving support and being able to contribute results in a sense of reassurance. Locating the theory of participative reassurance within the practical involvement of individuals in a radio link, suggests there are two key aspects. Firstly, the talk-to-many and listen-for-many mobile communication facilitates access to the support received from a group of people who need not be physically located together and secondly, a resident can in turn be supportive of the same group of individuals who are located within a geographical area of which they have a very real interest. The research findings tell us that not everyone was reassured through participation in the radio link, the ex-miner in Northville being just one example. The findings did however provide examples of the benefit that some residents derived from the reassurance they obtained through participation in the radio link, such as the lady in Westville who when feeling a little low simply made contact with a friend. Reference was made in the second chapter to the current drive to address environmental indicators of disorder, signal crimes or the crime and grime agenda, as a means by which to reduce the fear of crime (HMIC, 2001). The resident’s perspectives on these issues provide a number of insights, for example if a well-known vice area is allowed to continue in Westville then what does that say about police – and crime reduction partners – commitment to address signal crimes? Is there a danger that the current focus on the physical environment, broken windows, abandoned cars and graffiti may cause agencies to miss the deeper level of resident’s understanding of crime and fear in their locality, again for example the presence of large numbers of refugee families in the tower blocks in Westville, drug dealers and users on the estate or being a Muslim woman in Eastville? It can be suggested that just seeking to address the ‘visible’ indicators of crime may be as limited a response to reducing fear of crime as ‘visible reassurance’, a service that was found to be significantly absent in the high-crime areas of Westville and Eastville.
To further assist our understanding of participative reassurance it is proposed to consider the concept within the context of the problems associated with youth disorder and anti-social behaviour. A significant source of anxiety to participants in all three areas and it is suggested an identifiable issue for residents requiring reassurance was the disorder and anti-social behaviour associated with young people. This was not mentioned quite so often in Westville probably because of two reasons: firstly, when set against the background of crime in the vice area, in particular violence and drug misuse, it may have just faded into the background of resident’s awareness and secondly, it may have been accepted as part of everyday life on the estate. In Eastville and Northville however, issues of disorder and nuisance, for example setting fire to the bins raised considerable levels of concern. The topic of youth problems was a feature throughout the research and in each case the residents utilised the radio link to respond to the issue. In Westville the sight of the radio being used may have caused the troublesome youths to believe the residents had a direct link to the police, in Eastville the residents literally chased the youths off from the corridors of the maisonettes and in Northville they challenged the young people and their parents regards incidents of vandalism and disorder. What does this tell us about any changes in the residents, their relationships with the young people and the wider neighbourhood? It is suggested that the residents may have sensed a greater degree of confidence in themselves and each other and felt enabled to challenge the youth issues in a manner they perhaps would not have done in the past. As such there is evidence of the radio link facilitating an increase in levels of social control, which is an important consideration and one that will be discussed in more detail below (Cohen, 1989). It is suggested there may be a relationship between the residents being reassured through participation in the radio link – participative reassurance – and increased levels of social control but unfortunately the research has failed to provide clear evidence of this link. It can though be suggested that this increase in social control has been achieved at the expense of young people whose freedoms, particularly their use of public space, have been curtailed. It could equally be argued that this was not such a bad thing as in the case of the damage caused to the church in Northville where the young people clearly acted illegally. In Northville, in particular, this increased level of social control, enabled perhaps through the participative reassurance derived by radio users, caused another form of anxiety within the group. This took the form of an active discussion as to what to do with the young people?
Some of the suggestions varied between active involvement through seeking interventions from youth workers or building more leisure facilities, to exclusion by engaging with the police to hold the young people to account and in a sense frighten the young people into compliance. This discussion did not take place in Westville and Eastville where both communities are located in large urban areas. It is suggested this was probably because there was little sense of responsibility for the young people and an expectation – hope – that they may have come from – and would go back to – areas other than the estate. As for the wider neighbourhood it can be suggested that on the one hand the actions of a minority – the radio link users – may have helped reduce overall levels of disorder, actions which may have been of benefit to the majority of the other residents, but this may not be what, neither the young people, nor their parents wanted.

In fact there was an acceptance by some of the radio users that advertising their involvement in the radio through signs in the windows might result in an adverse reaction. It can be theorised that the environment within which young people previously occupied their neighbourhoods has been altered through the introduction of the radio link and perhaps only further research with the young people, their parents and non-radio link users will aid our full understanding. There are here a number of wider moral issues such as: are the radio links users acting in the best interests of the young people or themselves; in the absence of adequate recreational and leisure facilities in all three areas are the residents adequately providing for the young people’s enjoyment of association in their own neighbourhood; and finally in the context of the theory of participative reassurance has the reassurance derived by the adults been at the expense of raising the level of anxiety of the young people?

It has been suggested above that within the context of the youth problems in the three areas that if there had been any participative reassurance derived by the radio users it may have enabled the residents to begin to address the issues through an increase in levels of social control. An obvious question that arises, of which there was evidence within the research, was where does acceptable social control end and vigilantism begin? In Northville and Eastville there was evidence of the residents undertaking actions that may be interpreted as having extended beyond acceptable levels of social control.
This was not the case in Westville, probably because of the small number and nature of the residents involved in the radio link. In Eastville we are aware of the residents physically chasing-off youths causing problems by the resident’s homes. In Northville we are aware of the ex-miner patrolling his neighbourhood and challenging young people. He also sought to address the theft of his Christmas lights by putting bleach inside them. In addition another resident who was not apparently a member of the radio link was suspected of trying to burn down a wooden bus shelter to prevent youths gathering there. Where do residents and agencies draw the line, who is responsible and when does social control become taking the law into your own hands? The issue of vigilantism was never explicitly discussed by the residents during the research – would they in front of a police officer – but within our consideration of participative reassurance it is necessary we acknowledge that within the benefits of increased levels of social control we should ask what did the residents do to control the young people – did they just talk to them or run at them? In conclusion, it must be asked if the young people are forced to become wary or even fearful of the radio link and the users, what are the longer-term implications for relationships within that community?

Within the literature review consideration was given to issues of community, with reference being made to the Internet (Smith and Kollock, 1999). This study has developed the suggestion that a radio link facilitates the creation of a separate community, one both real and virtual. The ‘real’ interactions, for example the father in Eastville using the radio to reassure his daughter are accompanied by the creation of the ‘virtual’ community. It is argued that from two examples found in Northville, the distressed woman and the drunk driver, we can see the creation of a ‘virtual’ community, one that is discussed, expressed and decided upon within the context of inter-personal communication.

It has been proposed above, that should residents have derived participative reassurance then it may have had a number of outcomes, the consequences of which may have been detrimental to others. Accepting that these outcomes may have been both positive and negative this discussion has been specifically concerned with issues regards crime and disorder reduction.
However, individual’s lives will never be solely concerned with just crime and there is a need to perhaps take a broader view and consider the possible place of participative reassurance within a wider social context.

Beginning our consideration with newly arrived communities it is worth considering the experience of previous groups of immigrants and refugees entering the United Kingdom, such as those from Ireland, the Caribbean and Indian sub-continent. Did enabling dialogue, promoting integration and providing reassurance within and between ethnic groups prove to be a social benefit? It is reasonable to ask that, within those locations where newly arrived and newly established communities exist, work is undertaken to promote access to and improve levels of inter-personal communication between individuals. Could a radio link which, within this study, has facilitated and concentrated dialogue among specific ethnic groups, white in Westville and Malawian in Eastville, assist or hinder that wider process of integration?

Another area worthy of consideration is that of local democratic and political processes. The comments of the Northville Parish Councillors regards levels of democratic involvement suggest that the development of additional systems of communication at a neighbourhood or Ward level may help inform Council members about issues that are of concern to their electorate. Such systems may have assisted in engaging residents in decision making about service provision in their area, for example the discussions in Northville regards youth worker involvement, recreational facilities and policing. Improving systems of communication and involving elected representatives may therefore, assist the local democratic process. Finally, it can be suggested that developing processes that may provide participative reassurance, such as improving systems of inter-personal communication, could have a positive effect upon an individual’s health, for example the Westville resident talking to her friend when she felt ill at ease. Taking one example therefore, of elderly patients awaiting discharge from hospital it may be proposed that there is a very real difference between them rejoining a supportive community interested in and able to support that individual and one that is not. In conclusion, it is suggested that should participative reassurance be more than just a theory an honest recognition is held that for some people engagement in social networks, enabled through involvement in improved systems of inter-personal communication, may result in a number of possible outcomes, some positive and some not.
What is apparent though is that not enough is known about participative reassurance, which suggests it is may be worthy of wider consideration and research. These are theoretical considerations at this time and the suggestion of engaging politicians in direct dialogue with their electorate may well not be practical nor worthy of further thought.

**Policy**

It is suggested that the research touches upon a significant number of areas of social policy. Therefore, as with our analysis of reassurance it is proposed to utilise areas of interest found in the research, for example trust, concepts of community and policing as vehicles through which to contextualise our discussion of the policy implications of radio links and participative reassurance. Trust is an important issue (Sztompka, 1999). Who residents trusted ultimately determined whom they were prepared to talk to, which by definition, defined the social network that was the radio link. In Westville trust was determined by being a known member of the TRA committee or friends of such. Other people interestingly termed by the residents as outsiders – that was not a reference to geography i.e. living outside the estate (in some regards people living on the estate may have been trusted least) – but outside of the group of people who made up the TRA committee. In Eastville trust was initially located within the ethnic origins of an individual; simply put if they were Malawian they would be likely to be trusted. In Northville trust was placed in close-knit friends and immediate neighbours. It is important to note that trust was not just directed within the social network as residents not involved in the scheme trusted radio link members to safeguard their homes, purely on the basis that they were a member of the network. Interestingly this request was made even though they had not previously asked them to look after their house. It is therefore suggested that inter-personal communication needs be added to Walklate and Evans’ (1999) list of factors, which mediate trust.

The development of trust between individuals is an important policy issue, for example do we trust our politicians to tell us the truth, our doctors to act in our best interests and our police to safeguard us? If we are to begin to trust our neighbours and public servants then it is worthwhile asking if there is a need for the extent of inter-personal communication between us to increase?
It is highly unlikely that the Prime Minister is going to spend much time talking to residents in Westville on a two-way radio but why not the estate caretaker, or police officer? If those agencies did engage in the radio link it is possible that one of the policy outcomes may well be a more focussed delivery of public services to those issues that concern some of the residents. For agencies to be able to access what can best be termed as community information, to improve service delivery and increase their efficiency, then they will quite literally have to begin to talk to the residents. The present policing and other related policy initiatives from the Home Office clearly see this as a requirement particularly as part of Neighbourhood Policing agenda (Home Office, 2005).

At a local level if neighbours in high-crime areas such as Westville are to begin to trust each other more then they may need some form of external assistance, for example Neighbourhood Wardens or housing concierge officers supporting such social networks (McAllister, 2003). If that support is provided the residents may gain sufficient confidence, derive such reassurance and begin to trust, some though perhaps not all, of their neighbours. It may be an over simplification but for the residents concepts of community mirror those you trust. For Westville their immediate community is represented by those people they know and trust, in particular the other members of the TRA committee. For the residents in Eastville, community is seen as being represented by those of your own ethnic origin.

In Northville, community for some means the village but for others, such as the ex-miner it means those residents living near to his home or those with whom he attends church, while for other villagers community might be conceived as being represented by the village societies or clubs. Levels of involvement by residents in those communities are an issue that has been raised above when it was questioned if the radio users were by their nature community activists. Is it the case that existing or potential community activists will be attracted to the concept of radio links and all that it represents in terms of membership, volunteering, belonging and involvement? There is evidence to support this suggestion as some of the radio users were existing members of other community groups, such as the TRA in Westville and Eastville or the Parish Council in Northville and that membership of a radio link is seen as almost a natural extension of their existing community involvement.
For other residents, particularly in Northville, the radio link provided an opportunity for involvement in the village and represented quite simply a friendship generator. Examples are, the lady who used to mix with other women when her children attended school and the other lady who while describing herself as not the chitty chatty type but wanted to be involved in the village.

Somewhat in contrast to Northville the experience of residents in Westville perhaps inhibits the establishment of communities. In an area in which strangers visited the area for improper uses – why else visit a vice area and what does that say about strangers – would you, as a woman, act like the Northville resident and both greet and talk to people you do not know? In many ways the absence of trust and supportive relationships precludes the creation of community. It can be argued that racism represents a perversion of the concept of community. The research provided evidence of racist views being held by some residents in all three areas, in Westville and Eastville residents reported general feelings of dislike and perceptions of being threatened by the Kosovan and Somalian refugees respectively, while in Northville a man suggested that visiting a BME area in a nearby city made him feel uncomfortable. An important question therefore, arises if developing levels of interpersonal communication assists the creation of social networks is it possible it can also support social integration? The current Government is very supportive of policies, which promote active citizenship (Home Office, 2004b). In fact earlier reference has been made to the importance Government has attached to community empowerment policies, which can in general terms be described as achieving a balance between rights and responsibilities. There is an emphasis placed upon volunteering and community engagement within these debates, which are not limited to just addressing issues of crime and anti-social behaviour but wider social problems such as youth disengagement with the political process. In December 2003 the then Home Secretary sought to encourage members of the public to get involved in changing their local community by asking them to become ‘Can-do Britons’ (Blunkett, 2003b).

More recently, December 2004, the Civil Renewal Unit within the Home Office has published a paper entitled ‘Firm Foundations: the Government’s framework for community capacity building’ within which it has reviewed the nature and variety of support it gives to community capacity building (Home Office, 2004b).
The paper identified four headline outcomes from community capacity building: social capital and cohesion; community self-help; participatory governance; and sustainable involvement (Home Office, 2004b: 7). Within our discussion of participative reassurance, radio links and interpersonal communication there are clearly a number of points of similarity with the above stated policy aspirations for community capacity building. However, this is not to suggest that a radio link is the ‘silver bullet of interpersonal technologies available to slay the great ogre of crime’ (Buerger, 1994: 412) as theory and practice are sometimes distant relatives. If our consideration of the development of Neighbourhood Watch tells us anything it is that there are no certainties with community based crime and fear reduction programmes.

It is inevitable that issues regard the police and policing would feature in this study, not least because of the author’s own interests. It is intended therefore, to discuss these issues within the context of the radio link scheme and reassurance and use the resident’s perceptions of the service they receive (or not as the case may be) as a means by which to consider policing. It was found that in all three areas the residents expressed some dissatisfaction with the police and local policing. In Westville the police failed to support the radio link and residents. This was notwithstanding the fact the local officer had been provided with a radio, that he had attended the initial meeting with the scheme members and that the sector inspector had expressed his full support. For an area such as Westville, with its crime and disorder profile, such a failure to engage with a community based crime and disorder reduction programme was a cause of some disappointment both to the residents and researchers. The residents had a clear idea what they wanted from the police, an approachable and involved local officer sensitive to the needs of the community. That officer was expected to patrol the area, speak to the TRA and residents and even join them at community events, such as eating curry. They also expected the police service to disrupt and reduce levels of crime on the estate, particularly those related to the vice area and drug misuse.

The residents of Eastville similarly failed to receive the level of support they wanted from their local police. As with Westville they expressed a desire for a designated local officer to patrol their estate and for other officers to not just sit in their cars but police the estate and address the issues they were directed to or came across.
The police were expected to relate to the community in an appropriate and sensitive manner. As with Westville there was an expressed desire for a long-term commitment by an officer to the area and its community. This approach was most appropriately described as a ‘buddy’ scheme, which was contrasted with what residents described as the worrying presence of large number of officers descending on the estate to attend an incident. This policing approach – while probably operationally appropriate – was the cause of some anxiety to the residents. The key issue is that in the absence of a local officer who could have provided an explanation as to the reason for this approach the community was left apprehensive of and disappointed with the policing service it sought so very much. It is useful to note that within the context of visible reassurance more may not necessarily be better. For both these inner-city priority neighbourhoods the police, from a resident’s perspective, have singularly failed the communities of Westville and Eastville.

The situation in Northville, an area that enjoyed many advantages over Westville and Eastville in terms of social and economic circumstances, was found to be different. While the residents were not without criticism of the police, for example in failing to detect crimes or deal appropriately with 999 calls, they enjoyed the active support of the village officer. During the course of the research the officer allocated to the village changed role but notwithstanding this the new constable continued to be involved with and supportive of the radio link. The incidents where the officer called an individual resident on the radio link to meet up with them or responded to the damage being caused at the church were specifically mentioned. It is clear that the community of Northville were confident enough and able to challenge the nature of the policing service they received, even stopping and instructing the newly appointed officer on how to operate the radio link, and sought to direct him to their advantage. It is significant that the residents wished to be recognised by the police for the role they performed in the radio link. This issue of who knows whom – is it more important the officer is known to the residents or the residents to the police – is one in which it is suggested that current police practice is perhaps misdirected.

It is pertinent to note that within the Home Office consultation paper on police reform ‘Policing: building safer communities together’ (Home Office, 2003) two of the main objectives are stated as being, community engagement in policing and the creation of a police service more responsive and accountable to local communities.
Perhaps police support for and engagement with residents through radio links, particularly in priority areas, might be a useful first step in achieving these objectives?

**Practice**

As with the above discussion of reassurance, policy and implications for policing it is intended to draw from areas of interest found in the research, for example the practicalities involved in radio links as vehicles through which to contextualise our discussion of the practical implementation and development of radio links and theory of participative reassurance. The essential objective of this study was to learn what had worked and what had not, to ask why that had happened, to think through the lessons learnt and share that knowledge, about radio links and participative reassurance, with other people. The research has shown that each of the three schemes, to a lesser or greater degree, enjoyed some successes and failures. There are a number of reasons for those successes and failures and it is proposed to consider these with respect to the schemes implementation and the operation of the radio link.

We have already seen that the method through which the schemes were initially introduced was different to that adopted in the implementation of earlier radio links. The reason for this was that the rigours of the quantitative based Home Office research required that selection of residents to be radio users was as random a process as possible to avoid any introduction of bias. It is not felt that this obligation of randomness is likely to be imposed on any other future group of residents developing a radio link and is therefore, considered a necessary but unfortunate feature of this particular research study. The implications of this method of implementing a scheme were that in Westville residents who were strangers to the TRA joined the radio link. The fact that there was little or no trust among the residents meant that a number of those who first joined the scheme decided to withdraw at an early stage. These residents simply handed their radios back to the researchers. Thinking through the practical issues involved it can be imagined that within the environment of a high-crime inner-city estate, for someone to approach all the residents even those who may be involved in drug dealing or sex work, give them radios and expect them to all co-operate to reduce crime is asking too much.
From the research it has been learnt that in priority neighbourhoods it is essential to involve existing, but representative, community groups in introducing a radio link. This was certainly the case in Eastville in that the Malawian community knew of and trusted each other at the outset. However, what of the other communities in Eastville? In Northville the extent of existing social capital and number of established supportive networks provided an environment within which a radio link would be accepted. In the case of earlier schemes it was found that one individual invariably accepted the role of representing the other residents and supported the development of the radio link. That most active activist, especially in priority neighbourhoods, deserves additional support from agencies, as they will invariably be the person the other residents turn to for advice and assistance. As we have seen with the Parish Councillor in Northville and the community representative in Eastville such residents will accept significant responsibilities, which require a reciprocal commitment from the statutory agencies to offer them support and assistance. The implications for those agencies involved in developing such schemes, especially the police, is that they need to prepare, even train, local activists and volunteers who are prepared to act as scheme co-ordinators. Such preparation should include guidance as to the likely outcomes of leading upon the development of schemes. It should be recognised that these individuals have shown considerable commitment to affecting positive change in their neighbourhood, for example the lady in Northville who invited other residents, if they could not contact her on the radio and needed assistance, to phone her at home at any time. As with our consideration of the implementation of the radio links there were a number of issues regard the operation of schemes from which learning has been derived. In chapter two, reference was made to studies of Neighbourhood Watch. It was suggested that by emphasising the crime reduction and safety aspects of Watch schemes that resident’s fear of crime and defensive reactions might actually be raised thereby reducing opportunities for social engagement (Crawford et al., 2003).

In Northville the scheme members saw the nature of the objective of the scheme in two distinct lights. One group perceived the scheme to be mostly concerned with issues related to crime prevention and community safety, while the other group, whilst recognising the need for the community safety function, saw the scheme as offering an opportunity to talk to each other and thereby connect members. These two objectives were labelled during this study as safety and talk respectively.
The radio link schemes initially introduced in town and city centres were specifically intended to address issues of criminality. It was found that the nature and frequency of such criminal incidents in a retail environment, together with the known level of associated violence, required a retail radio link be wholly concerned with crime. There was therefore, no opportunity for talk. The frequency of criminal incidents and level of aggression is clearly not found in a residential community. This meant that it was necessary to think about residential schemes other than being solely concerned with crime reduction, for to do otherwise would mean the initiative was likely to face a number of problems. These include the fact that: residents may not be sufficiently concerned with crime and so not participate in the radio link; that they may not have any crime issues to talk about and therefore abandon the scheme; and that such a scheme by definition should enjoy the active involvement of the police in answering radio messages, a situation no police force could adequately resource in a residential setting. As such it was thought that any radio link proposed solely on the basis of being a crime reduction initiative was likely to be only partially successful, if at all. In light of these considerations the researchers were at pains, during the implementation phase, not to premise the scheme as being concerned with crime prevention alone. Notwithstanding the above, in Northville there was a difference in approach to the scheme. A related argument developed over whether the residents in Northville needed to continue to use radio call-signs to identify themselves. The difference between the professional approach – use of call-signs – as against a more relaxed style – use of names mirrored the safety and talk discussion. The use of call-signs was recommended as part of the research and is used by existing schemes as a means by which to protect user’s identity as the radios are not secure forms of communication and can be accessed by others, such as criminals (note the young people in Northville talking on the radio link).

This difference in approach was perhaps because the professional style appeared to be related to such concerns over protecting user’s identity, which was only really, justified if the scheme was concerned with safety while the relaxed style related more to talk. Interestingly the use of call signs was not raised as an issue in either Westville or Eastville, areas in which users probably felt most at risk of being identified and subject to retaliation or intimidation.
It is suggested that it would be inappropriate to specify definitive guidance as to what is the correct approach, safety or talk, professional or relaxed. However, what is important is that users are made aware of the issues and decide as a group, which approach best suits their particular needs and importantly, which offers them appropriate safeguards.

The development of radio links has not occurred in isolation and residents, particularly in Northville and Eastville, sought to compare and relate their involvement in the scheme with other existing crime reduction programmes, including Neighbourhood Watch, Ring Master and CCTV. The resident’s perceptions of these systems have been detailed above but in general terms residents in Northville felt that the radio link had superseded Neighbourhood Watch and that the Ring Master scheme was ineffective. In Eastville the CCTV scheme which operated across the estate, lacked credibility and was perceived as having failed to address issues of crime, (see McAllister (2003) for an example of a residential CCTV scheme and radio link being integrated together). This study has raised the question as to whether existing Neighbourhood Watch and residential CCTV schemes would benefit from having a radio link in their areas?

The research provided examples of resident’s radio messages going unanswered or only by a limited number of users. It was seen in the pilot interviews that some residents volunteered to act as a base for the scheme and refer incidents to other residents or the police. In Northville the users developed the concept of the daily update whereby at a specific time in the evening, when residents who worked during the day would be at home, they would be provided with information on events in the village. In practical terms this was found to be a worthwhile development by the users. This system did not overcome the practicalities of having a base but went some way towards ensuring radio user’s knowledge was current and that they remained involved.

The research showed that a radio link provided a method by which some residents overcame their anxieties and yet was a cause of anxiety in its own right. As discussed above, residents used the scheme to talk to their neighbours and friends. This simple act reassured them.
In contrast the lady in Northville when going towards the car, which had come off the road, found the fact that she was unsure of how to deal with a potential casualty, a source of anxiety. The tenant’s representative in Eastville and the Councillor in Northville also felt anxious when using the radio link as they believed they had to react to incidents reported on the scheme. We have also seen that the radio link was the cause of anxiety among young people in Northville whose behaviour may or may not have been disorderly. It was also found that the lady in Northville whose dog had run-off reacted in quite a negative manner, Big Brother. It is important we think through the situation, as described, and ask was she shamed in front of her neighbours – found to be lacking in some way and therefore she reacted in the way she did? Was this a case of there being differing perceptions of individual responsibility and would it have been reasonable for the lady to have thanked the residents for returning her dog? What caused her to react in such a negative manner was it just the circumstances and manner in which the residents returned her dog or was there something in her own life story or background that caused her to react the way she did?

In a very real and practical manner there is a need to recognise that membership of a radio link is likely to change a resident’s relationship with their neighbours and perception of their environment. In the case of the Northville Councillor who felt he was under an obligation to respond to incidents the radio link was clearly seen as a source of some anxiety.

It may be the case that exposing a greater number of people in a community to incidents, especially crimes, might have a long-term detrimental impact on their feelings of safety. It may be useful to ask would ignorance of local events, of not knowing what is going on, be more beneficial? Does involving a wider group of residents in an incident expose a greater number of people to risk – simply put would more people be assaulted or traumatised by an incident of violence? It is quite often said that there would be fewer cases of assault upon the police if they did not get involved in so many fights. Does this anxiety and risk pose a threat to the social networks that are radio links? In the case of the Northville lady who came across the distressed women and sought the advice of the radio link group she had exposed her opinions and potential future actions to semi-public scrutiny and felt very dissatisfied with the response. It is relevant to ask if that lady was reassured by the decision-making capabilities of the group?
Again thinking through the issues it can be questioned if the role of the residents has been so changed that they are now behaving more as public servants rather than as individuals and as such placing their actions up for criticism and censure? And is that likely to be a cause of additional anxiety? We have already seen that in the case of the youth disorder in Westville and Eastville collective action proved to be successful but not so in the case of drunk driver in Northville, also see below. It is suggested that a radio link could be the cause of division within a neighbourhood for two reasons: disagreement over decisions the radio link users may have reached, and alienation of non-radio link users again over their decisions or actions. There can be no more dramatic example of such differences arising between residents than that which occurred in Northville over the alleged drunk driver found in his car which had run into a ditch. It appears from the resident’s responses that a group of the radio users gathered at the scene and on the radio link – real and virtual community – to discuss the most appropriate response. There was a clear difference between the radio users as to whether the police should have been involved or not, with the radio ham being very critical of the other users. It is necessary to ask if this is an example of local justice in action, for example community shaming and reintegration (Braithwaite, 1989)? Or is it a case of justice having been obstructed and the villagers looking after their own?

What would be the reaction in the village if the same man was seen in the public house again with his car on the car park and he was drunk? There is little likelihood that the story of the man being found in his car in the ditch had not been repeated throughout the village. If the man was found drunk again what would be the perception, particularly among the young people and their parents, of the value of the radio link and the values of its users? The important issue here is that the radio link facilitated the discussions around what needed to be done with the man. The group clearly made up their minds and acted upon what they felt was an appropriate decision. The decision taken by the group not to involve the police can be compared with their similar reluctance to call the emergency services to the distressed lady found in the village. It is necessary to ask would future decision-making processes undertaken by the Northville radio link group naturally default to keeping village problems within the village?
In conclusion, it should be observed that every radio link would, at some time or other, find a need to satisfy the potential conflict between privacy and safety among both users themselves and other residents. Where that balance is not met then there is every likelihood that the scheme will become a source of anxiety and potential conflict. In practice radio link scheme members should be provided with information on the potential negative consequences upon themselves and other people and offered advice as to implications for their involvement. Would this be the death knell for radio links? As previously experienced with Neighbourhood Watch there is a natural enthusiasm among some residents and agencies to be seen to be addressing crime and for new approaches. The research has shown however, that there are inherent problems within the implementation and operation of a radio link. Notwithstanding, the potential benefits, it is not an entirely risk-free initiative.

**Conclusion: The End**

This thesis sought to test the theory of participative reassurance by one main method, studying the essential relationships involved in individual’s participation in radio links. The intervention of the radio link is by no means the only method by which to study participative reassurance and the two elements – radio link and theory of participative reassurance – should, however difficult that may have been, be considered separately.

It is confidently suggested that participative reassurance already existed prior to this study. However, labelling this form of reassurance and suggesting it is important to a number of policies and policing endeavours is perhaps a valuable outcome of this research. For example, an assessment of levels of reassurance within a community may be seen as a useful measure of the success or otherwise of a range of social policies and interventions, particularly those intended to address problems of crime and disorder. It is to be expected that the conclusion of an endeavour such as this research will be faced by a sense of pleasure, at the task being nearly completed, but also regret that more has not been achieved. It would have been perhaps an ideal if every resident had enthusiastically embraced their involvement in the research and the radio link, that the police had been more supportive, and that the author had more time to commit to this study.
But that is not what happened and this study is as it is. In many regards these observations reflect the essential ingredients of the study, for some residents their involvement in the radio was found to be beneficial, while for others it offered them little or no return. Such pleasure and regret were derived within the context of a less than ideal reality. It is to be hoped that the next time a residential radio link is developed things will be different. But they will only be different because of hopefully what has been learnt through undertaking this study, both what went well and gave pleasure and what did not, which caused regret.

What is known now that was not known six years ago?

This research proposed the theoretical premise that individuals participating in supportive social networks, in this case enabled through mobile radio inter-personal communication, would derive a sense of reassurance, termed participative reassurance. This theoretical position was evaluated as part of the research and it is concluded that insufficient evidence was found to conclusively prove its existence. It is not believed that participative reassurance as a theoretical position may only to be found through the intervention of radio links. There may be a number of other social settings within which such reassurance could be present, for example within military units and it is useful to ask if participative reassurance is a feature of the concept of esprit de corps? If it exists at all then participative reassurance was not discovered in 1999. It is suggested that we have learnt a little about participative reassurance and it is hoped that having tied a label to it that others will be interested in placing it under closer examination. It has also been learnt that the nature of communication within social networks should be considered by a number of different people. Those people include policy makers, Government – both central and local – statutory agencies, academics and the police. Levels of communication between individuals within a community are a key determinant of a range of issues, such as the extent of social integration, cohesion, support and control.

For an academic seeking to understand the nature of community engagement with an intervention, they should recognise the importance of communication. It is essential when; say evaluating a crime reduction programme to ask people whom they talk to, how do they talk, what do they talk about, when and why?
Any programme designed, for example to increase levels of community cohesion to resist crime needs to determine the nature of and changes in talk within that community. The relatively new social networks established through the development of radio links, in this case in residential areas, have proved to be an interesting research subject. It has certainly been learnt that they provide a rich source of information. In addition it has been learnt that while they have enjoyed some successes these have not been achieved without difficulty and some disappointment. The research has provided information about how to advise others on the implementation and operation of such schemes.

It has also provided an historical context within which such systems have been developed and perhaps offered a glimpse into the future. It can be suggested that it takes more time and effort to establish a social network than it does a technological one. It is though predicted that a people based network will last longer than a technological based system. In this regard those radio links that exist now, predominately retail and residential, will, it is suggested, form the basis of social networks that will continue for many years, for example when the retail radio link was introduced in Wolverhampton 14 years ago mobile phones were a rare object indeed and were brick sized. While the retail radio link still exists to this date, and uses some of the original radios, there has been considerable change in the use of cellular phones. It is also suggested that technology should be wrapped around such social networks rather than the current situation were technology suppliers offer systems into which people and their needs are shoehorned, note the adoption of text messaging by young people. It seems to the author that current mobile communication technologies offer little regard both to individual and community safety and people connectivity. It is easier to use a mobile phone talk to someone in Australia than it is to all your neighbours. In summary, more has been learnt about radio links, and the implications of inter-personal communication, but importantly a useful insight has been gained into the theory of participative reassurance.
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Appendix 1

Home Office Research Questionnaires

Number 1 Before

A Survey on Attitudes Towards the Local Area and Issues Surrounding Community Safety

Research conducted by the University of Leicester on behalf of the Home Office

Hello, my name is ........... and I’m working on behalf of the University of Leicester, which is carrying out a piece of research for the Home Office. We are conducting research on residents’ attitudes towards their local area and feelings towards community safety. Hopefully you should have received a letter in the last few days outlining this research.

Would it be ok to interview either yourself or another adult in the property? The way we would like to select this is to choose the person whose birthday is next and who is over the age of 16. (If that person refuses, go for the next person with the nearest birthday.) I can assure you that anything you say to me will be treated with complete confidentiality and your answers will remain anonymous in the report that will be sent to the Home Office, and any other reports or articles that may arise from this piece of research. The interview should last approximately 30 minutes.

Ok, so first of all, I’d like to ask you a few questions about where you live, and the other people who live in your neighbourhood and local area.

I’d just like to make clear exactly what I mean when I talk about your neighbourhood and local area. When I talk about neighbourhood I mean … (street), and when I talk about local area I mean (… this part of ….)

Where you live

1. How many people, including yourself, live in the property?

   ______ Adults  ______ Children (where children are aged under 16)

   Can I just confirm that this property is a

   - House (2 storey) □ 1
   - Flat/Maisonette - what floor □ 2
   - Bungalow (1 storey) □ 3
   - Other □ 4
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2. Is it
- Owner occupied □ 1
- Rented from private landlord □ 2
- Rented from housing association □ 3
- Rented from the Council □ 4
- Sheltered accommodation □ 5
- Lodge with a friend □ 6
- Other □ 7

3. How long have you lived here?
- Less than 12 months □ 1
- 12 months but less than 2 years □ 2
- 2 years but less than 3 years □ 3
- 3 years but less than 4 years □ 4
- 4 years but less than 5 years □ 5
- 5 years but less than 10 years □ 6
- 10 years or more □ 7

4. How many people do you know (at least to say hello to) in this neighbourhood? (reminder about what we mean by neighbourhood)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>□</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How many people do you know (at least to say hello to) in the local area? (reminder about what we mean by local area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>□</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6-10 □
11-15 □
16+ □

6. How many friends and/or family would you say you have in this neighbourhood?

0 □
1-5 □
6-10 □
11-15 □
16+ □

7. To what extent do you know the people living to the left of you? (as you are facing the property)

- Not at all □
- By sight □
- To say hello to □
- Know them quite well, talk to them □
- Know them very well, consider them as friends □
- N/A □

8. Do you know the people living to the right of you? (as you are facing the property)

- Not at all □
- By sight □
- To say hello to □
- Know them quite well, talk to them □
- Know them very well, consider them as friends □
- N/A □
9. Do your neighbours tell you if they are going away for a few days, for example on holiday?

- Yes □ 1
- Sometimes □ 2
- No □ 3 go to Q12

10. Do they ask you to look out for their property?

- Yes □ 1
- Sometimes □ 2
- No □ 3 go to Q12

11. On the past few occasions, what have you done?

a) responded to an alarm (for example a burglar alarm)

b) kept a look out for people acting suspiciously near the property

c) pushed letters through the letterbox (so that the property doesn’t look empty)

d) listened out for unusual noises coming from or around the property

e) looked out for unusual people at the property

f) mowed the lawn (so the property doesn’t look empty)

g) switched on/off lights and closed and opened their curtains

Go to Q14

12. Do you look out for your neighbours’ property if you know they have gone away, even if they haven’t asked you to?

- Yes □ 1
- No □ 2 go to Q14
13. On the past few occasions what have you done?

a) respond to an alarm (for example a burglar alarm)

b) keep a look out for people acting suspiciously near the property

c) push letters through the letterbox (so that the property doesn’t look empty)

d) listen out for unusual noises coming from or around the property

e) look out for unusual people at the property

14. In general, do you trust the other people who live in your NEIGHBOURHOOD? (for example, that they wouldn’t attempt to victimise you) (Prompt with relevant category)

- no – none of them  □ 1
- some of them □ 2
- most of them □ 3
- all of them □ 4

15. In general, can you rely on people in your NEIGHBOURHOOD if you need help or assistance (for example if you are locked out, or if your car were to break down in the street)? (Prompt for relevant category)

- no - none of them □ 1
- some of them □ 2
- most of them □ 3
- all of them □ 4

16. What do you consider to be the best thing(s) about your LOCAL AREA? (name of area/village)
17. What do you consider to be the worst thing(s) about your LOCAL AREA?

18. Do you feel part of a ‘community’ where you live?
   - Yes □
   - No □

19. Why do you think this?

20. What do you think are the most important things that make up a community?

   **Risk**

21. I’m now going to ask you some questions that will be repeated later in this interview when you will be asked how worried and how afraid you are of these things happening to you. But on this first occasion I want you to think about how likely you think it is that certain things will happen to you in the next 12 months in your LOCAL AREA.

   *(keep reminding – how likely …)*

Please rate this on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 means you DO NOT THINK IT IS AT ALL LIKELY and 10 means it’s VERY LIKELY

How likely do you think it is that…

1 - 10

Your home will be broken into and property stolen or damaged

a) While you are in your home □

b) While you are out (at work, shopping, for an evening) □

c) While you are away (on holiday) □

d) Your home will be deliberately damaged by vandals □

f) Your vehicle will be stolen or driven away without your permission □

f) Property will be stolen from your vehicle □
g) You will be mugged or robbed in public including pick pocketing and bag snatching in your local area

h) You will be subject to a physical or verbal attack because of your skin colour, ethnic origin or religion

i) You will be attacked or hit in the street

j) You will be threatened, insulted or harassed by strangers in public

**Participation in the area**

I’d now like to find out how much you use your local area or are involved in things within this LOCAL AREA. (**ensure that respondent is answering only for themselves and not for partner/children**)

22. First of all, could you tell me whether you are:
   a) a member of a residents’ or tenants’ association
   b) a member of your local neighbourhood watch
   c) a member of a local religious group
   d) a member of a council/community group
   e) involved in voluntary work within the local area

23. And now could you tell me whether you (ensure that no or n/a are used correctly and prompt for how often if yes)
   a) use the shops in your local area
   b) attend local council/community group meetings
   c) attend local tenants/residents meetings
   d) work in a local shop/business
   e) use local sports facilities/member of a local sports team/group
   f) a member of a local community credit union
g) use a local library  
h) use a local nursery/crèche/babysitting circle  
i) attend an elderly persons’ group  
j) use a local parent and toddlers’ group  
k) attend a local women’s group  
l) a member of a cultural association in this area

24. Do you read a local newspaper? (Local variant) (prompt sometimes or often)  
- yes, often □ 1  
- yes, sometimes □ 2  
- no □ 3  

25. Do you read local newsletters? (Local variant) (prompt sometimes or often)  
- yes, often □ 1  
- yes, sometimes □ 2  
- no □ 3  
- n/a □ 4  

26. Do you read the local council bulletins? (Local variant) (prompt sometimes or often)  
- yes, often □ 1  
- yes, sometimes □ 2  
- no □ 3  

27. To what extent do you care or are bothered about what generally goes on in your LOCAL AREA?  
- not at all □ 1  
- somewhat □ 2  
- quite a bit □ 3  
- a lot □ 4  

I’m now going to ask you some questions about whether you have witnessed any crimes or behaviour you have found to be a nuisance in this area.
28. In the last 12 months have you witnessed a crime in your
NEIGHBOURHOOD? (give reminder about what we mean by
neighbourhood)

- yes
- no
- not sure

29. If yes, could you tell me what you have witnessed? (Types of crime are
property crime, for example burglary or attempted burglary, vandalism;
vehicle crime for example vehicle stolen or property stolen from vehicle;
crime against a person for example robbery, assault, bag snatch)

Was it …

- a property crime - how many
- a vehicle crime - how many
- a crime against a person - how many

30. On the last occasion, what type of crime was it, and did you report this to the
police?

- Type of crime

- yes
- no

31. If no, can you tell us why not? (use show card 1 – can answer more than
one)

- private/personal/family matter
- dealt with matter myself/ourselves
- reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff)
- dislike/fear of police
- fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse
- police could have done nothing
32. On any occasion that you witnessed a crime in the last 12 months, did you recognise the offender? (know their name, or seen them before)

- yes □ 1
- no □ 2 go to Q36
- not sure □ 3

33. Did they live in the local area?

- yes □ 1
- no □ 2
- don’t know □ 3

34. On the last occasion that you recognised the offender, did you report their identity to the police?

- yes □ 1 go to Q36
- no □ 2

35. If no, could you please tell me why not? (use show card 1 – can answer more than one)

- private/personal/family matter □ 1
- dealt with matter myself/ourselves □ 2
- reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff, company security staff, etc.)
- dislike/fear of police
- fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse
- police could have done nothing
- police would not have been bothered/not been interested
- inconvenient/too much trouble
- no loss/damage
- attempt at offence was unsuccessful
- too trivial/not worth reporting
- previous bad experience of the police or courts
- none of my business
- other

36. In the last 12 months we’d like to know how often you have seen the following in your LOCAL AREA, and if you have seen these things, what, if anything, you have done about them?

Use show card 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Less than monthly</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>groups of people hanging around on the streets causing trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>people throwing litter on the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>people breaking windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>people committing vandalism such as to a bus stop/telephone box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>people spraying graffiti on walls/buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>people dealing/using drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>people hanging round in entrances of buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Beggars and/or vagrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I - People drinking alcohol in public
J - Prostitutes and/or kerb crawlers

Use show card 2

For each of the above, on the last occasion, what did you do? (go through each Q in turn i.e. A – how many times, and what did you do, then go on to B)

1. Nothing – didn’t see it as a problem
2. Nothing – none of my business
3. Nothing – didn’t want to get involved/afraid of what might happen
4. Shouted at them from a distance
5. Went up to them and said something
6. Mentioned the problem to someone else in passing
7. Mentioned to their parents/other family member(s) if known
8. Mentioned the problem to a person of more authority – councillor, NW co-ord, RA chair, community police officer
9. Called the police
10. Other

37. In the last 12 months have you witnessed a crime in your LOCAL AREA? (if yes to previous question, make sure answer is outside neighbourhood but inside local area)

- yes □1
- no □2 go to Q45
- not sure □3

38. If yes or not sure, what was this?
39. Did you report this to the police?
   - Yes □1 go to Q41
   - No □2

40. If no, can you tell us why not? (use show card 1)
- private/personal/family matter
  □ 1
- dealt with matter myself/ourselves
  □ 2
- reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff, company security staff, etc.)
  □ 3
- dislike/fear of police
  □ 4
- fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse
  □ 5
- police could have done nothing
  □ 6
- police would not have been bothered/not been interested
  □ 7
- inconvenient/too much trouble
  □ 8
- no loss/damage
  □ 9
- attempt at offence was unsuccessful
  □ 10
- too trivial/not worth reporting
  □ 11
- previous bad experience of the police or courts
  □ 12
- none of my business
  □ 13
- other
  □ 14

41. On any occasion did you recognise the offender?
   - Yes
     □ 1
   - No
     □ 2  go to Q45
   - not sure
     □ 3

42. If yes or not sure, did they live in the local area?
   - Yes
     □ 1
   - No
     □ 2
   - don’t know
     □ 3

43. On the last occasion that you recognised the offender, did you report their identity to the police?
   - Yes
     □ 1  go to Q45
44. If no could you please tell me why not? (use show card 1)
- private/personal/family matter □ 1
- dealt with matter myself/ourselves □ 2
- reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff, company security staff, etc.) □ 3
- dislike/fear of police □ 4
- fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse □ 5
- police could have done nothing □ 6
- police would not have been bothered/not been interested □ 7
- inconvenient/too much trouble □ 8
- no loss/damage □ 9
- attempt at offence was unsuccessful □ 10
- too trivial/not worth reporting □ 11
- previous bad experience of the police or courts □ 12
- none of my business □ 13
- other □ 14

Surveillance and involvement
45. In general do you keep an eye on what goes on in your NEIGHBOURHOOD?
- not at all □ 1
- somewhat □ 2
- quite a bit □ 3
- a lot □ 4

46. In general do you notice strangers in your NEIGHBOURHOOD?
- yes – always □ 1
- yes – sometimes □ 2
- no □ 3
47. In the last 12 months have you seen someone you thought was acting suspiciously in your NEIGHBOURHOOD?

- Yes □  
- No □  go to Q50

48. How often? (show card 3)

Daily 1  Weekly 2  Monthly 3  Less than monthly 4

49. On the last occasion, what did you do? ... (use show card 4, then prompt was it during the day, etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you do?</th>
<th>Was it during the day</th>
<th>Was it at night</th>
<th>Were you alone</th>
<th>With someone else</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Watched them to see what they were doing</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Made my presence known to them</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Approached them</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Spoke to family member/friend</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Phoned the police</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Mentioned it in passing to local community beat officer</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Brought it up at residents/NW meeting</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Other – please specify</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Nothing – didn’t really see it as a problem</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j Nothing – none of my business</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k Nothing – fear of retaliation</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l Nothing – fear of embarrassment (that I</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worry/anxiety

50. Earlier I asked you some questions about how likely you thought it is that something may happen to you. I'm now going to ask you how WORRIED you are that certain things might happen to you in the next 12 months in your LOCAL AREA.

Please rate how worried you are on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means you are NOT WORRIED AT ALL and 10 means that you are VERY WORRIED.

How worried are you that … 1 - 10

Your home will be broken into and property stolen or damaged
   a) While you are in your home
   b) While you are out (at work, shopping, for an evening)
   c) While you are away (on holiday)
   d) Your home will be deliberately damaged by vandals
   e) Your vehicle will be stolen or driven away without your permission
   f) Property will be stolen from your vehicle
   g) You will be mugged or robbed in public including pickpocketing and bag snatching
   h) You will be subject to a physical or verbal attack because of your skin colour, ethnic origin or religion?
   i) You will be attacked or hit in the street
   j) You will be threatened, insulted or harassed by strangers in public

How worried are you about…

k) Walking along a street in your area when a group of youths are either walking towards you or hanging
Crime prevention – security measures

We’d like to find out something about security measures and crime prevention.

51. What security measures have you taken or got to protect your property and vehicle? (When answering F,G,H ensure respondent answers for themselves only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Who provided them (use show card 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Extra locks or catches on doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Had window locks fitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Postcoded or marked your property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Burglar alarm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Security lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Car alarm/immobiliser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Steering/gear lock on vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>More than one lock on bicycle - or remove seat/wheel when not in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Reinforced gate to access to rear of property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Fitted padlocks to sheds/outbuildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Had panic button installed (to the police)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Bought a dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Other – please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52. Do you have any home contents insurance?
   - Yes  \( \square_1 \) go to Q54
   - No  \( \square_2 \)

53. If no, could you please tell me why?
   - never had it  \( \square_1 \)
   - policy lapsed – haven’t renewed it yet  \( \square_2 \)
   - cannot afford it – too expensive  \( \square_3 \)
   - had insurance refused  \( \square_4 \)
   - don’t think it’s necessary  \( \square_5 \)

54. The next question is about you walking around the LOCAL AREA on your own. First of all, could you tell me whether you walk around on your own during the day?
   - Yes  \( \square_1 \) go to Q56
   - No  \( \square_2 \)

55. If no could you please tell me why? (can be more than one answer)
   - too old  \( \square_1 \)
   - too ill/sick/disabled  \( \square_2 \)
   - family responsibilities, for example children/sick relatives  \( \square_3 \)
   - fear of being mugged or physically attacked  \( \square_4 \)
   - fear of burglary/vandalism  \( \square_5 \)
   - fear of the dark/night  \( \square_6 \)
   - fear of going out on your own  \( \square_7 \)
nowhere to go/nothing to do/no reason to go out  □
- busy working/content to stay in – watch TV  □
- don’t want to go out  □
- other  □

56. and do you walk around your local area on your own after dark?
- Yes  □  go to Q58
- No  □

57. If no could you please tell me why? (can be more than one answer)
- too old  □
- too ill/sick/disabled  □
- family responsibilities, for example children/sick relatives  □
- fear of being mugged or physically attacked  □
- fear of burglary/vandalism  □
- fear of the dark/night  □
- fear of going out on your own  □
- nowhere to go/nothing to do/no reason to go out  □
- busy working/content to stay in – watch TV  □
- don’t want to go out  □
- other  □

If no to 54 and 56, go to Q59

58. (If yes to Q54 or 56), could you tell me whether you take any of the following precautions …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you</th>
<th>During the</th>
<th>After dark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>carry a personal attack alarm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>carry something which could be used as a weapon – if so, could you please specify?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Speak (or pretend to speak) on a mobile phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>take a dog with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Other – please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fear**

59. Earlier I asked you some questions about how likely you think it will be that certain things will happen and how worried you are that these things will happen to you. I am now going to ask you some questions about how afraid you are that these things may happen to you within the next 12 months. When I talk about being afraid, what I mean is how frightened, scared or fearful you are.

Are you **afraid** that the following might happen to you in the coming year in your LOCAL AREA? Please rate your fear on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means you are NOT AFRAID AT ALL and 10 means you are VERY AFRAID.

How afraid are you that …

1 - 10

Your home will be broken into and property stolen or damaged

- a) While you are in your home
- b) While you are out
- c) While you are away (on holiday)
- d) Your home will be deliberately damaged or defaced by vandals
- e) Your vehicle will be stolen or driven away without your permission
- f) Property will be stolen from your vehicle
- g) You will be mugged or robbed in public including pick pocketing
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and bag snatching

h) You will be subject to a physical or verbal attack because of your skin colour, ethnic origin or religion

i) You will be attacked or hit in the street

j) You will be threatened, insulted or harassed by strangers in public

How afraid are you about …

k) Walking along a street in your area when a group of youths are either walking towards you or hanging around on the pavement – during the day

l) what about at night

m) There being a knock at the door when you are not expecting anyone – during the day

n) what about at night

o) Being at home alone – during the day

p) what about at night

That’s the end of the questions specifically about fear.

60. Is there any part of your LOCAL AREA that you would not go to alone during the day?
   - yes
   - no

to Q62

61. If yes – could you please explain why this is

62. after dark?
   - yes
   - no

to Q64
63. If yes – could you please explain why this is
64. Do you think that crime, or how you feel about becoming a victim of crime
has an impact on your everyday life?
- Yes - definitely □ 1
- Yes – to a certain extent □ 2
- No □ 3

65. If yes, could you please give brief details

The Police

I would now just like to ask you a few questions about what you think of your local
police.
66. Have you had any contact with the police in the last 12 months IN THIS
AREA?
- Yes □ 1
- No □ 2 go to Q68
67. If yes, could you please give brief details

68. Do you know your local beat officers? (tick one only)
- yes – often talk with them □ 1
- yes – by sight □ 2
- not all of them □ 3
- no □ 4

69. In general, to what extent do you think the police do a good job in this area?
(tick one only)
- very good □ 1
- good □ 2
- bad □ 3
- very bad □ 4
- don’t know □ 5
Victimisation

We’d now like to find out whether you have been a victim, or if you know someone who has been a victim of crime in the last 12 months.

70. So, in the last 12 months, have you had any crimes committed against you or your property/vehicles, etc.

Yes - how many □ □

No □ 2 go to Q80

71. If yes, what types of crime were these?

- Property (e.g. burglary, vandalism) □ 1
- Vehicle (e.g. car stolen, property stolen from car) □ 2
- Person (e.g. verbal or physical assault) □ 3

72. How many of these crimes were committed against you in your NEIGHBOURHOOD?
□

73. How many of these crimes were committed against you in your LOCAL AREA?
□

74. Did you report this/these incidents to the police?

- yes – all of them □ 1
- go to Q76
- some of them □ 2
- no □ 3

75. On the last occasion that you didn’t, can you tell us why you didn’t report it to the police? (use show card 1 – can tick more than one)

- private/personal/family matter □ 1
- dealt with matter myself/ourselves □ 2
- reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff) □ 3
company security staff, etc.)

- dislike/fear of police □4
- fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse □5
- police could have done nothing □6
- police would not have been bothered/not been interested □7
- inconvenient/too much trouble □8
- no loss/damage □9
- attempt at offence was unsuccessful □10
- too trivial/not worth reporting □11
- previous bad experience of the police or courts □12
- none of my business □13
- other □14

76. On any occasion did you recognise the offender?

- Yes □1
go to Q80
- No □2
- not sure □3

77. Did they live in the local area?

- Yes □1
- No □2
don’t know □3

78. On the last occasion that you recognised the offender, did you report their identity to the police?

- Yes □1
go to Q80
- No □2
79. If no, could you please tell me why you didn’t? (use show card 1 – can tick more than one)

- private/personal/family matter □ 1
- dealt with matter myself/ourselves □ 2
- reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff, company security staff etc.) □ 3
- dislike/fear of police □ 4
- fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse □ 5
- police could have done nothing □ 6
- police would not have been bothered/not been interested □ 7
- inconvenient/too much trouble □ 8
- no loss/damage □ 9
- attempt at offence was unsuccessful □ 10
- too trivial/not worth reporting □ 11
- previous bad experience of the police or courts □ 12
- none of my business □ 13
- other □ 14

80. In the last 12 months, do you know anybody who has been the victim of a crime?

- Yes □ 1
- No □ 2 go to Q84

81. If yes, how many people?

82. And how many of these people were victimised in your NEIGHBOURHOOD?

83. And what about the LOCAL AREA?
And finally, just a few questions about yourself.

84. You are male □

Female □

85. From this card (show card 6) can you tell me the number which corresponds to the age range that applies to you.

18-25 26-33 34-41 42-49 50-57 58-65 66-73 74-81 82+

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

86. What is your ethnic group?

White British □

White Irish □

Any other White background (please state) □

White and Black Caribbean □

White and Black African □

White and Asian □

Any other Mixed background (please state) □

Asian or Asian British Indian □

Asian or Asian British Pakistani □

Asian or Asian British Bangladeshi □

Any other Asian background (please state) □

Black or Black British Caribbean □

Black or Black British African □

Any other Black background (please state) □

Chinese □

Other ethnic group (please state) □

85. Are you currently employed?
Yes - full time, part time, training scheme, self employed

No - disability/incapacity benefit, jobseekers allowance, full time student, looking after home and family, retired

Thank you very much for finding the time to answer these questions. As I mentioned at the beginning of the interview, this is part of a project looking to improve community safety through better communication between residents.

Would you be willing to be involved in the next phase? If you are, the research team will contact you about this in the near future.

If you have any questions please contact Tracey Dodman, 0116 2525996.

If the respondent agrees to take part further, please ask for their name and their full address.
Number 2 After

A Survey on Attitudes Towards the Local Area and Issues Surrounding Community Safety

Research conducted by the University of Leicester on behalf of the Home Office

Hello, my name is ........ and I’m working on behalf of the University of Leicester, which is carrying out a piece of research for the Home Office. We are conducting research on residents’ attitudes towards their local area and feelings towards community safety. Hopefully you should have received a letter in the last few days outlining this research.

Would it be ok to interview either yourself or another adult in the property? The way we would like to select this is to choose the person whose birthday is next and who is over the age of 16. (If that person refuses, go for the next person with the nearest birthday.) I can assure you that anything you say to me will be treated with complete confidentiality and your answers will remain anonymous in the report that will be sent to the Home Office, and any other reports or articles that may arise from this piece of research. The interview should last approximately 30 minutes.

Ok, so first of all, I’d like to ask you a few questions about where you live, and the other people who live in your neighbourhood and local area.

I’d just like to make clear exactly what I mean when I talk about your neighbourhood and local area. When I talk about neighbourhood I mean ... (street), and when I talk about local area I mean (... this part of ....)

Where you live

1. How many people, including yourself, live in the property?

   ______ Adults    ______ Children (where children are aged under 16)

   Can I just confirm that this property is a

   - House (2 storey)    □
   - Flat/Maisonette - what floor □

   □

   - Bungalow (1 storey) □
   - Other □

2. Is it

   - Owner occupied □
3. How long have you lived here?
- Less than 12 months
- 12 months but less than 2 years
- 2 years but less than 3 years
- 3 years but less than 4 years
- 4 years but less than 5 years
- 5 years but less than 10 years
- 10 years or more

4. How many people do you know (at least to say hello to) in this neighbourhood? (reminder about what we mean by neighbourhood)
- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16+

5. How many people do you know (at least to say hello to) in the local area? (reminder about what we mean by local area)
- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
6. How many friends and/or family would you say you have in this neighbourhood?

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16+

7. To what extent do you know the people living to the left of you? (as you are facing the property)

- Not at all
- By sight
- To say hello to
- Know them quite well, talk to them
- Know them very well, consider them as friends
- N/A

8. Do you know the people living to the right of you? (as you are facing the property)

- Not at all
- By sight
- To say hello to
- Know them quite well, talk to them
- Know them very well, consider them as friends
- N/A
9. Do your neighbours tell you if they are going away for a few days, for example on holiday?

- Yes
- Sometimes
- No
   \[\text{to Q12}\]

10. Do they ask you to look out for their property?

- Yes
- Sometimes
- No
   \[\text{to Q12}\]

11. On the past few occasions, what have you done?

   h) responded to an alarm (for example a burglar alarm)
   i) kept a look out for people acting suspiciously near the property
   j) pushed letters through the letterbox (so that the property doesn’t look empty)
   k) listened out for unusual noises coming from or around the property
   l) looked out for unusual people at the property
   m) mowed the lawn (so the property doesn’t look empty)
   n) switched on/off lights and closed and opened their curtains

   \[\text{Go to Q14}\]

12. Do you look out for your neighbours’ property if you know they have gone away, even if they haven’t asked you to?

- Yes
- No
   \[\text{to Q14}\]
13. On the past few occasions what have you done?

   g) respond to an alarm (for example a burglar alarm)
   h) keep a look out for people acting suspiciously
       near the property
   i) push letters through the letterbox (so that the
       property doesn’t look empty)
   j) listen out for unusual noises coming from or
       around the property
   k) look out for unusual people at the property

14. In general, do you trust the other people who live in your
NEIGHBOURHOOD? (for example, that they wouldn’t attempt to victimise
you) (Prompt with relevant category)

   - no – none of them  □1
   - some of them  □2
   - most of them  □3
   - all of them  □4

15. In general, can you rely on people in your NEIGHBOURHOOD if you need
help or assistance (for example if you are locked out, or if your car were to break
down in the street)? (Prompt for relevant category)

   - no - none of them  □1
   - some of them  □2
   - most of them  □3
   - all of them  □4

16. What do you consider to be the best thing(s) about your LOCAL AREA?
(name of area/village)
17. What do you consider to be the worst thing(s) about your LOCAL AREA?

18. Do you feel part of a ‘community’ where you live?
   - Yes
   - No

19. Why do you think this?

20. What do you think are the most important things that make up a community?

**Risk**

21. I’m now going to ask you some questions that will be repeated later in this interview when you will be asked how worried and how afraid you are of these things happening to you. But on this first occasion I want you to think about how likely you think it is that certain things will happen to you in the next 12 months in your LOCAL AREA.

   (keep reminding – how likely …)

Please rate this on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 means you DO NOT THINK IT IS AT ALL LIKELY and 10 means it’s VERY LIKELY

How likely do you think it is that…

Your home will be broken into and property stolen or damaged

a) While you are in your home

b) While you are out (at work, shopping, for an evening)

c) While you are away (on holiday)

d) Your home will be deliberately damaged by vandals

l) Your vehicle will be stolen or driven away without your permission

f) Property will be stolen from your vehicle

g) You will be mugged or robbed in public including pick pocketing
and bag snatching in your local area

h) You will be subject to a physical or verbal attack because of your skin colour, ethnic origin or religion

i) You will be attacked or hit in the street

j) You will be threatened, insulted or harassed by strangers in public

**Participation in the area**

I'd now like to find out how much you use your local area or are involved in things within this LOCAL AREA. (ensure that respondent is answering only for themselves and not for partner/children)

22. First of all, could you tell me whether you are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) a member of a residents’ or tenants’ association

f) a member of your local neighbourhood watch

g) a member of a local religious group

h) a member of a council/community group

i) involved in voluntary work within the local area
23. And now could you tell me whether you
(ensure that no or n/a are used correctly and prompt for how
often if yes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES Often</th>
<th>YES Sometimes</th>
<th>N O</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

m) use the shops in your local area

n) attend local council/community group meetings

o) attend local tenants/residents meetings

p) work in a local shop/business

q) use local sports facilities/member of a local
   sports team/group

r) a member of a local community credit union

s) use a local library

t) use a local nursery/crièche/babysitting circle

u) attend an elderly persons’ group

v) use a local parent and toddlers’ group

w) attend a local women’s group

x) a member of a cultural association in this area

24. Do you read a local newspaper? (Local variant) (prompt sometimes or often)
   - yes, often
   - yes, sometimes
   - no

25. Do you read local newsletters? (Local variant) (prompt sometimes or often)
   - yes, often
26. Do you read the local council bulletins? (Local variant) (prompt sometimes or often)
   - yes, often □ 1
   - yes, sometimes □ 2
   - no □ 3
   - n/a □ 4

27. To what extent do you care or are bothered about what generally goes on in your LOCAL AREA?
   - not at all □ 1
   - somewhat □ 2
   - quite a bit □ 3
   - a lot □ 4

I’m now going to ask you some questions about whether you have witnessed any crimes or behaviour you have found to be a nuisance in this area.

28. In the last 12 months have you witnessed a crime in your NEIGHBOURHOOD? (give reminder about what we mean by neighbourhood)
   - yes □ 1
   - no □ 2

   go to Q36
   - not sure □ 3

29. If yes, could you tell me what you have witnessed? (Types of crime are property crime, for example burglary or attempted burglary, vandalism; vehicle crime for example vehicle stolen or property stolen from vehicle; crime against a person for example robbery, assault, bag snatch)

   Was it …
   - a property crime - how many □ 1
- a vehicle crime - how many □ 2
- a crime against a person - how many □ 3
- drugs - how many □ 4

30. On the last occasion, what type of crime was it, and did you report this to the police?

- Type of crime ______________________
- yes □ 1
  go to Q32
- no □ 2

31. If no, can you tell us why not? (use show card 1 – can answer more than one)

- private/personal/family matter □ 1
- dealt with matter myself/ourselves □ 2
- reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff) □ 3
- dislike/fear of police □ 4
- fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse □ 5
- police could have done nothing □ 6
- police would not have been bothered/not been interested □ 7
- inconvenient/too much trouble □ 8
- no loss/damage □ 9
- attempt at offence was unsuccessful □ 10
- too trivial/not worth reporting □ 11
- previous bad experience of the police or courts □ 12
- none of my business □ 13
- other □ 14
32. On any occasion that you witnessed a crime in the last 12 months, did you recognise the offender? (know their name, or seen them before)

- yes □ 1
- no □ 2

**go to Q36**
- not sure □ 3

33. Did they live in the local area?

- yes □ 1
- no □ 2
- don’t know □ 3

34. On the last occasion that you recognised the offender, did you report their identity to the police?

- yes □ 1

**go to Q36**
- no □ 2

35. If no, could you please tell me why not? *(use show card 1 – can answer more than one)*

- private/personal/family matter □ 1
- dealt with matter myself/ourselves □ 2
- reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff, company security staff, etc.) □ 3
- dislike/fear of police □ 4
- fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse □ 5
- police could have done nothing □ 6
- police would not have been bothered/not been interested □ 7
- inconvenient/too much trouble
- no loss/damage
- attempt at offence was unsuccessful
- too trivial/not worth reporting
- previous bad experience of the police or courts
- none of my business
- other

36. In the last 12 months we’d like to know how often you have seen the following in your LOCAL AREA, and if you have seen these things, what, if anything, you have done about them?

use show card 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Less than monthly</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the above, on the last occasion, what did you do? (go through each Q in turn i.e. A – how many times, and what did you do, then go on to B)

1. Nothing – didn’t see it as a problem
2. Nothing – none of my business
3. Nothing – didn’t want to get involved/afraid of what might happen
4. Shouted at them from a distance
5. Went up to them and said something
6. Mentioned the problem to someone else in passing
7. Mentioned to their parents/other family member(s) if known
8. Mentioned the problem to a person of more authority – councillor, NW co-ord, RA chair, community police officer
11. Called the police
12. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How often</th>
<th>What did you do 1-10</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Night</th>
<th>Own</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. In the last 12 months have you witnessed a crime in your LOCAL AREA?  
(if yes to previous question, make sure answer is outside neighbourhood but inside local area)

- yes □ 1
- no □ 2
- go to Q45
- not sure □ 3

38. If yes or not sure, what was this?

39. Did you report this to the police?
- Yes □ 1
- go to Q41
- No □ 2

40. If no, can you tell us why not?  
(use show card 1)

- private/personal/family matter □ 1
- dealt with matter myself/ourselves □ 2
- reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff, company security staff, etc.) □ 3
- dislike/fear of police □ 4
- fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse □ 5
- police could have done nothing □ 6
- police would not have been bothered/not been interested □ 7
- inconvenient/too much trouble □ 8
- no loss/damage □ 9
- attempt at offence was unsuccessful □ 10
- too trivial/not worth reporting □ 11
- previous bad experience of the police or courts □ 12
41. On any occasion did you recognise the offender?
   - Yes □
   - No □
   - go to Q45
   - not sure □

42. If yes or not sure, did they live in the local area?
   - Yes □
   - No □
   - don’t know □

43. On the last occasion that you recognised the offender, did you report their identity to the police?
   - Yes □
   - go to Q45
   - No □

44. If no could you please tell me why not? (use show card 1)
   - private/personal/family matter □
   - dealt with matter myself/ourselves □
   - reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff, company security staff, etc.) □
   - dislike/fear of police □
   - fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse □
   - police could have done nothing □
   - police would not have been bothered/not been interested □
   - inconvenient/too much trouble □
- no loss/damage □ 9
- attempt at offence was unsuccessful □ 10
- too trivial/not worth reporting □ 11
- previous bad experience of the police or courts □ 12
- none of my business □ 13
- other □ 14

**Surveillance and involvement**

45. In general do you keep an eye on what goes on in your NEIGHBOURHOOD?
   - not at all □ 1
   - somewhat □ 2
   - quite a bit □ 3
   - a lot □ 4

46. In general do you notice strangers in your NEIGHBOURHOOD?
   - yes – always □ 1
   - yes – sometimes □ 2
   - no □ 3

47. In the last 12 months have you seen someone you thought was acting suspiciously in your NEIGHBOURHOOD?
   - Yes □ 1
   - No □ 2
   - go to Q50

48. How often? (show card 3)
   Daily 1   Weekly 2   Monthly 3   Less than monthly 4

49. On the last occasion, what did you do? … (use show card 4, then prompt was it during the day, etc)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you do?</th>
<th>Was it during the day</th>
<th>Was it at night</th>
<th>Were you alone</th>
<th>With someone else</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Watched them to see what they were doing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Made my presence known to them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Approached them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Spoke to family member/friend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Phoned the police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Mentioned it in passing to local community beat officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Brought it up at residents/NW meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Other – please specify</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Nothing – didn’t really see it as a problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j Nothing – none of my business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k Nothing – fear of retaliation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l Nothing – fear of embarrassment (that I may have been wrong)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Worry/anxiety**

50. Earlier I asked you some questions about how likely you thought it is that something may happen to you. I'm now going to ask you how **WORRIED** you are that certain things might happen to you in the next 12 months in your LOCAL AREA.

Please rate how worried you are on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means you are NOT WORRIED AT ALL and 10 means that you are VERY WORRIED.
How worried are you that …

Your home will be broken into and property stolen or damaged

a) While you are in your home

b) While you are out (at work, shopping, for an evening)

□

c) While you are away (on holiday)

□

d) Your home will be deliberately damaged by vandals

□

e) Your vehicle will be stolen or driven away without your permission

□

f) Property will be stolen from your vehicle

□

g) You will be mugged or robbed in public including pickpocketing and bag snatching

□

h) You will be subject to a physical or verbal attack because of your skin colour, ethnic origin or religion?

□

i) You will be attacked or hit in the street

□

j) You will be threatened, insulted or harassed by strangers in public

□

How worried are you about…

k) Walking along a street in your area when a group of youths are either walking towards you or hanging around on the pavement – during the day?

□

l) what about at night?

□

m) There being a knock at the door during the day, when you are not expecting anyone?

□

n) what about at night?

□

o) Being at home during the day on your own?

□

p) what about at night?

□
Crime prevention – security measures

We’d like to find out something about security measures and crime prevention.

51. What security measures have you taken or got to protect your property and vehicle? (When answering F,G,H ensure respondent answers for themselves only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Who provided them</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Myself/ourselves</th>
<th>Council/partnership org</th>
<th>Already had them</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra locks or catches on doors</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had window locks fitted</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcoded or marked your property</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglar alarm</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car alarm/immobiliser</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering/gear lock on vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one lock on bicycle - or remove seat/wheel when not in use</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforced gate to access to rear of property</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitted padlocks to sheds/outhbuildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had panic button installed (to the police)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought a dog</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52. Do you have any home contents insurance?
   - Yes ☐1
   - No ☐2

   **go to Q54**

53. If no, could you please tell me why?
   - never had it ☐1
   - policy lapsed – haven’t renewed it yet ☐2
   - cannot afford it – too expensive ☐3
   - had insurance refused ☐4
   - don’t think it’s necessary ☐5

54. The next question is about you walking around the LOCAL AREA on your own. First of all, could you tell me whether you walk around on your own during the day?
   - Yes ☐1
   - No ☐2

   **go to Q56**

55. If no could you please tell me why? *(can be more than one answer)*
   - too old ☐1
   - too ill/sick/disabled ☐2
   - family responsibilities, for example children/sick relatives ☐3
   - fear of being mugged or physically attacked ☐4
   - fear of burglary/vandalism ☐5
   - fear of the dark/night ☐6
- fear of going out on your own □ 7
- nowhere to go/nothing to do/no reason to go out □ 8
- busy working/content to stay in – watch TV □ 9
- don’t want to go out □ 10
- other □ 11

56. and do you walk around your local area on your own after dark?
- Yes □ 1
- go to Q58
- No □ 2

57. If no could you please tell me why? (can be more than one answer)
- too old □ 1
- too ill/sick/disabled □ 2
- family responsibilities, for example children/sick relatives □ 3
- fear of being mugged or physically attacked □ 4
- fear of burglary/vandalism □ 5
- fear of the dark/night □ 6
- fear of going out on your own □ 7
- nowhere to go/nothing to do/no reason to go out □ 8
- busy working/content to stay in – watch TV □ 9
- don’t want to go out □ 10
- other □ 11

If no to 54 and 56, go to Q59

58. (If yes to Q54 or 56), could you tell me whether you take any of the following precautions …
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you</th>
<th>During the day</th>
<th>After dark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>carry a personal attack alarm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>carry something which could be used as a weapon – if so, could you please specify?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Speak (or pretend to speak) on a mobile phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>take a dog with you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Other – please specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fear**

59. Earlier I asked you some questions about how likely you think it will be that certain things will happen and how worried you are that these things will happen to you. I am now going to ask you some questions about how afraid you are that these things may happen to you within the next 12 months. When I talk about being afraid, what I mean is how frightened, scared or fearful you are.

Are you **afraid** that the following might happen to you in the coming year in your LOCAL AREA? Please rate your fear on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means you are NOT AFRAID AT ALL and 10 means you are VERY AFRAID.

How afraid are you that …

1 - 10

Your home will be broken into and property stolen or damaged

- a) While you are in your home
- b) While you are out
- c) While you are away (on holiday)
- d) Your home will be deliberately damaged or defaced by vandals
- e) Your vehicle will be stolen or driven away without your permission
- f) Property will be stolen from your vehicle
- g) You will be mugged or robbed in public including pick pocketing
and bag snatching

h) You will be subject to a physical or verbal attack because of your skin colour, ethnic origin or religion

i) You will be attacked or hit in the street

j) You will be threatened, insulted or harassed by strangers in public

How afraid are you about …

k) Walking along a street in your area when a group of youths are either walking towards you or hanging around on the pavement – during the day

l) what about at night

m) There being a knock at the door when you are not expecting anyone – during the day

n) what about at night

o) Being at home alone – during the day

p) what about at night

That’s the end of the questions specifically about fear.

60. Is there any part of your LOCAL AREA that you would not go to alone during the day?

- yes □
- no □

go to Q62

61. If yes – could you please explain why this is after dark?

62. □

- yes □
- no □
63. If yes – could you please explain why this is

64. Do you think that crime, or how you feel about becoming a victim of crime has an impact on your everyday life?

- Yes - definitely
- Yes – to a certain extent
- No

65. If yes, could you please give brief details

The Police

I would now just like to ask you a few questions about what you think of your local police.

66. Have you had any contact with the police in the last 12 months IN THIS AREA?

- Yes
- No

67. If yes, could you please give brief details

68. Do you know your local beat officers? (tick one only)

- yes – often talk with them
- yes – by sight
- not all of them
- no

69. In general, to what extent do you think the police do a good job in this area? (tick one only)

- very good
- good
- bad
Victimisation

We’d now like to find out whether you have been a victim, or if you know someone who has been a victim of crime in the last 12 months.

70. So, in the last 12 months, have you had any crimes committed against you or your property/vehicles, etc.

Yes - how many □ 1  □  

No □ 2

go to Q80

71. If yes, what types of crime were these?
   - Property (e.g. burglary, vandalism) □ 1
   - Vehicle (e.g. car stolen, property stolen from car) □ 2
   - Person (e.g. verbal or physical assault) □ 3

72. How many of these crimes were committed against you in your NEIGHBOURHOOD?

□

73. How many of these crimes were committed against you in your LOCAL AREA?

□

74. Did you report this/these incidents to the police?
   - yes – all of them □ 1  go to Q76
   - some of them □ 2
75. On the last occasion that you didn’t, can you tell us why you didn’t report it to the police? (use show card 1 – can tick more than one)

- private/personal/family matter
- dealt with matter myself/ourselves
- reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff, company security staff, etc.)
- dislike/fear of police
- fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse
- police could have done nothing
- police would not have been bothered/not been interested
- inconvenient/too much trouble
- no loss/damage
- attempt at offence was unsuccessful
- too trivial/not worth reporting
- previous bad experience of the police or courts
- none of my business
- other

76. On any occasion did you recognise the offender?

- Yes
- No
- go to Q80
- not sure

77. Did they live in the local area?

- Yes
- No
78. On the last occasion that you recognised the offender, did you report their identity to the police?

- Yes □
- No □
- go to Q80

79. If no, could you please tell me why you didn’t? (use show card 1 – can tick more than one)

- private/personal/family matter □
- dealt with matter myself/ourselves □
- reported to other authorities (e.g. Council staff, company security staff etc.) □
- dislike/fear of police □
- fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse □
- police could have done nothing □
- police would not have been bothered/not been interested □
- inconvenient/too much trouble □
- no loss/damage □
- attempt at offence was unsuccessful □
- too trivial/not worth reporting □
- previous bad experience of the police or courts □
- none of my business □
- other □

80. In the last 12 months, do you know anybody who has been the victim of a crime?
- Yes  □1
- No  □2
- go to Q84 or 88

81. If yes, how many people?  □

82. And how many of these people were victimised in your NEIGHBOURHOOD?  □

83. And what about the LOCAL AREA?  □

Q84-87 is for respondents in XXX, XXX and XXX only (test areas). For XXX, XXX and XXX (control sites) go to Q88.

84. Are you aware of the Community Radio Link Scheme operating in your area?
   - Yes  □1
   - No  □2  go
to Q88

85. If yes, how
   - taken a radio  □1
   - know someone who has a radio  □2
   - seen someone with a Scheme radio  □3
   - heard about the Scheme  □4

86. Can you please tell me why you became (why you didn’t become) involved in the Scheme?

87. What do you think about the Scheme?

And finally, just a few questions about yourself.

88. You are male  □1
    Female  □2

89. From this card (show card 6) can you tell me the number which corresponds to the age range that applies to you.
   18-25  26-33  34-41  42-49  50-57  58-65  66-73  74-81  82+

312
90. What is your ethnic group?

White British

White Irish

Any other White background (please state)

White and Black Caribbean

White and Black African

White and Asian

Any other Mixed background (please state)

Asian or Asian British Indian

Asian or Asian British Pakistani

Asian or Asian British Bangladeshi

Any other Asian background (please state)

Black or Black British Caribbean

Black or Black British African

Any other Black background (please state)

Chinese

Other ethnic group (please state)

91. Are you currently employed?

Yes - full time, part time, training scheme, self employed

No - disability/incapacity benefits, jobseekers allowance, full time student, looking after home and family, retired
Thank you very much for finding the time to answer these questions.
Appendix 2

Data Tables

Demographic Characteristics of Experimental and Control Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville Before</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville After</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville Control Before</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville Control After</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville Before</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville After</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville Control Before</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville Control After</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville Before</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville After</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville Control Before</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville Control After</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Characteristics Ethnicity and Employment
### Experimental Area

#### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Mixed Race</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Count 29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Count 3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Count 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Count 69</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Benefit (Jobseekers /Incapacity)</th>
<th>Looking After Home / Retired</th>
<th>Student / Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Count 11</td>
<td>Count 3</td>
<td>Count 13</td>
<td>Count 15</td>
<td>Count 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Count 3</td>
<td>Count 9</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td>Count 27</td>
<td>Count 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td>within area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-25</th>
<th>26-33</th>
<th>34-41</th>
<th>42-49</th>
<th>50-57</th>
<th>58-65</th>
<th>66-73</th>
<th>74-81</th>
<th>82+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Before</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West After</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Control</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control After</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Before</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East After</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Control</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Before</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Control</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Before</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North After</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Control</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Before</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Control</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Control</td>
<td>% in area</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Taken Radio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Crosstabulation Analysis

Experimental Before v After

Question 4 “How many people do you know to say hello to in neighbourhood?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 9 “Do your neighbours tell you if they are going away for a few days?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 14 “Do you trust the other people who live in your neighbourhood?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No - none of them</th>
<th>Some of them</th>
<th>Most of them</th>
<th>All of them</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% within area</th>
<th>No - none of them</th>
<th>Some of them</th>
<th>Most of them</th>
<th>All of them</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 15 “Can you rely on people in your neighbourhood?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% within area</th>
<th>No - none of them</th>
<th>Some of them</th>
<th>Most of them</th>
<th>All of them</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 18 “Do you feel part of a community where you live?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 50 a) & k) “Worried home will be broken into while at home & worried walking along a street in your area when a group of youths are either walking towards you or hanging around on the pavement during the day?”

Scale 1 - 10 (1.00 = not worried at all, 10.00 = very worried)

a) Worried home will be broken into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Westville Experimental Before</th>
<th>Westville Experimental After</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count % within area % within worried</td>
<td>Count % within area % within worried</td>
<td>Count % within area % within worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16 37.2% 64.0%</td>
<td>9 39.1% 36.0%</td>
<td>25 37.9% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3 7.0% 60.0%</td>
<td>2 8.7% 40.0%</td>
<td>5 7.6% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2 4.7% 100.0%</td>
<td>0 .0% .0%</td>
<td>2 .0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 7.0% 60.0%</td>
<td>2 8.7% 40.0%</td>
<td>5 7.6% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2 4.7% 66.7%</td>
<td>1 4.3% 33.3%</td>
<td>3 4.5% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3 7.0% 60.0%</td>
<td>2 8.7% 40.0%</td>
<td>5 7.6% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4 9.3% 80.0%</td>
<td>1 4.3% 20.0%</td>
<td>5 7.6% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2 4.7% 100.0%</td>
<td>0 .0% .0%</td>
<td>2 .0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3 7.0% 60.0%</td>
<td>2 8.7% 40.0%</td>
<td>5 7.6% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2 4.7% 66.7%</td>
<td>1 4.3% 33.3%</td>
<td>3 4.5% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3 7.0% 50.0%</td>
<td>3 13.0% 50.0%</td>
<td>6 9.1% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43 100.0% 65.2%</td>
<td>23 100.0% 34.8%</td>
<td>66 100.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Worried walking along a street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Eastville Experimental Before</th>
<th>Eastville Experimental After</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count % within area % within worried</td>
<td>Count % within area % within worried</td>
<td>Count % within area % within worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>33 53.2% 54.1%</td>
<td>28 54.9% 45.9%</td>
<td>61 54.6% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 3.2% 33.3%</td>
<td>4 7.8% 66.7%</td>
<td>6 5.3% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2 3.2% 40.0%</td>
<td>3 5.9% 60.0%</td>
<td>5 4.4% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7 11.3% 77.8%</td>
<td>2 3.9% 22.2%</td>
<td>9 8.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1 1.6% 100.0%</td>
<td>0 .0% .0%</td>
<td>1 .9% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5 8.1% 71.4%</td>
<td>2 3.9% 28.6%</td>
<td>7 6.2% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0 .0% .0%</td>
<td>3 5.9% 100.0%</td>
<td>3 2.7% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>3 4.8% 100.0%</td>
<td>0 .0% .0%</td>
<td>3 2.7% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9 14.5% 50.0%</td>
<td>9 17.6% 50.0%</td>
<td>18 15.9% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62 100.0% 54.9%</td>
<td>51 100.0% 45.1%</td>
<td>113 100.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Worried walking along a street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Northville Experimental Before</th>
<th>Northville Experimental After</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count % within area % within worried</td>
<td>Count % within area % within worried</td>
<td>Count % within area % within worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24 33.8% 46.2%</td>
<td>28 38.9% 53.8%</td>
<td>52 36.4% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1 1.4% 100.0%</td>
<td>0 .0% .0%</td>
<td>1 .7% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>15 21.1% 60.0%</td>
<td>10 13.9% 40.0%</td>
<td>25 17.5% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2 2.8% 100.0%</td>
<td>0 .0% .0%</td>
<td>2 .1% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7 9.9% 38.9%</td>
<td>11 15.3% 61.1%</td>
<td>18 12.6% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1 1.4% 100.0%</td>
<td>0 .0% .0%</td>
<td>1 .7% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5 7.0% 45.5%</td>
<td>6 8.3% 54.5%</td>
<td>11 7.7% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Westville Experimental Before</td>
<td>Westville Experimental After</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count % within area</td>
<td>% within worried</td>
<td>Count % within area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10 22.7% 52.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 42.9% 47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3 6.8% 75.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4.8% 25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 6.8% 60.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 9.5% 40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2 4.5% 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1 2.3% 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4 9.1% 57.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 14.3% 42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5 11.4% 83.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4.8% 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6 13.6% 85.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4.8% 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2 4.5% 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>1 2.3% 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4 9.1% 57.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 14.3% 42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44 100.0% 67.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 100.0% 32.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

k) Worried about group of youths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Eastville Experimental Before</th>
<th>Eastville Experimental After</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count % within area</td>
<td>% within worried</td>
<td>Count % within area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19 31.7% 44.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 48.0% 55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 3.3% 28.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 10.0% 71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4 6.7% 50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 8.0% 50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4 6.7% 66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4.0% 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>17 28.3% 89.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4.0% 10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1 1.7% 50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.0% 50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4 6.7% 66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4.0% 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4 6.7% 66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4.0% 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2 3.3% 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3 5.0% 27.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 16.0% 72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 100.0% 54.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 100.0% 45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Northville Experimental Before</td>
<td>Northville Experimental After</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within area</td>
<td>% within worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 64 "Does crime, or feeling about being a victim have an impact on your everyday life?"
# Appendix 4

## Chi - Test of Difference

### Before v After & Experimental After v Control After

**Question 4** “How many people do you know to say hello to in this neighbourhood?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>0 - 5</th>
<th>6 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 15</th>
<th>16 + 15</th>
<th>Exp Before v After</th>
<th>Exp After v Cont After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>16 / 35.5% &amp; 8 / 34.8%</td>
<td>8 / 17.8% &amp; 5 / 21.7%</td>
<td>7 / 15.6% &amp; 2 / 8.7%</td>
<td>14 / 31.1% &amp; 16 / 34.8%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 19.935$, df = 4, $p = .000$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 21.853$, df = 4, $p = .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>20 / 32.3% &amp; 14 / 27.4%</td>
<td>6 / 9.7% &amp; 8 / 15.7%</td>
<td>8 / 12.9% &amp; 6 / 11.8%</td>
<td>28 / 45.2% &amp; 23 / 45.1%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 20.824$, df = 4, $p = .000$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 49.345$, df = 4, $p = .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>2 / 2.8% &amp; 2 / 2.8%</td>
<td>13 / 18.3% &amp; 7 / 9.7%</td>
<td>8 / 11.3% &amp; 16 / 22.2%</td>
<td>48 / 67.6% &amp; 47 / 65.3%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 118.239$, df = 3, $p = .000$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 137.196$, df = 3, $p = .000$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 9** “Do your neighbours tell you if they are going away for a few days?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Exp Before v After</th>
<th>Exp After v Cont After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>23 / 51.1% &amp; 11 / 47.8%</td>
<td>5 / 11.1% &amp; 2 / 8.7%</td>
<td>17 / 37.8% &amp; 10 / 43.5%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 7.000$, df = 2, $p = .030$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 7.000$, df = 2, $p = .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>37 / 59.7% &amp; 24 / 47.1%</td>
<td>6 / 9.7% &amp; 7 / 13.7%</td>
<td>19 / 30.6% &amp; 20 / 39.2%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 48.694$, df = 3, $p = .000$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 30.655$, df = 2, $p = .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>62 / 87.3% &amp; 55 / 76.4%</td>
<td>3 / 4.2% &amp; 9 / 12.5%</td>
<td>6 / 8.5% &amp; 8 / 11.1%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 103.000$, df = 2, $p = .000$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 151.315$, df = 2, $p = .000$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 14 “Do you trust the other people who live in your neighbourhood?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No - none of them</th>
<th>Some of them</th>
<th>Most of them</th>
<th>All of them</th>
<th>Exp Before v After</th>
<th>Exp After v Cont After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>5 / 11.1%</td>
<td>16 / 35.6%</td>
<td>20 / 44.4%</td>
<td>4 / 8.9%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 26.235$ df = 3 p = .000</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 27.419$ df = 3 p = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; 0 / .0%</td>
<td>&amp; 11 / 47.8%</td>
<td>&amp; 8 / 34.8%</td>
<td>&amp; 4 / 17.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>8 / 13.1%</td>
<td>27 / 44.3%</td>
<td>19 / 31.1%</td>
<td>7 / 11.5%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 42.333$ df = 3 p = .000</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 17.810$ df = 3 p = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; 5 / 10.0%</td>
<td>&amp; 26 / 52.0%</td>
<td>&amp; 15 / 30.0%</td>
<td>&amp; 4 / 8.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>0 / .0%</td>
<td>6 / 8.5%</td>
<td>16 / 22.5%</td>
<td>49 / 69.0%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 90.014$ df = 2 p = .000</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 99.134$ df = 3 p = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; 0 / .0%</td>
<td>&amp; 3 / 4.2%</td>
<td>&amp; 19 / 26.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 15 “Can you rely on people in your neighbourhood?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No - none of them</th>
<th>Some of them</th>
<th>Most of them</th>
<th>All of them</th>
<th>Exp Before v After</th>
<th>Exp After v Cont After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>6 / 13.3%</td>
<td>17 / 37.8%</td>
<td>20 / 44.4%</td>
<td>2 / 4.4%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 19.647$ df = 3 p = .000</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 19.806$ df = 3 p = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; 4 / 17.4%</td>
<td>&amp; 8 / 34.8%</td>
<td>&amp; 7 / 30.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>11 / 17.7%</td>
<td>32 / 51.6%</td>
<td>18 / 29.0%</td>
<td>1 / 1.6%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 54.643$ df = 3 p = .000</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 20.381$ df = 3 p = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; 4 / 8.0%</td>
<td>&amp; 25 / 50.0%</td>
<td>&amp; 16 / 32.0%</td>
<td>&amp; 5 / 10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville Before &amp; After</td>
<td>0 / .0%</td>
<td>7 / 9.9%</td>
<td>24 / 33.8%</td>
<td>40 / 56.3%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 42.979$ df = 2 p = .000</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 78.418$ df = 3 p = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; 0 / .0%</td>
<td>&amp; 9 / 12.5%</td>
<td>&amp; 23 / 31.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. 50 How worried are you that certain things might happen to you in the next 12 months?

a) “Worried home will be broken into while at home?” & k) “Worried walking along a street in your area when a group of youths are either walking towards you or hanging around on the pavement during the day?”

Scale 1-10 (1.00 = not worried at all, 10.00 = very worried)

1-3 Not Worried 4-7 Neutral 8-10 Worried
NB – difference in scales and missing values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Westville Before a)</th>
<th>Westville After a)</th>
<th>Westville Before k)</th>
<th>Westville After k)</th>
<th>Chi – Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp Before v After v Cont After</td>
<td>Exp After v Cont After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16 37.2 9 39.1 10 22.7 9 42.9</td>
<td>a) ( \chi^2 = ) 69.333</td>
<td>df = 10, p = .000</td>
<td>a) ( \chi^2 = ) 173.746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3 7.0 2 8.7 3 6.8 2 4.8</td>
<td>k) ( \chi^2 = ) 47.800</td>
<td>df = 8, p = .000</td>
<td>k) ( \chi^2 = ) 319.881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2 4.7 0 0 3 6.8 2 9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3 7.0 2 8.7 2 4.5 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2 4.7 1 4.3 1 2.3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3 7.0 2 8.7 4 9.1 3 14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4 9.3 1 4.3 5 11.4 1 4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2 4.7 0 0 6 13.6 1 4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3 7.0 2 8.7 2 4.5 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2 4.7 1 4.3 4 9.1 1 4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3 7.0 3 13.0 4 9.1 3 14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Eastville Before a)</th>
<th>Eastville After a)</th>
<th>Eastville Before k)</th>
<th>Eastville After k)</th>
<th>Chi – Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp Before v After v Cont After</td>
<td>Exp After v Cont After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>33 53.2 28 54.9 19 31.7 24 48.0</td>
<td>a) ( \chi^2 = ) 225.894</td>
<td>df = 8, p = .000</td>
<td>a) ( \chi^2 = ) 75.659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2 3.2 4 7.8 2 3.3 5 10.0</td>
<td>k) ( \chi^2 = ) 122.727</td>
<td>df = 9, p = .000</td>
<td>k) ( \chi^2 = ) 89.810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2 3.2 3 5.9 4 6.7 4 8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7 11.3 2 3.9 4 6.7 2 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1 1.6 0 0 0 0 17 28.3 2 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5 8.1 2 3.9 1 1.7 1 2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0 0.0 3 5.9 4 6.7 2 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>3 4.8 0 0.0 4 6.7 2 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3 14.5 9 17.6 2 3.3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Northville Before a)</td>
<td>Northville After a)</td>
<td>Northville Before k)</td>
<td>Northville After k)</td>
<td>Exp Before v After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB – difference in scales and missing values**

Question 64 “Does crime, or feeling about being a victim have an impact on your everyday life?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yes – Definitely</th>
<th>Yes – to a certain extent</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Exp Before v After</th>
<th>Exp After v Cont After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before &amp; After</td>
<td>15 / 33.3%</td>
<td>18 / 40.0%</td>
<td>12 / 26.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; 7 / 30.4%</td>
<td>&amp; 5 / 21.7%</td>
<td>11 / 47.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before &amp; After</td>
<td>21 / 35.0%</td>
<td>12 / 20.0%</td>
<td>27 / 45.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; 11 / 24.4%</td>
<td>&amp; 10 / 22.2%</td>
<td>24 / 53.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before &amp; After</td>
<td>3 / 4.2%</td>
<td>20 / 28.2%</td>
<td>48 / 67.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; 11 / 15.3%</td>
<td>&amp; 18 / 25.0%</td>
<td>43 / 59.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Aggregated Degree of Worry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Worried</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville a) &amp; k)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Before &amp; After</td>
<td>55.9% / 56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Before &amp; After</td>
<td>40.8% / 57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville a) &amp; k)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Before &amp; After</td>
<td>59.6% / 68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Before &amp; After</td>
<td>41.7% / 66.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northville a) &amp; k)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Before &amp; After</td>
<td>59.2% / 68.1%</td>
<td>23.9% / 23.7%</td>
<td>7.0% / 1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Before &amp; After</td>
<td>80.0% / 88.9%</td>
<td>18.6% / 11.2%</td>
<td>8.3% / 0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Westville Experimental Before v Experimental After a) $\chi^2 = 69.333 \ p = .000$  k) $\chi^2 = 47.800 \ p = .000$

Westville Experimental After v Control After a) $\chi^2 = 46.065 \ p = .000$  k) $\chi^2 = 51.288 \ p = .000$

Eastville Experimental Before v Experimental After a) $\chi^2 = 225.894 \ p = .000$  k) $\chi^2 = 122.727 \ p = .000$

Eastville Experimental After v Control After a) $\chi^2 = 75.659 \ p = .000$  k) $\chi^2 = 89.810 \ p = .000$

Northville Experimental Before v Experimental After a) $\chi^2 = 222.000 \ p = .000$  k) $\chi^2 = 426.746 \ p = .000$

Northville Experimental After v Control After a) $\chi^2 = 173.746 \ p = .000$  k) $\chi^2 = 319.881 \ p = .000$
## Appendix 5

### One-Way ANOVA Test

#### Before v After & Experimental After v Control After

Question 4 “How many people do you know to say hello to in neighbourhood?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>F = .028</td>
<td>F = .475</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 66</td>
<td>df = 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .867</td>
<td>p = .493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>F = .038</td>
<td>F = 2.415</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 111</td>
<td>df = 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .846</td>
<td>p = .124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>F = .204</td>
<td>F = 1.311</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 141</td>
<td>df = 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .653</td>
<td>p = .254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 9 “Do your neighbours tell you if they are going away for a few days?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>F = .135</td>
<td>F = .366</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 66</td>
<td>df = 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .715</td>
<td>p = .547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>F = 1.476</td>
<td>F = .843</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 111</td>
<td>df = 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .227</td>
<td>p = .361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>F = 1.659</td>
<td>F = .688</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 141</td>
<td>df = 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .200</td>
<td>p = .408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 14 “Do you trust the other people who live in your neighbourhood?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>F = .812</td>
<td>F = .793</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 66</td>
<td>df = 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .371</td>
<td>p = .377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Eastville | F = .100       | F = 10.228                        | Exp After v Cont After
<p>|           | df = 109       | df = 82                           |                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>F = .127</td>
<td>F = .036</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>df = 66</td>
<td>df = 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>p = .723</td>
<td>p = .850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>F = 4.268</td>
<td>F = 8.628</td>
<td>Exp After v Cont After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>df = 110</td>
<td>df = 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>p = .041</td>
<td>p = .004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>F = .088</td>
<td>F = 2.267</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>df = 141</td>
<td>df = 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>p = .767</td>
<td>p = .135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 18 “Do you feel part of a community where you live?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>F = 4.872</td>
<td>F = 2.223</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>df = 66</td>
<td>df = 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>p = .031</td>
<td>p = .141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>F = 4.644</td>
<td>F = 16.725</td>
<td>Exp After v Cont After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>df = 111</td>
<td>df = 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>p = .033</td>
<td>p = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>F = .090</td>
<td>F = .315</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>df = 139</td>
<td>df = 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>p = .765</td>
<td>p = .576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 50 a) & k) “Worried about house being broken into & group of youths?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>a) F = .035</td>
<td>a) F = .443</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>df = 64</td>
<td>df = 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>p = .852</td>
<td>p = .508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>k) F = 1.500</td>
<td>k) F = 2.494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>df = 63</td>
<td>df = 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>p = .225</td>
<td>p = .120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>a) F = .105</td>
<td>a) F = 1.822</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>df = 111</td>
<td>df = 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>p = .747</td>
<td>p = .181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 64 “Does crime, or feeling about being a victim have an impact on your everyday life?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Before v After</th>
<th>Experimental After v Control After</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>F = 1.318</td>
<td>F = .109</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 66</td>
<td>df = 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .255</td>
<td>p = .742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastville</td>
<td>F = 1.202</td>
<td>F = 1.382</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 103</td>
<td>df = 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .276</td>
<td>p = .243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>F = 2.903</td>
<td>F = .687</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df = 141</td>
<td>df = 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .091</td>
<td>p = .409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 6

### Pearson / Spearman Correlations

**Questions Experimental Before v After & Gender and Ethnicity Before v After and Experimental After v Control After**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question v Taken Radio</th>
<th>Westville</th>
<th>Eastville</th>
<th>Northville</th>
<th>Test Findings p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 (know to say hello to)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.026 Sig. (2 tailed) = .900 Correlation Coefficient = -.011 Sig. (2 tailed) = .956</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = .234 Sig. (2 tailed) = .177 Correlation Coefficient = .300 Sig. (2 tailed) = .080</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = .112 Sig. (2 tailed) = .401 Correlation Coefficient = .073 Sig. (2 tailed) = .586</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (neighbours tell if going away)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.288 Sig. (2 tailed) = .154 Correlation Coefficient = -.337 Sig. (2 tailed) = .093</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.101 Sig. (2 tailed) = .562 Correlation Coefficient = -.090 Sig. (2 tailed) = .605</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.074 Sig. (2 tailed) = .579 Correlation Coefficient = -.095 Sig. (2 tailed) = .478</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (trust other people)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.184 Sig. (2 tailed) = .367 Correlation Coefficient = -.148 Sig. (2 tailed) = .469</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.244 Sig. (2 tailed) = .164 Correlation Coefficient = -.198 Sig. (2 tailed) = .261</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.055 Sig. (2 tailed) = .579 Correlation Coefficient = -.068 Sig. (2 tailed) = .610</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (rely on other people)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = .059</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.052</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -.025</td>
<td>No significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (feel part of a community)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -0.138</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -0.006</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = -0.107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.772</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.772</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = 0.060</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = 0.060</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = 0.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.502</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.972</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = -0.138</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = -0.006</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = -0.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.502</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.972</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50 a) &amp; k) (worried about home and youths)</th>
<th>a) Pearson Correlation = 0.023</th>
<th>a) Pearson Correlation = 0.031</th>
<th>a) Pearson Correlation = 0.009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.852</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.747</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Pearson Correlation = -0.152</td>
<td>k) Pearson Correlation = -0.092</td>
<td>k) Pearson Correlation = -0.092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.225</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.342</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Correlation Coefficient = 0.009</td>
<td>a) Correlation Coefficient = 0.019</td>
<td>a) Correlation Coefficient = 0.019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.945</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.844</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Correlation Coefficient = -0.166</td>
<td>k) Correlation Coefficient = -0.138</td>
<td>k) Correlation Coefficient = -0.138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.185</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.149</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>64 (crime / fear impact on everyday life)</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation = 0.317</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation = 0.118</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation = -0.106</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.114</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.499</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = 0.319</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = 0.120</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient = 0.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.112</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.491</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed) = 0.491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance
## Correlation Gender for Experimental Area Before v After

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male / Female</th>
<th>Area Exp Before v After</th>
<th>Q) 5</th>
<th>Q) 9</th>
<th>Q) 14</th>
<th>Q) 15</th>
<th>Q) 18</th>
<th>Q) 50 a)</th>
<th>Q) 50 k)</th>
<th>Q) 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Correlation Gender for Experimental Area After v Control Area After

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male / Female</th>
<th>Area Exp After v Cont After</th>
<th>Q) 5</th>
<th>Q) 9</th>
<th>Q) 14</th>
<th>Q) 15</th>
<th>Q) 18</th>
<th>Q) 50 a)</th>
<th>Q) 50 k)</th>
<th>Q) 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>-.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

337
### Correlation Ethnicity for Experimental Area Before v After

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Area Exp Before v After</th>
<th>Q) 5</th>
<th>Q) 9</th>
<th>Q) 14</th>
<th>Q) 15</th>
<th>Q) 18</th>
<th>Q) 50 a)</th>
<th>Q) 50 k)</th>
<th>Q) 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.459</td>
<td>-.440</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>-.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>-.489</td>
<td>-.465</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>-.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlation Ethnicity for Experimental Area After v Control Area After

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Area Exp After v Cont After</th>
<th>Q) 5</th>
<th>Q) 9</th>
<th>Q) 14</th>
<th>Q) 15</th>
<th>Q) 18</th>
<th>Q) 50 a)</th>
<th>Q) 50 k)</th>
<th>Q) 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>-.414</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>-.435</td>
<td>-.373</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>