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ABSTRACT

The involvement of citizens and communities in public service decision-making has been the focus of a great deal of policy initiatives and academic research over recent years. Much of this research, exploring the conduct, effectiveness, and problems of citizen engagement, has shown how the roles of the citizen-consumer and public service officials in co-governance are problematised and contested (Clarke et al 2007, Foot 2009). This has led to a call for empirical research to explore and better understand the local situated practice within implementations (Hughes 2007, Barnes 2009). My research addresses the gap in our knowledge of the bottom-up micro-level practice of co-governance by conducting ethnography of the lived experience of neighbourhood public meetings that were introduced as part of the Neighbourhood Policing programme within England and Wales. My methodology draws on critical discourse analysis (Fairclough 2005a) in understanding the importance of identities in collaboration and the way that power dynamics are enacted within collaborative interactions. By providing evidence of locality differences and of nuanced embodied and relational identities within collaboration it contributes empirical depth to our knowledge of the situated practice of professionals, residents and elected representatives within the context of power-sharing and vertical coproduction. This highlights the importance of procedural, distributive and outcome justice in police-community engagement (Bradford 2011). It also contributes to current policy and practice debates in a number of ways: by making the case for the empowerment of disadvantaged communities as predicated by radical communitarianism (Braithwaite 2000); by demonstrating the relevance and importance of collective identities within co-governance (Emejulu 2011); and by exploring the difficulties faced by the police and public service officials in dealing with both citizens and elected representatives within co-governance (Yang 2005, Sullivan 2009). Finally it highlights the importance of the relationship between horizontal and vertical partnerships and how access to key decision-makers is vital for community co-governance to achieve any form of justice.
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Chapter One Introduction

The involvement of citizens and communities in public service decision-making has been the focus of a plethora of policy initiatives and academic research over recent years. This has included research addressing the conditions for, and performance of, partnerships (cf Glendinning & Powell 2002), typologies of successful partnership implementations (cf Lowndes & Skelcher 1998, Hill & Hupe 2009) and a growing realisation of the need for research that looks at the part played by agency and the social practice of partnership and conditions of effective collaborative working (cf Hardy et al 2005, Newman 2007, Munroe et al 2008). Latterly, this has been supplemented by research – most often involving key decision-makers and interviews or surveys - to capture the talk about the practice of partnership and co-governance, including initiatives within policing, health and social settings (Newman 2007, Clarke et al 2007, Barnes & Prior 2009). My research was designed to address gaps in the literature by exploring the ethnographic and situated lived experience of the practice of governance (Newman 2007). This has involved a detailed longitudinal micro-level study of co-governance within local settings that focuses on the identifications and power-relations involved in coproduction (Hartley 2005, Hughes 2007).

My research is a Wales based study of a new site of governance and citizen-police engagement in an urban city. It focuses on public meetings called Partners & Community Together (PACT), introduced within Neighbourhood Policing in 2006, and follows specific PACT meetings from 2007-2009. These meetings are one strand of New Labour’s broader neo-liberal modernisation agenda, with its dual drivers of co-opting a wider range of actors into governance and embedding citizen-led customer-responsive services through partnership working. The citizen-led agenda aims to provide a customer focus and voice within both planning and service delivery. Partnership increases the range of those responsibilised within governance; it introduces a managerialist agenda to bring together previously separate providers to achieve joined-up services, capable of doing more with less. It is driven by performance management and best value agendas. PACT public meetings focus on local neighbourhood crime, disorder and quality of life issues (CDQL)\(^1\). This is broader in approach than previous initiatives focused on crime & disorder reduction or specific

\(^1\) Crime disorder and quality of life is the emphasis and phrasing used in the policy documentation and guidance introducing Neighbourhood Policing and its public meetings.
community safety issues; it incorporates street cleaning, rubbish and parking – all beyond a police remit - as well as ASB, noise nuisance and direct incidents of crime and disorder (NCPE 2006). This remit is made possible through appropriate horizontal partnership working.

The history of neighbourhood CDQL is encapsulated in two separate initiatives. Firstly, the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 introduced Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) - called Crime Disorder Reduction Partnerships in England - which responsibilised local authorities and introduced a range of third sector partners to address issues such as antisocial behaviour (ASB) on a city or regional basis. The second initiative, Neighbourhood Policing\(^2\), was introduced in the Police Reform Act 2002. It followed trials of reassurance policing, a community oriented policing (COP) initiative. It was based on increasing police visibility, and refocused their activities to include some citizen-identified local issues. This initiative introduced the non-warranted Police & Community Support Officers (PCSOs) who ‘walk the streets’ to engage with people. This is partially based on Innes (2005) signal crimes philosophy. It responsibilises police to work with partners and engage with communities on a neighbourhood basis, including holding public meetings that allow local citizens to exercise a ‘call to action’ through setting three local priorities. This establishes local residents as key new actors in governance, with the aim that they provide a citizen-led focus to service delivery (Beecham 2006). Burton (2004) suggests this occurs within the context of a lack of systematic evaluation as to the effectiveness of community involvement, in particular whether the ‘good things’ expected of it are realised in practice. He recommends longitudinal investigation of the complex relationships within such initiatives. My research looks at these complex relationships through the practice and conduct of PACT. The research takes an inter-disciplinary approach, investigating the workings of Neighbourhood Policing and drawing on a range of different literatures and methodologies.

Neighbourhood Policing can be seen within a history of COP and community-engagement initiatives as the latest attempt at police reform (Westmarland & Clarke 2009). Various literatures have considered the focus on power-relations and the scope for contestation of actors within CDQL (cf Prior 2009). Within the criminology & governance literature, the

\(^2\) Neighbourhood Policing is the formal name of this initiative introduced within all 43 Police Forces in England & Wales
inclusion of new voices and actors is seen as creating new spaces for the exercise of agency – and what Prior (2009) calls counter-agency – as new governance initiatives are interpreted and re-interpreted as a natural part of their implementation. For Hughes (2007), the specific in-situ locality, with its own socio-geo-political histories, is the interstice at which the various agendas & discourses and contestations will be most visible. The organisational studies collaboration literature suggests a detailed identities approach that explores micro-practices, lived experiences and relational positionings: how changes are enacted, contested and created by participants (Fairclough 1998, Beech & Huxham 2003). I build on Fairclough’s (1998) approach to critical discourse analysis (CDA) and suggest that this gives an additional micro-level insight to situated power-relations within PACT which are also related to broader macro discourses. Some of the broader discourses that may be drawn on as discursive resources within co-governance relate to: professional expertise, the potential (or not) for citizen empowerment, and the organisational discourses of the public service professionals (Hardy et al 2005). Previous research suggests that the construction of the citizen-consumers as well as the public service providers (Clarke et al 2007) are problematised within these governance changes and this reinforces my focus on examining identities in collaboration.

My research was therefore focused on three main issues: how professionals perform their roles in collaboration; the extent that the community – or variety of publics3 – feel able to exercise voice, choice and challenge; and how community collaboration is experienced in different socio-economic contexts.

The remainder of the thesis is structured as follows:

Chapter two discusses the introduction of New Public Management (NPM) and the broader literature on partnership and co-governance, including CDRPs/CSPs and latterly Neighbourhood Policing. The main focus is on horizontal partnerships and includes a review of the claims for, and benefits of, partnership, including the different identifications involved, power asymmetries and issues of trust. It introduces the later emphasis on New Public Service (NPS) citizen-led co-governance and the potential responsibilisation of new actors, particularly communities (Garland 2001, Balloch & Taylor 2002). It also introduces my

---

3 Publics is the phrase used in some studies of governance to better reflect the heterogeneity of interests, groups and different types of publics and communities that the phrase ‘public’ or ‘community’ seem to infer are overly homogeneous and uniform (cf Barnes et al 2003 & 4, Newman & Clarke 2009).
relational identities approach which I suggest enables a more detailed examination of the situated practice of co-governance and power-relations at the local community level (cf Jenkins 2008, Hughes 2007).

Chapter three focuses in more depth on the construction and appeal to communities. It examines the contradictions and differences in conceptualisations of citizen-consumers within co-governance (ibid, Clarke et al 2007). It explores specifically how co-governance within crime and disorder reduction and police-community engagement has been conducted. It focuses on issues of legitimisation and inclusivity, revealing evidence of differential influence and discretionary allocation of resources within neighbourhood-based initiatives between those from advantaged middle-class areas and the disadvantaged or ‘communities of fate’ (cf Gilling 2007). This highlights the challenge to representative democratic structures, the role of public service officials, the police, elected representatives and local citizens, and the need to consider competing and privileged discourses within deliberative democracy (cf Barnes 2008). Finally, it introduces the Clarke et al (2007) model of citizen-led governance which brings together many of the concepts reviewed in chapters two and three.

Chapter four introduces my research frame, research setting and research questions. It introduces my extension and development of the Clarke et al (2007) model of citizen co-governance to incorporate the potential for marginalisation and exclusion of so called ‘lesser citizens’ who may feel unwelcome or unable to participate (cf Amin 2005). It identifies five themes developed from my literature review that I explore through the operationalisation of my research questions. It outlines the contribution and strengths of my research frame, and my inclusion of an identities and power-sensitive micro-level approach to studying community level co-governance meets Burton’s (2004) call for in-depth longitudinal studies of practice.

Chapter five presents my methodological approach. It outlines my situated, social constructionist, longitudinal and empirical focus. This is achieved through long-term ethnographic observation, supplemented with focus groups and interviews. It discusses my focus on lived experience and the study of PACT public meetings as interactive episodes, utilising Fairclough’s (1998) three level model of critical discourse analysis (CDA). This is applied to the study of identities as bodily and relationally co-constructed (Rasche & Chia 2009) and affords us insight into agency and natural subversion in the implementation of co-
governance (Barnes & Prior 2009). It also introduces the local ethnographic context and background to my research setting which is developed in Appendix Five.

Chapters six and seven are my empirical chapters. Chapter six focuses on PACT meetings from a communities and resident perspective and compares and contrasts the three main PACTs followed in my study: advantaged Whitewood, Redbank with its combination of advantage and ethnically mixed disadvantage, and overwhelmingly white, disadvantaged Evergreen. It reflects the multiple and different identifications and experiences of residents attending these PACTs and explores the marginalisation and exclusion of some residents with those who do not attend PACT meetings. This allows exploration of the practice of empowerment and of the exercise of choice, challenge and responsibilisation by attendees, including community PACT chairpersons. Chapter seven focuses on the identifications and practices of public service officials, including the police domination and ownership of PACT. It reveals how their construction of vertical coproduction is challenged and their attempts to control these challenges, particularly those from elected representatives who fail to conform to their preferred construction of PACT.

Chapter eight provides a discussion of my empirical findings related to the concepts reviewed in chapters two and three, and draws out the contributions of my research in relation to key themes. Specifically, these relate to the extent and limits of community and citizen empowerment; the use of power and control in vertical coproduction by the police; the contestation over the meaning of co-governance including the identifications and positions of the actors involved; the inequalities and exclusion revealed within neighbourhood based deliberative democracy; the tensions between centralist pressures and local implementation; and the relationship between horizontal and vertical partnership. My research makes a significant contribution to the literature through micro-level analyses of naturally occurring data, providing evidence of locality experiences and differences and revealing the nuances of governance practices within context.
Chapter Two New Forms of Governance & Partnerships

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will explore the changing governance context of UK public services, focusing specifically on partnerships and their application within a crime, disorder and quality of life (CDQL) context. Theorising these changes, I consider what Clarke & Newman (1997) in their discussion of new governance and partnerships refer to as the Managerial State, achieved through governance reforms that frequently establish formal or informal partnership arrangements. They conclude that managerialism and managerial power is becoming the dominant mode, co-ordinating a fragmented field of collaborative action as state power is dispersed across multiple actors and agents. This leads them to ask whether under New Labour this New Public Management (NPM) discourse, with its original emphasis on managerialism and efficiency may or may not become increasingly subordinate to the reassertion of public values and collaboration. This is a key theme of my research. This chapter introduces the shift from government to governance with a focus on horizontal multi-agency partnership working.

The UK public sector has undergone a number of significant changes since the 1980s; some of the key debates on the implications and effects in terms of governance and partnership will be developed in this chapter (cf Newman & Clarke 2009). Thatcher’s Conservative government’s conception of public sector reform in the 1980s focused on gains in efficiency, driven by a quasi-market environment and forces such as consumer choice, bringing in business partners and emphasising the management of performance (Hill & Hupe 2009). They emphasised the concept of partnership as central to their reforms. This emphasis continued under Blair’s New Labour government; partnership became central to changes in governance and social reforms, including within crime and disorder. These changes are referred to as the NPM discourse which incorporates inclusive governance through co-opting a wider range of participants, as well as promoting efficiencies through joined-up working practices and the Best Value agenda (cf Gilling 2007).

Emphasis is given in my research to an examination of these partnerships in policing and community safety. This co-joins concern for incidents of crime and disorder with quality of life issues (CDQL) such as consideration of the physical, living environment within
neighbourhoods (for example graffiti, street cleansing, disturbance, litter). I will discuss key issues that are important to my research focus on the local lived experience of CDRPs and introduction of the Neighbourhood Policing partnership. Section two introduces NPM partnerships, the difficulties associated with their definition and evaluation, and the consequences and policy implications of the exercise of street-level bureaucracy by professionals (Lipsky 1980). Section three discusses the inherent tensions between centralism and localism and the autonomy of partnerships; section four looks at the nature of control and collaboration within the local practice of partnership. Lastly, I introduce the contribution of my research which draws on the concepts of agency and identities to focus on discursively situated accounts of partnership and collaborative working.

2.2 New Public Management Partnerships: The Promise & the Benefits

A central tenet of NPM reforms has been the focus on horizontal coproduction between local government and service providers (Gilling 2007, Innes & Roberts 2011). This has introduced a broader range of stakeholders who are asked to take on new responsibilities to coproduce solutions and implement policies within new governance structures (Barnes et al 2008, Munroe et al 2008). This modernization model of governance has laid the foundation for a plethora of new partnerships, changing governance across a range of social policies such as regeneration, health, education and crime at national, regional and local levels (Glendinning et al 2002, Ling 2002, Stephens & Fowler 2004, Foot 2009, Newman & Clarke 2009).

New Labour’s agenda is also seen as encompassing what has been called the Third Way (Jones & Trystan 2001). The Third Way conceptualises inclusive governance as providing legitimacy through broadening its democratic base by bringing in new voices, including those who might originally be considered the governed (ibid, Clarke et al 2007). Inclusive governance can therefore be seen as an attempt to tackle wicked social issues such as unemployment, crime and disorder, regeneration, poverty and disadvantage - more effectively by improving government legitimacy through broader-based governance thus addressing the need for a wider range of expertise and less silo working (ibid, Gilling 2007, Ling 2002, Andrews & Entwistle 2010). New Labour’s desire to gain legitimacy through inclusive governance has become inextricably tied to its NPM agenda’s emphasis on social issues and partnerships as a new form of governance.
2.2.1 Defining Partnership

There does not seem to be a single definition of partnership. The Audit Commission (1998) provides a minimal definition of partnership as the involvement of at least two agents or agencies with some common interests or inter-dependencies and relationship between them that involves a degree of trust, equality, or reciprocity (Powell & Glendinning 2002). However, there is a high degree of variety and lack of homogeneity in partnership remits and sites of partnership (ibid, Ling 2002). We can conclude that it has become de rigueur to bring in new players and enable new voices previously outside the circle of government; these have been incorporated into policy-making and governance either through changes in representative arrangements or by the creation of new forums such as partnerships (Chaney & Fevre 2001a).

Originally, NPM focused on co-joining formal partners such as local authorities and voluntary sector organisations in networks of shared responsibility (Gilling 2007, Guarneros-Meza et al 2010) and peer to peer horizontal coproduction with a wider range of professional, institutional, and partner agencies (Innes & Roberts 2011). However, by 2000 this was supplemented by an increasing emphasis on citizen-led democratisation with agencies working downward to incorporate publics and communities in what has been called vertical coproduction (ibid). This differentiation provides a useful categorisation of different types of partnership. Horizontal coproduction is a key feature of New Labour’s introduction of new governance and partnership arrangements within community safety and crime reduction.

The Crime and Disorder Act of 1998 introduced Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) and – in Wales - Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs). These take a broad view, incorporating quality of life issues (for example the physical environment, including graffiti and street cleaning) with incidents of crime and disorder. Specifically CDRPs bring local agencies together and give Local Authorities responsibilities for many aspects of community safety (Section 17 CDA1998). This change to an integrated locality approach to tackle CDQL issues based on multi-agency partnership and joined-up working has been seen as essential in our late modern society (Jones 2007, Hughes 2007).

It is important to understand the rationale and issues addressed by the introduction of CDRPs. Of key relevance to my research are the implications for the role of the police and policing, and to what Clarke et al (2007) refer to as the desire to take sole control and responsibility...
away from the police. Firstly, the inappropriateness of the police to lead or fulfil community safety and preventative remits as they are the enforcement law and order arm of the state (ibid); secondly, the public’s low level of confidence in the police and criminal justice system; thirdly, reference can be made to the limited ability the police have displayed to tackle CDQL issues (Brogden & Nijhar 2005); fourthly, to bolster what Crawford (2007) calls the important symbolic role of the police to be seen as in control. The other remit of multi-agency CDRPs/CSPs is to weaken local political control over the community safety agenda and enable a clearer central government direction to be set, further reinforcing a preventative and locality focus (Hope 2005, Hughes 2007).

We have reached the point where it is suggested ‘preventive partnerships [are now] the defining face of crime control [and safety]’ (Garland 2001:16). Since April 1999, one characteristic of the 376 CDRPs/CSPs that operate in England & Wales is the implementation of a managerial and central government oversight apparatus that includes tri-annual reviews and strategic planning (Hope 2005). The emphasis on mandated partnerships within CDQL continues with the introduction of reassurance and partnership focused Neighbourhood Policing in 2006. This signals the policy shift within the neo-liberal crime control discourse from crime reduction to building confidence.

Having defined the rationale for NPM and the introduction of partnerships, it is important to look at the benefits that have been gained from their introduction. This is particularly relevant for CDRPs/CSPs as they form a critical part of the local partnership history and context for my study of the later introduction of Neighbourhood Policing partnership and public meetings. My review will focus on the advantages gained and examine the ability of partnerships to deliver the NPM agenda. This will include exploring how CDRPs/CSPs (and other partnerships) have lived up to their remit to develop the advantages of partnership solutions such as utilising a broader range of resources and competencies to deliver a centrally controlled agenda while at the same time providing locally joined-up solutions for CDQL issues (cf Gilling 2007, Hughes 2007). I also examine the potential barriers, politics and operation of CSPs/CDRPs and the implications for Neighbourhood Policing. CSPs are not just a technology of government but are constituted by power struggles and negotiations between different institutional actors; this has been well documented in the extensive literature on the subject in British criminology since the early 1990s (Hughes, Gilling, Crawford etc.).
2.2.2 The Benefits & Practice of Partnership Working

The turn to partnership working within public services is based to a large extent on the potential benefits and advantages to be gained from this form of governance. This section will review relevant evidence and introduce the concept of collaborative advantage and public service efficiency to improve services for citizens. This will include evaluations of CDRPs/CSPs designed to tackle wicked CDQL issues and factors that can lead to effective collaboration (cf Hardy et al 2005, Munroe et al 2008). Importantly, these show that obtaining the benefits of partnership may partly be dependent on participants’ understanding and practice of partnership working and effective collaboration (ibid).

The diverse agendas of partnerships require caution when assessing success or benefits as we may not be comparing like with like. Lowndes & Skelcher (1998) usefully summarise these rationales and potential benefits as including: drawing on the specific resources and competencies of other agencies to deliver more with less; encouraging networks between public agencies to plug holes in statutory mandates and deliver joined-up governance to tackle wicked issues; bring different groups and sectors into policy and strategy-making with the promise of more inclusive forms of governance than traditional institutions of representative democracy (Ling 2002, Entwistle & Martin 2005). Also emphasised is the centrality to New Labour’s NPM partnerships of replacing older bureaucratic command hierarchies and competition from the Conservative era with trust-based co-ordinating mechanisms (Rhodes 2000, Gilling 2007, Newman & Clarke 2009). Therefore, we need to acknowledge the complexity and diversity of these agendas and whether it is realistic to expect partnerships to deliver on one, let alone all these diverse agendas (Balloch & Taylor 2002).

Despite these difficulties, public service officials have been shown to recognise the benefits of partnership working. For example, survey research of elected representatives and senior officers in 21 councils in Wales suggests that joined-up working to tackle cross-cutting issues was seen to offer the most promising strategy for improvements in the effectiveness of services (Guarneros-Meza et al 2009). Most respondents viewed partnerships with local authorities that included key partners (such as the police and health) as leading to a better use and pooling of resources (ibid). The importance of information sharing (such as sharing partnership databases or call-centres) has been identified as a vital component of successful
partnership, and one that meets the key rationale of cost savings through joined-up working and doing more with less in local CDRPs partnerships (Hill & Hupe 2009, Berry et al 2011).

There is a clear agenda to achieve the benefits of ‘collaborative advantages’ of partnership such as relationship capital (Huxham 2000, Huxham & Vangen 2005) or better use of inputs and relevant aims (cf Hill & Hupe 2009). Ansell & Gash (2007) suggest it is critical for partners to recognise their interdependence; Fix et al (1990) argue that there is a need for an overarching mandate to guide complex layered partnerships dealing with complex wicked social issues.). It is suggested that participants’ actions affect trust, leadership, power and communication, and their understanding of change as they continue to work in collaboration and address conflicting goals and power struggles (Beech & Huxham 2003). Public-public partnerships have been positively associated with achieving a number of benefits, including those related to effectiveness, efficiency and equity (Andrews & Entwistle 2010). Closely aligned goals based on an agreed problem focus have been identified as critical to effective partnership (ibid, Ansell & Gash 2007). Stephens & Fowler (2004) also suggest partnership studies need to take a long-term focus because effective collaboration requires internal adjustments within individual organisations:

Local Government […] partnership is clearly on the agenda. [To succeed] it needs culture change, agencies who are prepared to work together productively […] and this will only come about over time, with sustained and committed leadership (Stephens & Fowler 2004:127)

Other researchers have concluded that further work is needed to identify whether differences in actual partnership performance can be explained by resources, activity or the chemistry of working with likeminded organisations (Ansell & Gash 2007, Andrews & Entwistle 2010). This clearly points to the need to consider the practice of partnership working, including the qualities and characteristics that may lead to obtaining the benefits and the advantages of collaboration (Beech & Huxham 2003).

Within organisational studies, Hardy et al (2005) have presented a model of effective inter-organisational collaboration. They argue for the importance of forging collective membership ties to enable the building of collective identities that are supported by positive collaborative behaviours such as assertiveness and cooperation. This is similar to what other
researchers have called the importance of the quality of communications (Ansell & Gash 2007, Andrews & Entwistle 2010, Berry et al 2011). Like other authors (cf Beech & Huxham 2003, Vangen & Huxham 2003, Ansell & Gash 2007, Hill & Hupe 2009) Kirkpatrick (1999) and Entwistle & Martin (2005) suggest a key issue for NPM partnerships is the building of high-trust relations which in turn affects the potential of trust as a coordinating mechanism. Research has found trust is not straightforward and is vulnerable to misinterpretations, asymmetric information and opportunism. Many theorists point to the need for sufficient time and conditions to build deep trust, commitment and shared understanding between participants as essential within inter-organisational partnerships (Ansell & Gash 2007). Lack of inter-organisational trust amongst partners can be an issue for CDRPs (Skinns 2005).

Examining partnerships between the police and other agencies has identified a number of difficulties rather than positive advantages in the practice of partnership (ibid). For example, conflicting interests and priorities reveal the cultural assumptions of different agencies and highlight the importance of the local political landscape to the practice of individual partnerships (Crawford 2007). This reflects research on effective collaboration which suggests that difficulties with goal alignment - and an orientation to individual organisational goals, rather than inter-organisational - can undermine effective collaboration (Hardy et al 2005). Within some CDRPs, effective collaboration has been difficult due to conflicting desires to protect individual budgets (Skinns 2005). Likewise an unwillingness to share information (often arising from negative interpretations of data protection legislation) has been linked to delays and a lack of agreement on protocols for data-sharing (ibid). Within CDRPs, a key barrier has been the frequent marginalisation of the role of voluntary sector partners and the overreliance on informal contacts and networks which lapse when key individuals move on, as happens frequently with police participants (ibid). Additionally, some agencies proved reluctant to join and participate in CDRPs (particularly health, education and social services) and fulfil their statutory duties (for health, fire & police authorities) as enabled by the Police Reform Act 2002 (ibid). Phillips (2002) concludes CDRPs have failed to live up to expectations and, despite their initial promise, their honeymoon period was short-lived.

Hughes (2007) argues that community safety partnerships continue to be sites of contestation and struggle between the different agencies and agendas. Research has identified the battle
for leadership and inter-agency politics between the two responsible statutory partners, the police and the local authority, as to who should lead the CDRPs/CSPs (Gilling 2007:72). This includes control of the agenda for these partnerships and whether the focus is on policing-oriented crime reduction under police control or a broader agenda of community safety and quality of life issues under the remit of local authorities (Hughes 2007:63). This battle has continued with the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing with its emphasis on multi-agency working and community engagement to address neighbourhood based public concerns and low level disorder, for example graffiti and vandalism (Johnston 2007:45-6, Flanagan 2008). These power struggles have been referred to as the turf wars, engendered by this new mode of partnership and its integration within, and resistance to, existing local crime and disorder partnership arrangements (Hughes & Rowe 2007). Hughes & Rowe (2007:9) identify a range of ‘cultural and organisational obstacles [arising with the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing] that beset the reality of multi-agency partnership and genuine joined-up thinking’ (2007:9). These include the culture clash between local authority planning cycles and the police ‘do by tomorrow’ short-term pragmatic project approach which leaves local authorities feeling pushed too hard. Additionally, there are clashes between individual organisational and Neighbourhood Policing performance targets and service focus, partner preference to operate under the banner of Neighbourhood Management, difficulties for agencies in most towns and cities to step-up and match police resources to participate, and finally the rivalry between the police and local authorities on the ‘wider goal of multi-agency neighbourhood management and neighbourhood action plans’ (ibid:23).

These suggest that the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing via the Home Office has been problematic for the police as it has left them responsible for bringing other agencies on board during implementation. However it could also be argued that the police have not wanted to lose control over the local crime and safety agenda because since the Morgan Report (1991) their monopoly over the leadership of crime prevention has been threatened.

One of the key differences in partnership agendas, including that of CDRPs/CSPs and Neighbourhood Policing, is the degree to which they encourage community involvement and participation. For example, Whitehead (2007) and Foot (2009) suggest that more formal hierarchically constituted partnerships, like Local Service Partnerships (LSPs), can inhibit participation whereas more informal networks encourage involvement. Community involvement through Neighbourhood Policing can be viewed as part of the post-Flanagan shift in policing performance management from crime reduction and detection to building
public confidence. Gilling (2010: 1137) argues that this may be problematic as falling confidence may have more to do with ontological insecurities of late modern societies than the actions of the police or other partners. Looking at the local implementation of Neighbourhood Policing within Wales, Edwards et al (2008) suggest a clash with existing community safety governance structures that do not include democratic citizen-led participation. The CSP officers within their study were critical of the nature of community empowerment within Neighbourhood Policing structures and therefore sought to distance themselves from the police owned Neighbourhood Policing partnership agenda and its call for community participation. The local political landscape is a key influence in the practice of partnership (for example, some organisations delaying their participation) (Crawford 2007). The need to understand local politics and practice leads Andrews & Entwistle (2010) to call for the conduct of community level studies to assess users’ discourses and to help identify the potential causes of differences in the performance of public-public collaborations. This further reinforces the significance of the political nature of partnership agendas and participation, and the need for researchers (and local practitioners) to understand how this interacts with practice and outcomes.

The extensive research on the difficulties and political nature of partnership strengthens the call for the detailed study of the practice and contestations of partnership within particular contexts (Hughes 2007, Munroe et al 2008). Munroe et al (2008:75) found a particular ‘discrepancy between the theory of involving agents [public managers and community leaders] in partnerships and the practice of doing so’. For example, where ‘the literature [on the] community participation archetype considers community leaders as key actors this is rarely borne out in practice. [They conclude there is] a need to better understand the circumstances in which agents are able to matter within the structured settings of partnership’ (ibid:76). I build on this key argument to suggest the need to focus on the situated practice, discourses and the actions of key stakeholders to reveal the nuanced processes of collaboration within the ‘flexible and messy environment of partnerships’ (ibid:76).

It is important to study situated practice to reveal the tensions between local practice and centralised pressures (cf Hodgson 2004a). These can be considered as the tensions between disparate and multiple forms of power, including the operation of power over partnership and the exercise of power within partnership. Research by Newman & Clarke (2009:106) suggests that: ‘governance comprises multiple and disparate forms of power that are uneasily
aligned producing tensions and dilemmas within and between organisations’ (Newman & Clarke 2009:106). This affirms the move to partnership and governance includes within it the potential for conflict and tension, particularly between the partnership drive for efficiency and performance and the drive to broad based inclusivity. This reminds us that local public services partnership has been mandated and encouraged through NPM which brings its own potential difficulties and problems (Gilling 2007).

These issues are central to my research. The tensions between local practice and centralised pressures are clear in Stephens & Fowler’s (2004) investigation of the Safer Guildford CDRP. They found that while this began as a locally led initiative with strong local political support it was limited by the top-down rational planning approach rather than being driven by community democracy and involvement. The next two sections consider the tensions and issues linked to centralist pressures and the power exerted over partnership as well as the operation of power within partnership.

2.3 Centralisation, Local Partnerships & Autonomy
This section concentrates on the implications for local autonomy from the exercise of central power over partnership. The paradoxical centralising and decentralising tendencies within governance initiatives have been found across a range of New Labour’s NPM partnerships (McKee 2009). This debate emphasises the importance of looking at the different pressures of centralising (increasing the spread and depth of the central state influence and control across more areas of civic society) versus the potential for decentralising (perhaps what is now called an emphasis on localism which encompasses local delivery) and giving power and voice to local actors, including a broader array of institutional and citizen actors (cf Gilling 2007). Newman & Clarke (2009) present a positive analysis of the potential of NPM collaboration and partnerships. They suggest it is better to conceptualise this as a set of managerial discursive practices and technologies, and study how these are being assembled and re-assembled compared to other forms of power in dynamic and contested ways (ibid). Managerial discourses are critiqued as presenting an overly depoliticised language of NPM (Gilling 2007). This suggests that new governance and NPM - including its later emphasis on citizen-led collaboration and legitimacy - needs to be read as a political process and not conceived as a problem of policy or delivery implementation (Gilling 2007, Hughes 2007, Fairclough 2005a).
Others provide theoretical support for the more optimistic view of positive gains through changes in central control and resultant power-sharing. Rhodes (1997 & 2000) sees new partners as forming policy communities that are interdependent ‘nodal’ dispersed networks with a significant degree of autonomy which can resist control from the state and act independently (Hill 2004). For Kooiman (2000) this can result in government ‘steering’ from a distance without being dominant, setting the direction and framework for others to ‘row’ (Hodgson 2004b, Newman 2001). A more pessimistic view suggests there has been a spread of the central state through these new governance partnerships and centralist pressure in civic society rather than local enablement (Gilling 2007). From this perspective our social world has been reconfigured as a realm of government and governmental processes (Jones 2007). Political power has been dispersed throughout the social field in a fragmented and complex profusion of shifting alliances and projects (ibid).

These potentialities have been discussed as the imposition of top-down centrally designed initiatives on localities and local agencies tasked with their implementation (cf Hodgson 2004a). Within community safety this has been summed up as a political and superficial introduction of progressive practice that is in essence a neo-liberal social order discourse dressed up as power-sharing and devolution from the centre to local government partners (Gilling 2007). It fails to significantly redistribute power due to the centre, stipulating the very activities of partnership while introducing constraints and controls such as tight performance management regimes. In effect, these restrict local discretion at the same time as seeming to offer it (ibid). This raises issues for the operation of partnerships. Powell (2002) argues that the rationale for partnership and its potential benefits assumes it is a choice not an external or mandatory duty which Patton (1999:69 cited ibid:10) calls ‘statutory voluntarism… in which partnership cooperation and collaboration are emphasised and mandated at every turn’ (Audit Commission 1998:5). Reviewing earlier 1929 and 1977 introductions of legislated partnerships, Challis et al (1988) conclude that successful partnerships cannot be created by administrative fiat. These findings suggest it will be difficult for New Labour’s compulsory partnerships (including CDRPs/CSPs and Neighbourhood Policing) to generate sufficient levels of trust to function as effective collaborations (Hudson et al 1999, Powell & Glendinning 2002:6, Clarke et al 2007).

Hughes (2007) asks whether the centre is giving up or retaining power through partnerships. This raises the difficulty of the ‘growing battery of centralising powers… concomitant
reduction of discretionary local scope, and at distance governance solutions… and heavily prescribed infrastructure which result in similar outputs across the sector’ (Hughes 2007:84). It is suggested that CDRPs are part of this centralising tendency to task local and regional levels using technologies of compliance and control (Hope 2005). These technologies include public auditing of local government performance and service delivery. The Local Government Acts of 1999 & 2000 outline these responsibilities; coupled with a regime of penalties and incentives (including the Best Value agenda), they constitute a powerful disciplinary tool to bring about compliance (Hughes 2007, Entwistle & Martin 2005).

Looking at English CDRPs and the Welsh CSPs Edwards et al (2008:42) concluded that there was a highly prescriptive centralised ‘steering’ strategic and allocative infrastructure with some elements of ‘rowing’ through the diffusion of responsibility. The managerialist and administrative command and control regime has added significant burdens that has swamped broader partnership innovation and achievement, with a lack of community consultation and ownership of solutions (Stephens & Fowler 2004, McKee 2009).

The degree of local autonomy and scope for a locality focus is much debated. Newman & Clarke (2009:152-3) call themselves ‘critical enthusiasts’, concluding that there is the possibility of a redrawing of power and politics, enabling public participation in which actors may be able to ‘make a difference’ for themselves and others through progressive enactment by front-line staff and publics. Regardless of whether a more positive or negative framing of partnership is adopted, these authors stress the need to look at the contestation and dilemmas within these new spaces, particularly practice and implementation which encompasses the possibilities of an array of outcomes and situated practice (ibid, Gilling 2007, Hughes 2007). The debate on centralism and localism can be developed to ask critical questions such as how these NPM partnerships have redrawn or unsettled power-relations. What is the legitimate basis for the exercise of power in the transition from formal accountability towards one based on a broader range of actors? Does it, as Chandler (2000) suggests, make it easier for the central state to control and mandate changes to achieve its social agenda and undermine the role of local authorities, as central government increases control through the process of empowering communities? This points us to the critical importance of studying the exercise of power within local implementations of collaborative working of both horizontal and vertical partnerships. This is explored in more detail in the next section.
2.4 Power & Control within Partnerships

This section focuses on a key debate: the exercise of power within the practice of partnership. Crawford (2007) & Hughes (2007) argue that the findings from research and policy implementation need to be sufficiently rigorous in order to understand the power struggles within partnerships and how collaboration is enacted. They highlight the importance of locality-sensitive factors such as diverse social, economic and political histories, and the cultural milieus of locality; these will directly impact the definition of problems and acceptable solutions by partnerships.

It has been suggested that while typologies of partnership may contribute to our understanding of the form and capacity of partnerships (Sullivan & Skelcher 2002, Powell & Dowling 2006:305) they do not progress our understanding of ‘who does what to whom and how’ in partnerships or who and how one partner positions themselves on a proposed joint action (Ling 2002, Powell & Glendinning 2002). We are left with the critical issue of whether existing (older forms of) power-relations are reproduced within partnership as a new form of control, or whether new actors are empowered through participation in partnership. I suggest that answering this type of question requires a focus on the micro-level practice of partnership, its possibilities, and the local experience of partnership: power asymmetries, conflicting interests and priorities of partners, issues of trust and other implementation difficulties within particular localities.

The key issues of inequality and unequal access to resources are at the very heart of partnership; these will change the horizontal and vertical relationships within which partnerships are enmeshed (Powell & Glendinning 2002). This creates power dependence and negotiation of access to legal, financial, administrative, and political resources which can be characterised by asymmetric interdependence between partners, particularly of less powerful on more powerful members within local implementation (Stoker 2004, Jones 2007). Gilling (2007:72) suggests this has occurred within the rankings of the various partners in CDRPs/CSPs. It has also been suggested these complexities are often averted by the designation or emergence, by accident or design, of one or two lead partners (Ling 2000, Powell & Glendinning 2002). These dominant stakeholder perspectives will determine much of the partnership agenda, practice, and evaluation (Vangen & Huxham 2005). This suggests the need to focus on how power operates within partnerships as this has implications for autonomy and self-regulation (Mouffe 1999, Crawford 2007).
This potential for asymmetric and power imbalance points to the necessity of looking beyond the collaborative advantages to focus on the potential for collaborative disadvantage (Huxham 2000). In particular, there is a need to examine the considerable difficulties in making collaborative governance work and the importance and exercise of power (Gilling 2007, Newman & Clarke 2009). Many have found that voluntary sector and community organisations are consistently disadvantaged and pay too high a cost to work in these arrangements, becoming embroiled in asymmetric power relations with more powerful statutory partners (Chaney 2002; Chaney & Fevre 2001a,b; Hodgson 2004 a,b).

Asymmetrical power-relations and inequality within partnerships are examples of collaborative disadvantage. This includes the operation of power in conflicts of identification and professional remits which can pull partnerships in different directions (Huxham 2000, Glendinning et al 2002, Maguire & Hardy 2005). Failure to deliver has also been related to conflicts of identification created by multiple and potentially overlapping partnerships with attendant problems of coordination, membership, representation, and resourcing (Huxham 2000, Hughes 2007, Hughes & Rowe 2007, Barnes et al 2008).

The nature of the control of partnership and the legitimate exercise of power within partnership at a local level is fundamental to my study, including how the police ownership and control of the Neighbourhood Policing agenda and the inter-organisational politics of integrating this new partnership into existing structures are performed and experienced. It will enable the study of the potential changes to power-relations arising from New Labour’s reforms at an organisational and occupational level. This focuses attention on the practice of bureau-professionals’ practice and the performance of NPM horizontal and vertical co-governance (Farrell & Morris 2003). The term bureau-professional has been used to describe the range of public service officials involved in the administration and delivery of public services on behalf of society and the erstwhile welfare state (Dean 2003). The police, teachers and social workers are identified as bureau-professionals (as would other specialist local authority and CSPs officials) who can be categorised as both professional accountable administrators and an expert professional grouping (Farrell & Morris 2003). Farrell & Morris (2003) suggest these public bureaucracies and the role of bureau-professionals are threatened by public sector reforms and increasing managerialism. Others propose these reforms reveal conflicting and changing identity positions as staff struggle to align or resist the pressures of NPM. For example, there are struggles between the wish for a professional positioning motivated by the provision of appropriate services and the pressure of being
asked to operate as a manager of services driven by target and cost considerations (Newman & Clarke 1994, Thomas & Davies 2005).

The concept of street-level bureaucrats (Lipsky 1980) has been developed to look at how public service officials (including the police) perform their roles ‘in action’ and out in the real world rather than in terms of formal mandate and legal principles underpinning the service (cf Hill & Hupe 2009). This has included the level of autonomy, power and discretion these staff possess over service delivery as well as the individual practice of judgement and agency in particular front-line settings. Dean (2003) draws on Lipsky to suggest this autonomy and power can include acting cynically in strictly rule-bound ways and prescribed responsibilities. The police are prime examples of street-level bureaucrats. They are seen as having a high degree of autonomy and discretion which they can use to their advantage, either to subvert or support service agendas and to confer discretionary judgements in the day-to-day exercise of their powers (Somerville 2009). Somerville (2009) concludes the police see themselves as professional street-level bureaucrats who can be trusted and possess the necessary expertise to do their jobs, which they define in terms of occupationally defined relationships and cultural norms and practices alongside, and often in tension with, formal rules. These relationships are typically asymmetrical because the public do not have the same expertise or resources available to them. He suggests the practice of street-level bureaucrats within community policing is a balancing act between different multiple accountabilities that operate vertically upward (bosses, legal rules, targets and such like), vertically downward through forms of participatory citizenship (publics) and horizontally (peer review, expertise and professional networks). These are played out in the individual and collective practice of different policing duties including enforcement (of public order), performance (detection and prevention of crime), and coproduction (responsiveness to public demands and assurance of community safety) (ibid: 268-9).

The Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) has been introduced as part of the 2006 Neighbourhood Policing agenda to provide reassurance and confidence through visible beat policing and connecting with communities (Johnston 2007:46, see section 3.4). Therefore, they could be considered as the latest street level bureaucrats. They can be seen as performing an ambiguous para-professional role that lacks the same policing powers (training, status, and pay) as full police officers (Reiner 2010, Morgan 2011). PCSOs release PCs from routine beat duties and attending to low grade calls and victim support; this has been found to
increase morale amongst PCs and PCSOs (Johnston 2006). However PCs also reported that they spent a lot of time correcting PCSO mistakes, ensuring they were performing the tasks they had been assigned correctly and dealing with a perceived lack of discipline and understanding of the way the police work (ibid). PCSOs are at the forefront of the change from hard to softer policing aimed at addressing the reassurance gap (Dalgleish & Myhill 2004) and post-Flanagan (2008) reforms to increase the ratio of front-line officers (Morgan 2011).

Street level bureaucracy makes a positive contribution to the study of professional practice. However it is less useful to look at the various stakeholders of communities and local councillors involved in citizen focused co-governance. For my research, I draw on broader conceptualisations that are able to embrace all the actors within new NPM initiatives. For Barnes & Prior (2009:3) the concept of street-level bureaucrats is too limited to explore vertical partnerships because it solely focuses on the discretion and positions of professionals compared to an undifferentiated and potentially acquiescent community or public. They suggest publics need to be considered in an equally reflexive and less essentialist way that accredits them with the potential agency to subvert and support. They recommend a broader framing on the agency and counter-agency of both citizens and professionals within public participation (ibid:197-8). My focus on vertical co-governance builds on this critique through a detailed analysis of a range of community, local councillor and professional stakeholders.

Within this chapter I have emphasised Munroe et al (2008) and Andrews & Entwistle’s (2010) suggestion that there is need for more studies that focus on discursively based situated accounts. This reinforces the guidance of Hughes (2007) to study specific locales and socio-geo-political histories, and consider localities as potential sites of resistance to top-down initiatives and imported solutions. The study of the specific historical circumstances and dynamics that structure organisational members’ socially constructed worlds has also been highlighted by Marshall & Rossman (1995) as an essential contribution to research on the reality of collaboration and partnership working. This reflects what Newman et al (2004) calls a need to focus on the social dimensions of collaboration and partnership through which complex questions of situated agency are performed. In the next section I suggest that this can be achieved through the study of identities.
2.5 An Identities Approach to the Study of Partnership & Collaboration

This section argues for the contribution of a micro-level approach that focuses on identities, power and language to study the potential and situated practice of collaborative working within new spaces of governance and partnership. From critical organisation studies, I draw on research that has examined the importance of identities in the study of organisations, as well as studies of partnership and collaboration. Within this literature, identity has proved to be conceptually useful in understanding how power operates within organisations and across collective identity boundaries in the operation of horizontal inter-organisational collaborations, including between individuals from different organisations (Alvesson & Willmott 2002, Beech & Huxham 2003). An identities approach allows the complex processes of mutual constitution between self and other to be brought into sharp relief (ibid). The interaction of individual and collective identities has been used to study how a wide range of organisational techniques are enacted and understood (Alvesson & Willmott 2002). This has focused on the ‘self-positioning of employees within managerially inspired discourses’ (ibid:629). In this sense, identities and identifications allow us to look at how actors ‘do’ agency and also allows us to examine the micro-level power-relations in a given setting (Webb 2008). This draws on relational identities and identifications, such as ‘what you are’ in relationship to and ‘what you are not’, and a relational identification of how strongly you identify (or disidentify) with these positions (Sluss & Ashforth 2007). This puts the focus on conflicts of identity (for example over targets and objectives) and the failure to establish a collective identity as a legitimating focus for the collaboration process (Maguire & Hardy 2005, Hardy et al 2005). Within critical literatures this is often discussed as agency, the extent and exercise of power, resistance and discretion by individuals and groups within organisational or governance structures.

Within the study of NPM, identities have been used to reveal the scope for discretionary practice. For example, to compare the performance of traditional ‘stigmatised bureaucratic identities’ with modern versions of professional, managerial, or citizen-oriented identities (Newman et al 2004, Webb 2008). The scope for agentic and discretionary practice is central to the study of NPM partnerships; utilising a micro-level identities focus allows an evaluation of the practice of agency. The multiple-hyphenated and ambiguous identities that build our understanding of ourselves and others within the enactment of locally situated NPM collaborations (Prior & Barnes 2009). Critically, this will allow the evaluation or NPM partnership practice as either enabling and empowering new players or reproducing existing
power-relations and making them responsible - what Foucault calls, a governmentality agenda (Hacking 1990).

For Beech & Huxham (2003:31,32), identity is partly influenced by action and action is partly influenced by identity; while subject to change and ‘malleable’, they are underpinned by more solid categorisations and are emotionally invested rather than solely a ‘process of narration’. For them, identifications are ‘crystallisations’ (that may be difficult to change) through which we can see actors’ positions and the potential for collective shared meanings. They also consider identity formulation to be relational both internally (within individual positions) and externally (in comparison with others) and most visible when boundaries are challenged or need to be maintained. They call this ‘boundary spanner work (ibid:28): namely, how challenges and resistances to external categorisations as well as internal challenges to our multiple identity domains (the boundary maintenance or reconfiguration where some domains may threaten to overwhelm others) and a particular positioning will be given ascendency in particular crystallisations (ibid, Kreiner et al 2006).

My research draws on a discursive approach to the study of identities, revealing how individual and collective identities are discursively performed in interaction and the strength and type of identifications of the actors involved (Beech and Huxham 2003, Hardy et al 2005, Jenkins 2008). Discourse refers to all texts and statements concerning a particular topic, whether written (such as letters or policies) or talk (Benwell & Stokoe 2006).\footnote{See Methodology chapter five for fuller review of discourse, and discursive analyses of identities.} Importantly, this allows a focus on the constructive effects of talk and conversations through the study of the identifications and positions that individuals adopt as representatives of a collective. Self-identifications, categorisations and attributions by others are both constructed and drawn on as discursive and sense-making resources. Rather than seeing identifications as fixed and rigid, this allows the appreciation of nuanced and myriad iterative identity positions drawn on within interactions - both individual and collective - such as sister, occupational, neighbour, political party member, etc. This is an inherently political process as these identifications are discursively performed as situated and socially constructed in relation to others (Jenkins 2008). While categorisations by others can be limited by stereotypical tendencies they are seen as having real outcomes because they often form a basis of discretionary decision-making (ibid). They also focus our attention on the boundary work we undertake to construct
and maintain both self-identification and categorisations; often identifying ‘who we are’ in relation to ‘who we are not’ both individually and as an in-group defined against an out-group (Elsbach & Bhattacharya 2001, Jenkins 2008). From this we can determine that individual and collective identities are systematically produced, reproduced, and implicated in each other (ibid).

The discursive turn situates individual and collective identity in language not intentions or attitudes; that is, observable linguistic practices and the effects of these on social relationships and action (Potter & Wetherell 1987, Hardy et al 2005). This leads Hardy et al (2005) to argue that the discursive object of ‘collective identity’ (produced and reproduced by participants) is critically important as it is a discursive resource for current and future collaborative conversations. These promote joint action, resolve conflicts and provide a rationale for the continued cooperation essential to achieve effective collaboration. Such discursive construction of collective identity enables participants to ‘construct themselves, the problem and the solution as part of a collaborative framework in which the potential for joint action is both significant and beneficial’ (ibid:63). Collective identity has been identified as an essential part of effective collaboration because it allows participants to invest time and energy, commit to compromises and take collective risks; it is a resource to gain support from their respective organisations when traditional market or hierarchical controls are absent in partnership and collaborative settings (ibid). This suggests that collaborating partners discursively produce a collective identity that refers to themselves as a collective group. This identity is meaningful and shared by its members, who collectively engage in the discursive practices (through sets of related conversations, talk, and texts) that produce and reproduce it over time (ibid).

This adds to our understanding of relational and collective identities produced within interactions, such as the talk within public meetings, because it enables us to easily consider how actors are positioned by others, or position themselves within talk (ibid). Looking at positioning within interaction also builds on Benwell & Stokoe’s (2006) premise that collectivist accounts are often prompted by politically motivated identity work and coalitions (rather than representing homogeneous or static labels such as ‘working class’) and intersect in multi-dimensional ways. Within this study, disadvantage and inequality are considered locality signifiers of class (Hughes 1996), having salience in structuring people’s lives (Bradford 2011). This adds a dynamic that may have particular power in the study of
community-police public meetings because it allows us to focus on the adoption (or not) of a position. For example, whether people position themselves (and others) as victims or perpetrators; do they adopt active or passive positions; who might be positioned as powerful or powerless? This provides more nuanced analyses of the conceptualisation of this space and potential for people to resist, negotiate, modify or refuse positions thus preserving individual agency in identity construction (Benwell & Stokoe 2006:45).

Drawing on previous research that has examined the importance of identities in collaboration, my focus on identity allows a micro-level examination of the complex changes from government to governance, the bringing in of new actors, and a potential challenge to the existing hegemony and power-relations (Balloch and Taylor 2002, Hartley 2005, Newman 2004). This will enable a micro examination of the operation and effects of relational power, and how it is exercised in the talk and interaction of actors within settings of collaborative working (Foucault 1983:219). More importantly, this focus on interactive identities and talk will foreground the struggles over meaning and identities in participants’ attempts to balance the conflicting demands of partners and their own organisation (Hardy et al 2005, Tomlinson 2005). Identity struggles will be discernible through the analysis of the tensions, contradictions and contestation within participant partnership discourses that are visible in their situated talk and texts (Beech & Huxham 2003, Thomas & Davies 2005). The strength of my research approach and focus on micro-level interactions and discourses is how it enables the study of the scope for discretion and agency of those involved, as recommended by Munroe et al (2008).

This micro-level and identities approach seems to be the most appropriate method to study the lived experience and practice of collaboration within the interactions of public meetings. As demonstrated in the above review, a discursive identities approach that focuses on relational and collective identities contributes to the study of identifications and identity positions enactment of partnership (Hardy et al 2005). It does this in a number of ways. Specifically, it illuminates alternate and competing notions of good practice and focuses on how hoped-for advantage or collaborative disadvantages are built through practice and discursive exchanges (Beech & Huxham 2003). It builds on the Newman et al (2004) study of traditional and modern professional identities within horizontal NPM, and Andrews & Entwistle (2010) suggestion for a focus on new community level players that provides a setting in which we see the practice of partnership by frontline staff and community
members. It also provides a method that is suited to the analysis of naturally occurring data of lived experiences. This can usefully be applied to the study of partnership within public meetings. Interactions at public meetings will draw our attention to the fact that ‘actors’ definitions of the situation cannot be unilaterally paramount […] the matter of whose definition of the situation counts is always significant returning us to the importance of power, authority and resources’ (Jenkins 2008:128).

To conclude, the strength of this approach is the possibility of studying how identifications (that is the strength of identifying with a particular identity) and identities themselves (what we identify with) are discursively embodied (Jenkins 2008) within public meetings to discuss neighbourhood CDQL issues with the police and other professional partners. Firstly, these identifications and identities are produced and performed within specific cultural and temporal settings that inform us contextually how we do things here and now, including ‘who we are’ compared to ‘who we are not’ (Jenkins 2008). Secondly, their discretionary use and categorical nature have real outcomes in people’s lives (i.e. over the allocation of resources). This allows us to explore the Foucauldian analysis of NPM which suggests that a defining or controlling classification is at the heart of modern bureaucratic rational strategies of government and control (Hacking 1990). Thirdly, it draws on Foucault’s view of identities as existing, acquired, claimed and allocated within discursively enacted power-relations and ‘identification is something over which struggles take place and with which stratagems are advanced […] it is means and end in politics […] and at stake is the classification of populations as well as the classification of individuals’ (ibid:45). Therefore a discursive approach to identities (encompassing both the individual and collective) allows the exploration of these through its focus on their situated, reflexive and essentially relational co-construction in-situ. My study will examine the multiplicity of identifications within public meetings that discuss local CDQL issues to enable the study of the resistances, negotiations, and agency of the participating actors.

2.6 Conclusion

Chapter two began by introducing new governance and horizontal partnerships across a range of settings, including CDRPs. It has emphasised their underpinning by New Labour NPM rationales such as Best Value and performance through increases in effectiveness gained by the joined-up working of a wider array of relevant agencies to tackle wicked social issues. This has been coupled with the potentially competing desire to increase legitimacy and
inclusivity through giving voice and sharing power with a broader range of actors. It reviewed the complexities with the assessment and evaluation of the benefits of partnership which reflects the tensions and dilemmas evident in the range of partnership rationales. It examined the complex debates surrounding the compulsory top-down introduction of partnerships, the tendency to centralisation and control through managerialist and administrative regimes and the lack of power-sharing or the enabling of power-sharing within locale politics and practice of partnership (Gilling 2007, Newman & Clarke 2009). These horizontal partnerships – particularly CDRPs/CSPs - form the backdrop to the introduction of public meetings and vertical partnership focused on citizen-led participation in aspects of the delivery of services to address local CDQL issues (Garland 2001, Hope 2005, Hughes 2007). Important questions have been raised regarding the potentialities of partnership and the aspects that lead to effective collaboration. While Garland (2001: 171) strikes a more positive view of these partnerships, arguing that they provide a new adaptive strategy for crime control, there is a great deal of empirical evidence that points to difficulties and barriers (cf Skinns 2005). This has been related to the introduction of reassurance oriented Neighbourhood Policing, and the impact of NPM on street-level bureaucrats in policing and CDQL services.

This chapter also reviewed the importance of undertaking situated and detailed discursive research (Munroe et al 2008). These authors concluded that such reflexive and finer grained examination of particular partnership environments will lead to findings that are ‘applicable more generally to a variety of actors in institutional settings’ (ibid:76). This further reinforced the need to interpret the definition of aims, objectives and the evaluation and measurement of partnership and collaborative performance as politically and situationally constructed by stakeholders. Interpretation will vary according to who is dominant at the time of the evaluation, and is fraught with setting-specific and normative assumptions (Boyne 2003, Entwistle & Martin 2005, Huxham & Hibbert 2008, Hill & Hupe 2009).

Chapter two concluded with a review of the strengths of studying the lived experience of the situated local practice and enactment of partnership using a micro-level discursive and identities approach, and how this can reveal collective identities and potential collaborative working and changes to power-relations within new governance arrangements. It emphasised how important this relational identities approach is to elucidating the ‘how’ of control,
gaining voice, exercising local discretion and autonomy, and recognising the pulls and tensions of centralism and locale politics and the exercise of power.

In chapter three, the implications of this will be developed in relation to the Habermasian conception of democratic governance and vertical coproduction and citizen-led agendas. Chapter three will also look in more detail at issues with community oriented policing (COP), drawing on community and citizen as potentially homogenising entities and outcomes.
Chapter Three Community Collaboration & Community Policing

3.1 Introduction
Chapter three focuses on bringing citizens and locality-based service delivery into the NPM agenda. This has been called the New Public Service (NPS) democratic discourse, which suggests ‘citizens should actively participate in decisions about service delivery’ (Myhill & Quinton 2010:273). Within Wales, the NPS discourse is outlined in the ‘Making the Connections’ report (2004) and the Beecham Report (2006); both emphasise citizen-centred models for the provision of public services and well-being. Guarneros-Meza et al (2010) suggest there has been a clear shift to this second discourse with its emphasis on hearing citizen voices and engaging with citizens as a common practice. Neighbourhood Policing public meetings are conceived here as an example of vertical coproduction and part of this citizen-led NPS agenda. The overlay of participatory democratic co-governance on to traditional elected representative structures has direct implications for the influence, accountability and oversight roles of councillors (Chandler 2000, Sullivan 2009). The complications and confusions of this attempted policy change from representative to participatory democracy are discussed in section 3.3.3.

Chapter three begins with a consideration of the potentialities – and limitations – of appeals to community participation and of the citizen-consumer as well as the long history of community oriented policing (COP) and police-community engagement. These are further contextualised within attempts to reform the police, the tensions between COP, traditional policing identities, police culture and technologies of performance. This discussion is of particular relevance to my research as the police are the key partner within the public meetings established under this most recent incarnation of neighbourhood-based policing. This situates Neighbourhood Policing public meetings in the context of earlier co-governance initiatives such as the Police Consultative Committees introduced post-Scarman (1982).

It is suggested that the objective of Neighbourhood Policing is the reassurance of publics through the introduction of a universal provision of COP and partnerships within the localised resolving of CDQL issues. Neighbourhood police-community meetings are a key element of deliberative democracy within this context and can be considered from a number of perspectives. Firstly, their exhortation to community co-governance: its conceptualisation,
the feasibility of involving a range of members of the public, the potential for exclusion and marginalisation, and possibly flawed premise of community. This includes the theorisation of community governance and responsibilisation, issues of trust and social capital. Secondly, their implications for the effectiveness of police-community collaboration: the capacity of publics and the relevant services to work collaboratively and coproduce neighbourhood CDQL understandings and solutions.

3.2 The Appeal to Community
Key issues for the study of public participation within Neighbourhood Policing are the conceptualisation of community and the recasting of publics as citizen-consumers within governance and partnership. These can be theorised in a number of ways. Firstly, there is the Giddensian view of modernity and related conceptualisation of the radical communitarian view of new governance (Braithwaite 2000). Here, reference is made to the possibility of community actors being empowered by inclusion, which enables them to challenge in ways that were not open to them before (Clarke et al 2007, Hughes 2007). Secondly, they are viewed as part of neo-liberal reforms based on market force analyses that privileges the consumer power of citizens. Thirdly, there is the critique of any increase in legitimacy and of any change to existing hegemony and power-relations through the inclusion of more diverse voices (O’Malley 2009). This is based on Foucault’s (1972) concept of governmentality which suggests new actors are incorporated and co-opted within these arrangements so that existing power-relations are reproduced and enacted, albeit with a broader range of responsibilised participants (McNay 1994, Clarke et al 2007).

The involvement of the public within locality-based delivery and design of services is enshrined in the Local Government Act 2000 (Gilling 2007). Pre-dating this - and since - is a vast research literature that has examined the notion of community governance within service delivery, encompassing the different concepts and theoretical perspectives concerning community involvement, governance, citizenship and deliberative democracy. These have been considered in a range of contexts: regeneration or planning (cf Karn 2007), social welfare and health (cf Barnes et al 2003), CDQL (cf Newman & Clarke 2009), and the related topic of cohesion & capacity (cf Wilson & Wilde 2003). Within this section, theoretical concepts regarding the co-joining of community are focused on CDQL, briefly referring to other literatures only for illustration.
Within crime and disorder reduction strategies, co-joining the community has been seen as a way to combat the crisis and limitations of the (old) institutions, state power and the monopoly of crime control capacities in a limited range of professional services (Garland 2001). The involvement of communities through consistent community consultation on matters that affect them is enshrined in the 2006 amendments to the Crime and Disorder Act and the Local Government Act 2000 (Hughes 2007, Crawford 2007). It implies that those who are the subject and object of these initiatives need to be represented or included in these consultations and decision-making processes. Many authors suggest that community co-governance and the responsibilisation of individuals and communities within social reforms provides an ideal solution. Within crime and disorder reduction this has resulted in the ability to utilise the forces of civil society to deliver what Hughes (2007) refers to as communitarian crime prevention and Garland (2001:123) as ‘multi-actors’ operating ‘dispersed, pluralistic, effective social control’. Such initiatives are specifically aimed at persuading voluntary, community and new public sector players to take on formal and informal crime control responsibility, to act appropriately and to ‘encourage individuals to regulate themselves’ (Braithwaite 2000).

3.3 The Flawed Concepts of Community Cohesion & Empowerment

Opinions differ on how community can be conceptualised and the idea of community governance has been criticised as built on a flawed view of community. Two common views dominate this section that both constrain and limit the potential of co-governance compared to Braithwaite’s (2000) radical communitarian thesis of empowerment (Hughes 2007). The first is the overly positive, socially cohesive view of rosy bucolic homogeneous communities that can be mobilised in some way to come together and take responsibility (Young 2003). The second is the divisive, reactionary conception that focuses on fear of outsiders and protection from ‘communities of fate’. The latter opens up the possibility of the demonising and exclusion of minorities such as the homeless, young, unemployed, drug-users, the poor, ethnic minorities, asylum-seekers, disabled, gay and lesbian: a ghettoisation that ignores human rights (Loader & Walker 2006).

Some commentators suggest that New Labour’s neo-liberal social policies and reforms are the result of pressures from more powerful sections of society who have access to power and control. They exercise power over a disadvantaged and potentially disenfranchised underclass of society who are both subject to these policies and - as part of the operation of
moral and class politics - their object (Utting 2009, Reiner 2010). This underclass is identified by indices of deprivation (WIMD 2005), the operation of class, or differential claims to full and legitimate citizenship, often associated with differential levels of access and trust (Amin 2005, Isin 2009). This suggests both heightened fears and lower tolerance of minor infractions and a growing divide between the ‘haves’ and ‘have nots’. Social distance and growing polarisation erodes levels of trust and social solidarity in an increasingly downward spiral so that poor and disadvantaged ‘communities of fate’ continue to decline (Zedner 2003:171). This can combine with weakened ties to local places, labour market restructuring and decline in participation in institutions such as trade unions, local shops, churches, voluntary and community groups and clubs. The effect is to heighten ‘othering’ and ‘stranger danger’ (as opposed to those within our circle) and a sense of ‘ontological insecurity’ (Young 2003:445, Hughes 2007).

Given these exclusionary potentialities, it can be seen as paradoxical that appeals are made to community members to be active citizens - I call ‘care-takers’\(^5\) - to act not just as individuals but social beings and participants in social order mechanisms. These mechanisms are part of what Hughes (2003) suggests is the huge expansion of state criminal justice spending, of police staff and of penal apparatus. Gilling (2007) sees this as an outcome of an essentially centralising agenda which results in the state penetrating further into family and civil society to maintain order. He goes on to suggest that New Labour’s neo-liberal reforms are based on a flawed concept of community cohesion and the fallacy of homogeneous communities has never existed. However, community co-governance continues to hold power over government initiatives and the desire and illusion of community continues to underpin many initiatives (cf Brent 2004, Newman & Clarke 2009, Fortier 2010).

3.3.1 Crime, Disorder & a Sense of Community
Within the CDQL context, many researchers have examined how a sense of community and access to resources can be acquired. Often discussed as a sense of belonging, for Loader & Walker (2006) and Jones (2007) the central role of a constructed ‘we feeling’ is how collectives realise desires for security and freedom from threats, and maintain trust, social identity and a sense of community. It is said that public services need to continue to attend to

\(^5\) Being ‘care-takers’ suggests some residents may be active and interested in improvements in CDQL in their neighbourhood on behalf of themselves and their neighbours.
collective relationships as these remain a powerful form of attachment within communities, often structured around inclusion and exclusion that are not reflected in the concept of consumer (Clarke et al. 2007). This confirms the view that neighbourhood is a place of identification as well as heterogeneity; it is an identifiable place of belonging and a meaning-based spatial locality as well as a site of delivery (ibid, Gilchrist et al. 2010).

Others focus on social and cultural capital as a key component within social cohesion and confirm the feelings of ‘us’ against an othered ‘them’ found across the majority of communities that include white working class areas (cf Jones 2007). In the USA, Putnam (2000) has chronicled the negative impact of the decline in social capital; many researchers have looked at the different factors and properties within community that result in high social capital. However, this is a complex debate with a number of potentially contradictory findings. For example, some communities have been enabled to ‘act together’ as a healthy civil society based on a shared sense of identity and high levels of friendliness (Crawford 2007). In other settings, multiple forms of disadvantage have been found to depress shared expectation of collective action (Sampson 1999, Hodgson 2004a). Recent research suggests social capital (Putnam 2007) - or what Gilchrist et al. (2010:28) call identity capital - is not necessarily reduced by diversity within communities.

Within crime and disorder reduction it is suggested that community-based initiatives tend to hold unrealistic expectations of what communities can do to reduce crime (Crawford 2007). It has been shown that belonging to prosperous low crime areas - which seem on the surface to be more homogeneous - does not signal strong social capital or communities (Baumgartner 1998, Crawford 2007). Similarly, some immigrant communities have been found to build their own high levels of social capital and function as strong communities which possess their own private security arrangements, beyond the arena of the state and public police. However, as with other strong communities, they do not necessarily conform to wider societal moral codes or standards (Modood et al. 1997, Jones 2007). It seems more community does not equate in a simple way with less crime, and informal control mechanisms are not necessarily absent in all high crime areas (Hope & Foster 1992). Likewise, Innes & Roberts (2011) found that while vertical coproduction emphasises informal social control it also creates ambiguities for formal police control compared with community based constructions and enactments. It appears that communities have become a site around which individuals and
groups have been appropriated and mobilised to take on greater responsibility for their own well-being and security (Crawford 2007).

3.3.2 Pluralistic Conceptions of Community
Many writers refer to the need to rethink the meanings of community cohesion so that it can accommodate understandings of difference. Hughes (2003) suggests that it is essential that sociologists’ imagining of pluralism create nuanced alternatives beyond Young’s (2003) ‘othering’ and negative belonging, mutualism and collective solidarities. This suggests conceptualising multiple community membership as pluralistic social relationships with differences in lightness and density as the norm (ibid). Individuals are community members but are not simplistically identified by a single membership or ‘binding’ to workplace, faith, family or friendship groups, or by processes of bridging or building social capital through connections between these groups (Woolcock 2001).

We are seen as individuals who operate within a world of fluid cross-cutting rather than static concurrent memberships (Hughes 2007). The changing shape of gravitational pulls of other memberships – such as one’s profession, family, friends, church etc. - act as a check on their domination. This clearly directs us to the reality of strong communities not community (ibid). These ideas are supported by Weeks (1996) who argues that social relations of communities are repositories of meaning for its members and not sets of mechanical linkages between isolated individuals. This offers a realistic sociological premise of ‘the communal’ which Parekh (2000:56) refers to as the reality of belonging and identity in western society, based on ‘a community of communities, a community of citizens rather than a place of oppressive uniformity based on a single substantive culture’.

However ill-conceived or theoretically weak concepts of community or locality are they have entered public consciousness and social meaning as well as political discourse, crime and disorder and sociological narratives (Hughes 2007). The work of Weeks (1996), Braithwaite (2000) and Sennett (1999) allow us to mobilise the concept of radical communitarianism and give us a way of understanding a role for both communities and the state. The necessary fiction of communities allows groups, struggling against discrimination and marginalisation, the possibility of rights claiming beyond the moral majoritarian norm (Weeks 1996, Hughes 2007). This is also embedded in Braithwaite’s (2000) radical communitarian perspective of pluralistic contemporary society within which poor and weak communities can be enabled.
Similarly, Sennett’s (1999:143) notion of ‘strong bonding’ between people means engaging over time with their differences; the complexities and plurality of communities offers strong communities as part of a ‘shared civic future’ not predicated on simple ‘harmony consensus but also on opposition and conflict’. Conceptually, this is important as it refers to the potential to empower communities through changes to co-governance. It emphasises the role for the state as facilitator of community development and capacity-building to support such bottom-up governance (Adamson & Bromiley 2008). Ideas of communities being empowered are linked to complementary institutions of the state; these stress the importance of political strategies for practical enactment (Hughes 2007:15).

Some argue that inclusive ‘nodal’ governance depends on the local facilitation of the participation of less advantaged groups to ensure those with the loudest voices or deepest pockets do not dominate (Shearing 2006, Wood 2006, Jones 2007). Jones (2007) suggests that in Britain, the Macpherson report (1999) provides support for the Hayekian critique which suggests the state and public police are less trusted in some areas and ill-equipped to do this. Crawford (2007) advocates focusing on the structural attributes, connections and access to power. This includes those within society that have access to participate within this new ‘nodal’ form of crime and disorder governance, peopled by state institutions and commercial as well as community actors.

Structural attributes of communities […] the manner in which connected with, situated within sources of power and resources in the wider environment […]. That may be more important than community as a sense of belonging (Crawford, 2007:888)

For example, neighbourhood watch schemes have been easier to introduce and are more prevalent in safer, better-off areas (Hussain1998). Rather than reducing or replacing public police time these schemes have proved more demanding (Gilling 2007). This reflects the historical monopolisation of greater access and share of CDQL resources by better-off confident middle class communities (Newman & Clark 2009, Barnes et al 2008). An important factor for neighbourhood-based initiatives is differences in access to situated resources and power. A key debate is whether these differences are based on class, education, ethnicity, or due to the purchasing power of these consumers (Clarke et al 2007, Utting 2009).
This further reinforces the need to consider the diversity of communities and the diversity of meanings when drawing on community discourses. This includes reaching wider arrays of people than currently happens - particularly young people and black and minority ethnic (BME) groups (McKee 2010). She strikes a cautionary note by suggesting that while local participation is important it is not as important as improving the neighbourhood and the provision of services: quite understandably, people have an instrumental approach to involvement, only becoming involved if they have something to gain (ibid).

3.3.3 Participation & the Limits of Deliberative Democratic Forums

Foot (2009) suggests citizens and communities want more power and influence over their services (including policing) and their neighbourhoods. She suggests that citizen-involvement in local governance initiatives - such as public meetings within Neighbourhood Policing - need to deal with the realities of cities and urban communities, areas that are increasingly places of difference and transience rather than stable and homogeneous:

Community engagement must take account of diversity, migration, and mobility, as these are permanent features of neighbourhoods […] which pose problems for local governance. If [the full range of] community voices are not heard or respected, this can result in a loss of trust and cohesion […] concluding] while there is enthusiasm for greater involvement […] it needs a more integrated and coherent approach (Foot 2009:1-2)

The appeal to community is firmly embedded in the Habermasian ‘ideal’ of deliberative democracy as an appropriate mechanism of community engagement. This assumes equality of access to information, control of agendas and speech rights – even when these are often absent from its practice (Benhabib 1996, Mouffe 1999). It is suggested that sites of co-governance through public forums do not qualify as sites of democratic participation as they transgress many Habermasian conditions (Barnes et al 2008). In numerous settings they have been found to privilege professional sources of expertise and knowledge and close down citizen’s experiential perspectives (Barnes et al 2003, Collins & Evans 2002). Cavell (1990) points to the inherent injustice of public forums because many citizen voices have been excluded within their planning and design, or are closed-down during their conduct. Citizenry are disadvantaged by professional institutions’ domination of the design and implementation of these initiatives. Fairclough (2005a) confirms that the impact of governmental and professional control over setting agendas and specifying the conduct, scope
and content of deliberations in effect disempowers and blocks the ability of citizen attendees to question, raise issues as they see them or challenge the legitimacy of the process – that is, to exercise choice or challenge in current practices of participatory democracy. Cavell (1990) goes further, suggesting citizens’ silencing and denial of voice by officials and official procedures is a consciously enacted political and personal choice. These issues lead Mouffe (1999) to argue for an alternative conceptualisation of agonistic pluralism designed to unsettle the predominant rational based consensus model of democracy. This shifts the focus to the political nature of these endeavours and the real-time intersection of a variety of political, economic and cultural factors, and restores the notions of struggle and politics that more accurately characterise public sector democracy and civil society (ibid). These debates highlight the potential flaws and struggles within these spaces of deliberative democracy and illustrate how this occurs in the construction of both policy and practice. This signals the need to look closely at the conceptualisations of communities, citizens and participatory democracy when examining community and NPS citizen-consumer co-governance. Therefore, it is important that studies of community involvement consider the construction and conduct of public meetings and how this might aid or limit participatory democracy.

An important consideration is the potential confusion and struggles arising from the overlay of Neighbourhood Policing public meetings on existing council leadership and scrutiny roles, including local councillor representation. For councils, their wish to lead the Beecham and Neighbourhood Management agenda can be seen as a way of maintaining control and scrutiny of the introduction of this new multi-functional and agency delivery environment. Researchers have studied the impact of this policy change, designed to create more efficient separate partnerships through the removal of representative democracy oversight and scrutiny mechanisms (Chandler 2000). They ask whether these new governance arrangements provide a Third Way that is free from the constraints of representative democratic and accountability structures that have been seen to tie the day-to-day operations of statutory agencies (Munroe et al 2008). Within local crime and disorder reduction contexts we can ask if local authorities and the police are removed from the day-to-day interference of local politicians. Also, whether this enables local and flexible multi-agency solutions to be legitimised by allowing professionals to focus on getting the job done. For Sullivan (2009) there are critical issues with the overlay of partnership and neighbourhood participatory governance on electoral systems. She advocates research to examine the contestations and contradictions that arise - including those between elected representatives and participating citizens - to clarify the
tensions and difficulties for citizens, councillors and paid officials within local settings. Like others, her research found this was a contested change for many elected representatives who have tried to find ways and roles for themselves within new partnerships (like CDRPs, Neighbourhood Policing and Neighbourhood Management) that maintain their influence (ibid). This has included attempts to become involved in scrutiny of these new partnerships as well as service delivery focused locality participation (Barnes et al 2008). Ray et al (2008) looked at a range of NPM partnership settings and found some continue to include a formal representational role while others do not. This mix of representative and participatory democratic governance arrangements caused confusion and led to a lack of clarity concerning the roles of citizens and other representatives, including how officials and official procedures classify and cope with their inputs (ibid). They suggest that all actors are confused by the plethora of types of representativeness as well as the precise boundaries and purposes of what are now multiple participatory co-governance formal and informal partnerships (ibid). They and Barnes (et al 2008) argue that clarity is needed on these issues for partnerships to become sustainable, understood and effective.

A common UK finding across CSPs – including Guildford CSP - is that ‘nowhere is there a sense of the public being equal partners in the partnership scheme’ (Stephens & Fowler 2004:27). This suggests there will be problematic issues related to the conceptions and practice of citizen involvement in regard to identities, legitimacy, representation and power-relations between participants, officials, elected councillors and citizens within Neighbourhood Policing public meetings. The next section looks specifically at police-community involvement. It considers the history of community-focused policing and the different attempts over the last 30 years to improve relationships between the police and the communities it serves.

3.4 Community Oriented Policing & Police-Community Engagement

In this section, I review attempts to improve relations between the police and communities through community oriented policing (COP) and the practice of community engagement following Scarman in the 1980s. This includes key debates on the difficulties of engagement related to CDQL and the dismissal of contributions by community members. The section concludes with a review of the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing public meetings.
Underpinning recent initiatives - and a major reason for COP becoming part of the government’s broader NPM and NPS agendas - is a general acceptance that the police, and police reform alone, cannot resolve what are deep seated social and economic issues underlying crime and disorder (Brogden & Nijhar 2005). According to some, this led to social change and policing agendas being unevenly directed by more powerful sections of society to discipline the poor (Gilling 2007, Somerville 2009). It also privileges multi-agency working - and latterly public voices - to give legitimacy to partnerships aimed at tackling wicked issues, including CDQL (Fleming 2009).

Theorists concur that COP is difficult to define or pin-down as it incorporates a wide range of alternative guises (Brogden & Nijhar 2005). Offering some general principles and guides, Brogden & Nijhar (ibid) suggest that practitioners - including those in the USA and Britain - have adopted a pick and mix approach, selecting those elements they want to implement (ibid). This problematises comparative evaluations. British COP and community safety initiatives are often dominated by an ethos of delivering positive outcomes that reduce crime and disorder. These are frequently underpinned by intelligence-led approaches and frequently draw on the broken windows philosophy. Broken windows is a euphemism for the physical indicator for fears and concerns about where we live or work. Signal crimes proposes that services need to find out what triggers the concerns of each community and neighbourhood - be it youths in the park or dog fouling - then target effort and expenditure to tackle them (Innes 2005a). It is suggested that tackling these signals will have the greatest impact on measures of confidence and reassurance. Within British policing, this is frequently coupled with the use of a range of Problem Oriented Policing (POP) techniques to improve multi-agency and police analyses, identification and evaluation of solutions (Innes 2005b). We can therefore conclude that British COP is built on multi-agency approaches with an outcome orientation.

---

6 The ‘broken windows’ philosophy suggests that it is the fabric of the neighbourhood and quality of life that concerns people (Wilson & Kelling 1982).
7 For Innes (2005a) the ‘signal crimes’ approach suggests it is important to find out communities perceptions of key local signals of poor quality of life or crime and disorder. These can be mapped on to street maps to target action.
8 POP can be described as the application of a range of analysis and decision-making strategies to aid intelligence-led policing and resource allocation. Within partnership working this may be extended to inform partnership decisions and allocation of resources.
Within England & Wales, COP received a modern facelift following the Scarman Report on the 1980s riots within deprived and/or ethnic minority areas such as Broadwater Farm in 1986 (Gilling 2007). It suggested that the police needed to improve communications with communities, in particular to regain legitimacy and connect with the plurality of communities. The Scarman (1982) recommendations introduced police consultation forums (PCCs); in 1982 Sir Kenneth Newman, then head of the Metropolitan Police, attempted a series of reforms that placed greater emphasis on community involvement, multi-agency working, a code of ethics and corporate management. These reforms were not popular within the service nor widely taken up; Gilling (2007:193) suggests that from this beginning the police have cast participation as consultation, somewhere towards the bottom rungs of Arnstein’s Ladder, a stepped model that at the highest level includes joint decision-making and begins with minimum levels of informing the public (see also www.communityengagement.police.co.uk/ accessed 20.07.07).

A comprehensive review of PCCs identified their potentially unwarranted negative assessment, as well as a lack of empirical evidence concerning their democratic accountability (Hughes 1994). They were found to be amateurish, overwhelmingly pro-police and dominated by the white male middle-classes (Morgan 1992:176), resulting in ‘little more than a talking shop which lacked any role in the resolution of conflicts and in the solution of local problems’ (Morgan 1992:180). Hughes (1994:259) suggests the need for a more sophisticated analysis to reveal the complexities and ‘symbolic purposes and outcomes’ of PCCs - such as their role in the local politics of policing - rather than focusing solely on the substantive changes gained by their introduction.

Since the mid-1990 there has been increased impetus for community engagement based on the identification of a confidence and reassurance gap between public perception of crime and actual crime figures (Dalgleish & Myhill 2004, Newburn & Reiner 2007). Though critiqued, the British Crime Survey (BCS), Home Office Reports and Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) inspections have attempted to measure key aspects of public satisfaction and confidence in the police (Gilling 2010). Many concur that two important features that may have the potential to influence public satisfaction and reassurance are ease of access and timely, appropriate feedback on police actions (ibid, Myhill & Quinton 2010).
Trials of Reassurance Policing during the early 2000s found that publics have a positive reaction to visible walking the beat (Tuffin et al 2006) styles of policing. Neighbourhood Policing introduced the non-warranted Police and Community Support Officers (PCSOs) whose role is to be seen and to relate to communities. PCSOs are at the heart of this initiative; by 2010 there were over 16,500 PCSOs, accounting for 10% of uniformed police (Morgan 2011). Their introduction, and that of civilian community support officers, was viewed as both radical and controversial (Newburn & Reiner 2007). In the 1990s, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) rejected their introduction as ‘policing on the cheap’ and they were only accepted as part of the Policing Reform Act 2002 with the recognition that the ‘level of demand for policing of communities was not easily met by the public purse’ (ibid:936). The introduction of Neighbourhood Policing during 2005-8 can be seen as part of the initiative to improve police legitimacy; it hoped to increase public confidence by engaging and reassuring a diverse range of publics –including the disaffected - through the universal provision of visible local beat policing (Tuffin et al 2006, Gilling 2010).

Bayley (1997) identified three key structures in most modern forms of COP that all occur in Neighbourhood Policing. These include community consultation forums, the geographical de-centralization of command structures and decision-making to flatten the police hierarchy, and mobilisation to enlist the active support of the public. The latter is achieved through bringing together crime prevention schemes such as Neighbourhood Watch, preventative youth work and youth diversionary activities as well as developing inter-agency links with, for example, housing, to deal with problem-solving, vandalism, problem families, and to enable remedial action (ibid). Community consultation forums, like Neighbourhood Policing public meetings, are described as geographically based and with a number of identifiable aims such as helping the police educate the public and enlist their cooperation to deal with crime and disorder. They allow residents to express grievances against the police in face to face interaction, permitting the police to respond unimpeded by bureaucratic rules and practices while giving the police feedback from the community on how they are doing (ibid).

3.4.1 Critiques & Limitations of Community Oriented Policing
Some authors are highly critical of police-community engagement. Herbert (2006) and Crawford (2007) suggest much of what passes as community crime prevention has little to do with communities as collective entities and is a deployment of community focus in order to
facilitate neighbourhood-based delivery of policing and policing solutions. They argue that the emphasis is on reaching individuals or households with little sense of purpose beyond improving the locality and well-being, and with little conception of how change can be achieved (ibid). For Sullivan (2009) the problem is that it conflates neighbourhood with community as a delivery mechanism for contact and community intelligence (NCPE⁹ 2006).

The various websites and guidance on Neighbourhood Policing public meetings provide key evidence of practice: they use interchangeable terminology, variously describing the community as partners, users, clients or consumers. This suggests a fluidity and lack of clarity on the role of the community and therefore the roles of professionals within these settings (NCPE 2006). This emphasises the importance of the particular, situated historical factors entwined in the local implementation of Neighbourhood Policing reforms, what Newman & Clarke (2009) refer to as the space for the assemblage of local practice. The police have not been seen as particularly effective in dealing with crime and disorder, and horizontal and vertical co-governance has been seen as a way to spread both responsibility and access to resources (Somerville (2009). With respect to involving communities, it has been suggested this reflects repositioning COP as a public relations exercise (Brogden & Nijhar 2005).

Others suggest that coproduction of informal and formal social control through partnership with communities is a key concept of community-focused policing in England and Wales (Innes & Roberts 2011). For Morgan (2011) policy pronouncements presume coproduction when this is not a simplistic, agreed or an easily achieved outcome. Research examining the potential and difficulties of coproduction suggests the public police may not be the first choice of partner or be acceptable to some communities (Jones 2007). In some localities this suggests the need to rehabilitate the state and its police operatives due to differential levels of trust and experience. According to Vernon & Lasley’s (1992), the police underestimate the

---

⁹ The National Centre for Policing Excellence (NCPE) was an advisory body that issued guidance to Police Forces on many aspects of policing, including the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing. It existed until early 2007. Briefly renamed Centrex, it merged and became part of the newly formed National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) in April 2007. As laid out in the 2004 Police Reform Act, the NPIA has a broad remit to streamline advice and guidance on continuing self-improvements in national policing culture and effective delivery of services (cf Reiner 2010:236, www.npia.police.uk/accessed16.12.11).
historical levels of distrust within many disadvantaged communities, in particular ethnic minority communities that are more likely to be the subject of policing (Myhill 2006).

Somerville (2009) focuses on levels of trust and confidence within and between communities as well as the police. He suggests coproduction is feasible where trust is high, levels of crime and disorder and nuisance are low, and the police are less upwardly focused on accountability and performance measures. Also, coproduction depends on the police learning to adapt from an authoritarian command organisation to one that can coproduce horizontally and give serious attention to downward vertical coproduction with communities themselves. He paints the scenario of individual officers & community neighbourhood teams enabled to act as street-level bureaucrats (Lipsky 1980, Somerville 2009:268-9) with high levels of discretion and responsiveness. This suggests coproduction is impossible where trust in the police is low, where there are high levels of crime and disorder, and where there is greater dependency and enforcement of policing solutions, coupled with a history of lack of public police and partner action to tackle issues (Somerville 2009). Innes and Roberts (2011) suggest coproduction - while difficult for the police - can only work by encompassing the informal social control mechanisms of communities. They offer a breakdown of types of coproduction, ranging from police defined and delivered solutions (type 3 protecting the community), police defined but community delivered solutions (type 2 coproduction), community defined and police delivered solutions (type 1 coproduction) to - the most radical and challenging - community defined and delivered solutions (type 4 mobilisation by the community) (ibid:14-5).

There is considerable evidence of resistance to community participation, suggesting that coproduction rarely occurs (cf Gilling 2007). Somerville (2009) concludes that coproduction is an aspirational ideal that has not been operationalised within COP: the police remain an upwardly focused paramilitary organisation and may not be capable of effective vertical coproduction. Innes & Roberts (2011) agree that the focus of police energy and attention is on horizontal coproduction with formal partners but they also feel there is potential for vertical coproduction with communities. A focus of this thesis is whether vertical coproduction is possible within Neighbourhood Policing public meetings or whether it requires more resource-intensive political, strategic, tactical and individual relationship infrastructures. I also question whether vertical coproduction will struggle in communities where low trust and higher levels of nuisance and disorder occur. The difficulties of coproduction
within neighbourhood-based police-community forums leads Somerville (2009:266) to conclude that they remain ‘laundry meetings’ (Skogan 2005:17) where the community bring their ‘dirty washing out to air’, vent their frustrations with little or no influence on gaining police or partner action to resolve issues in coproduction and sustaining dependency on the police. This is similar to Morgan’s (1992) view of earlier PCCs as ‘talking shops’.

In these circumstances, it is important to ask who is prepared to engage with the police. It is suggested that based on interest or being directly affected by CDQL issues, only 1% of the population will be prepared to engage with the police in public forums or directly (Skidmore et al 2006). New Labour’s Crime Fighters programme targeted locally-based ‘active citizens’; their research suggested they could expect up to 4% of the population to become involved (Casey 2008). There is a tension between agencies’ need to consult communities and what is construed as constituting an acceptable forum and ‘legitimate community representation’ (Barnes et al 2003:387). Studying a range of public community engagement settings, Barnes et al (2004:273) found members of the community are frequently dismissed as the ‘usual suspects’ who may dominate forums – shout the loudest - but are not seen as representative of either the range of communities or their own interest group. This suggests that people trying to participate as active-citizens are dismissed by the negative categorisations of professionals. Frequently, community members/representatives are not viewed as able to represent their constituencies (ibid). The review of PCCs by Hughes (1994) found lay representatives came from local political parties and interest groups or constituencies that formed a minority inner circle that had a naïve confidence concerning their acceptance as representative partners. Reviewing the difficulties of legitimate membership and representation, Barnes et al (2003:383 citing Barnes 2002) identified ‘counter-publics’ and parallel discursive arenas where subordinated social group members create oppositional interpretations of their ‘identities, interests and needs’.

It suggests that within public meetings some citizen voices will be seen as more suspect or less legitimate and potentially excluded, with more credence given to more acceptable voices. Some groups have what Clarke et al (2007) call more volume or pressure to disrupt the rational allocation of resources. Vito (2005) argues that the community leaders, targeted as key informants within traditional PCCs, acted as gatekeepers or ‘counter-publics’ and were often more focused on specific financial self-interests or creating trouble. Other researchers have found that British affluent middle-class areas - operating a strategy to keep crime out -
have drawn on their experiences of self-governance to obtain disproportionate levels of service (Clarke et al 2007). Herbert (2006) - reviewing the operation of neighbourhood forums in a range of well-off and disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Seattle - suggests marked differences in resident capacity and influence. UK findings confirm the greater influence and confidence in some communities to challenge and engage with police (Gilling 2007, Westmarland & Clarke 2009). Some professionals and researchers have called for the accountability of citizen attendees to be addressed (cf Barnes et al 2008). This would be difficult to progress within highly informal, open door access Neighbourhood Policing public meetings that are intended to be open forums within which local residents can raise issues.

These points indicate a clash of views on representativeness between community members and professionals, suggesting that Neighbourhood Policing public meetings may be contested sites of deliberative democracy where residents cast themselves as bona-fide representatives or care-takers who can both speak for themselves and in some way represent their neighbours or area. The (low) level of respect for residents’ views - coupled with the rejection of residents’ emotional, figurative and storytelling style of communication - will lead to them being dismissed and ‘fobbed off’ by paid officials (Barnes 2008:274-5). For Barnes (2008) this reflects the privilege and credentialising of powerful professional contributions that undermines the very possibility of the enactment and practice of deliberative democracy. She concludes that public forums run along these traditional lines need to develop beyond these boundaries and become more able to incorporate the lay expertise and emotional discourse to allow power-sharing and citizen participation. This supports the limited hope expressed by Hughes (1994) for the potential of police-community meetings and general cynicism concerning the involvement of lay expertise with professional police experts.

There is a need to consider how police and other professionals construct community and community-engagement, and how police constructions are invoked within Neighbourhood Policing public meetings. Herbert (2006:67) identified three preferred modes of interaction that dominate community-police engagement, namely generative, separate, and subservient. Generative refers to the construction of the moral majority of ‘good citizens’ who are co-joined to bolster and support the police’s expert resolution of CDQL issues on their behalf (ibid, Isin 2009). Separate constructs a distance between the police and the political nature of the agendas of communities, partners, and councillors which allows the police to act as impartial authority and remain unquestioned guardians of law and order. This discourse
enables the police to view themselves as an embattled institution in the face of uninformed public meddling. Subservient allows them to fulfil their public duty as servants of the community and respond to legitimate requests for service from the range of communities (Herbert 2006). These different types of interaction agendas may explain the defensive change in police positioning within public meetings, especially when confronted with what is the messier reality of dealing with ‘slippery’ and diverse communities (ibid). For example, the subservient agenda might lead them to meet with the public to discuss CDQL and give feedback on police actions; separation will result in them wanting the community to accept their professional assessment and actions without challenge, and the generative position allows them to act on behalf of the moral majority of law abiding citizens. All these constructions allow them to maintain control of these meetings. In his US study, Herbert (2006) found 90% of solutions at neighbourhood community meetings were those of the police with little opportunity or credence given to those suggested by the community. This echoes Barnes et al (2003 & 2008) findings of the dismissal of community suggestions as less legitimate or informed than those of professional experts.

3.4.2 Procedural Justice & Police Community Interaction

An alternate model of COP gives paramount importance to the way citizens are treated during police-community engagements. This is based on procedural justice: how fairly we are treated within interactions with the police, and how this is identified as key to our willingness to engage with them (Tyler & Fagan 2008). Bradford’s (2011) meta-study of BCS results concludes that there are reducing levels of trust, support and confidence in policing across all communities, irrespective of whether they are elderly, youth, BME groups, or white middle-class or poor communities. The procedural justice thesis suggests that the trust and willingness to cooperate with the police can be enhanced through improvements within police interactions and dealings with all publics (Bradford 2011). The universal implementation of Neighbourhood Policing might provide an opportunity for positive encounters and lead to positive changes in citizens’ opinions (Fielding & Innes 2006).

A key aspect for the study of public meeting interactions is whether – as Tyler & Fagan (2008) suggest - positive encounters with the police will lead to higher levels of public trust, confidence and cooperation irrespective of any changes in outcome (desired outcome or better service) or distributive justice (what we receive or how we are treated compared to others). Will the police gain legitimacy and reassure us through improvements in their
conduct within these interactions? The procedural justice approach is the antithesis to the dominance of the signal crimes and the broken windows theses of COP that privilege the importance of outcomes as potentially leading to increases in citizen satisfaction and confidence. It is still unclear if these gains in legitimacy work similarly across different publics. Tyler and Huo (2002) found both whites and ethnic minorities put similar weight on procedural justice and trust; Sunshine and Tyler (2003) found some differences, with ethnic minorities giving more weight to distributive justice and (un)fairness which negatively affects their willingness to voluntarily cooperate with the police.

Yang (2005) directs our attention to officials’ trust in citizens and communities as a predictor of proactive citizen involvement. His findings suggest that the key factor is not citizens’ trust and confidence in services but paid officials’ trust and confidence in citizens that is paramount to the successful implementation of participatory governance, which he defines as a willingness to share power. He looks at a range of individual, organisational and social factors that lead officials to have less (or more) trust and confidence in citizens. He finds procedural bureaucracy and procedural orientation, including the privileging of professional expertise and an internally driven accountability and cost reduction culture, can lead to decreases in trust and willingness to share power through participation. This is reinforced by Myhill’s (2006) finding that internal culture and leadership are factors that may affect the police’s ability to deliver effective Neighbourhood based policing. For example, Stevens (2002) found excellent graded senior police officers rarely trusted what the public said, again reflecting their position as ‘experts who know best’.

Others have also identified positive influences that might increase trust: senior management’s prioritisation of power-sharing, consumer influence on service delivery and positive experiences of community engagement (Ansell & Gash 2007). For example, Metropolitan Police ward panels (comprising police, communities and councillors) were found to work well because they were given a high organisational priority and seen as a properly resourced ongoing dialogue around service delivery (Ray et al 2008). Together, these suggest successful power-sharing through participatory governance needs to be built on the trust and confidence of the police and other officials. This includes reducing reliance on internally and upward focused systems, procedures, performance measures and professional expertise – which Yang (2005) calls procedural bureaucracy. In addition, emphasis can be placed on
tackling professionals’ resistance through introducing activities like early career experience of community collaboration and visible proactive support of senior management (ibid).

Looking at collaboration between paid officials and community members, Ray et al (2008) found almost all the officials they spoke to - while positive about community engagement in principle - expressed uncertainty about putting it into practice. They found the key to officials’ ability and confidence to undertake engagement and act on its outcomes was primarily shaped by the organisational context. This included the provision of key resources such as time, staffing, senior management support, and appropriate performance incentives to enable officials to prioritise engagement. While there was some scepticism concerning the accountability and representative capacity of community members, their involvement was judged most successful on issues of service delivery. Engagement was particularly effective when based on ongoing dialogue; this was valued because it facilitates feedback, builds participants’ understanding of complex issues and developed trust (ibid).

This review has covered the history and potential of citizen and police partnership and coproduction. Much of this is based on macro-level cross-sectional survey research (cf Yang 2005, Tyler & Fagan 2008, Bradford 2011) or traditional case and interview studies; it still needs to be empirically studied through consideration of interactions themselves. The next section will consider influences on police positions, orientations and capacity within co-governance, particularly the tensions between traditional and community-focused policing cultures, and the centrality of performance targets to policing.

3.5 Policing Culture & Performance Targets
Police culture and performance targets provide the organisational context to the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing public meetings. These have already been referred to as setting an upward internal focus. It is important to look at how these might affect the police construction of the aims and possibilities of co-governance and power-sharing within these public meetings. There is a history and tension between traditional authoritative law enforcement and catching criminals - often referred to as ‘real policing’- and more community-focused policing (cf Brogden & Nijhar 2005). Neighbourhood Policing embodies the revival of the local beat bobby and visible police presence (Tuffin et al 2006).
This can be viewed as a modern variant of the village police officer: a ‘Dixon of Dock Green’\textsuperscript{10} character who builds strong community relationships, knows everyone, and can give those who require it a ‘cuff round the ear’. Research into UK Neighbourhood Policing identities show these have often been criticised as ‘pink & fluffy’ and compare unfavourably to what is regarded as ‘real policing’ (Davies & Thomas 2008:634). Herbert (2006) suggests COP is often categorised as an overwhelmingly feminized performance. While some practitioners buy into this role, others oppose it and other partnership CDQL initiatives. At a strategic and day-to-day level, this represents a battle ground over what ‘should’ constitute the police role and duties (Flanagan 2008). It has also been argued that the police are not equipped, willing, nor should be asked, to serve such a wide range of demands and agendas (Reiner 2010, Somerville 2009).

Davies & Thomas (2008) refer to the struggle and resistance within the profession regarding the range of community police identities, referring to one as ‘Dixon of Dock Green with attitude’ (2008:633). This suggests that some neighbourhood officers show a preference for ‘real policing’ with its macho persona and traditional law enforcement profile, characterised by a ‘fire-brigade’ reactive style policing (ibid, Reiner 2010). Neighbourhood police identities have been found less relevant for police officers (ibid). This is further complicated as neighbourhood police are asked to function as if they are community leaders (ibid, Somerville 2009) and move into the realm of community development, something officers may not be trained for, or willing to do (Brogden & Nijhar 2005). Similarly Williamson’s (2005:153) review describes COP as the ‘new orthodoxy’, indicating that it has always been in conflict to ‘real policing’ that is reactive and catches criminals rather than being preventative and proactive. He concludes that Neighbourhood Policing sits uncomfortably beside orthodox enforcement duties while at the same time being heralded as the way forward by some senior and front-line staff (ibid, Westmarland & Clarke 2009).

These tensions are exacerbated by the incompatibility of performance measures and strategies that focus on measurable activities when applied to COP. At this time, the performance measurement of policing is complex and involves centrally defined sets of measures across

\textsuperscript{10} PC Dixon was a 1960s TV character based on the concept of the village ‘bobby’ who walks the beat.
all performance areas.\textsuperscript{11} These allow the comparison of sectors within Basic Command Unit level (BCUs)\textsuperscript{12} and between Police Forces. Neighbourhood Policing is subject to some of these national measures and is included in HMIC Inspections of performance. For example, one measure is the setting of priorities at local public meetings. Performance is micro-managed and reviewed almost constantly, including priorities, activities and allocation of resources (ibid). This requires recording crime, disorder and other performance data which is reviewed daily and weekly with the appropriate reallocation of resources based on COMPSTAT\textsuperscript{13} and the NICHE tasking system to prioritise requests for service. A common local priority is incidents of antisocial behaviour but NICHE gives these a low priority. Research has shown that local mobilisation of police resources is constrained by these centrally specified performance indicators, down to - and including - ward level operations (McLaughlin 2005, Gilling 2007). The actions of BCU Commanders, Inspectors and Police Officers are driven by this target and performance measurement culture (Edwards et al 2008). For Newman & Clarke (2009) these assemblages of managerial technologies are managed to shift resources to meet the most pressing, centrally decreed and measured targets (Savage 2007). These may not be the most pressing local concerns and disempower local flexibility (Golding & Savage 2009).

It is also suggested that despite the intensive performance and crime indices regimes - including elements of the BCS – the right things are not measured in the right way (Fielding & Innes 2006). This includes the long-term relationship building and the real work of Neighbourhood Policing that may remain ‘invisible’ because it is either not measured or distorted in the figures (ibid:133). This can lead to a lack of long term commitment of staffing to community-engagement activities (Sadd & Grinc 1994, Myhill 2006:36). Staffs

\textsuperscript{11} At the time of this research, performance measures are specified within the Police Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF) and Public Service Agreement (PSAs) and Assessment and Performance of Community (APACs). For a review of national performance assessments, see Golding & Savage (2009:740-746). These and other measures are designed to allow a comparison of performance between Police Forces that is also detailed enough to compare within force delivery of most day to day policing operations- including Neighbourhood Policing activities. Part of this performance monitoring regime is inspections conducted by Her Majesties Inspectorate of Policing (HMIC); as well as statistical data, these can include focus groups and interviews with police and sometimes other key partners.

\textsuperscript{12} Police Forces are divided into autonomous, regionally based delivery units. These are called BCU’s and each of these will have a number of local sectors and police stations that cover one or more local wards.

\textsuperscript{13} The collection of performance statistics - COMPSTATS - records performance on various actions against set targets (for example vehicle thefts). Since 2007, this has been supplemented by the NICHE tasking system that captures requests for police services (other than 999 calls) and grades them from those requiring the most urgent attendance to no-attendance.
are allocated to activities that have more immediate and direct performance measures attached to them – such as response times and clear-up rates. This is worsened with the misattribution of outcomes based on longer-term intelligence gathering to the final response team (Fitzgerald et al 2002, Fielding & Innes 2006). It is argued that police culture reflects a profoundly political process in which duties that meet targets are valued and prioritised and ‘what gets done is what gets measured’ (ibid:127). This is likely to militate against prioritising important aspects of Neighbourhood Policing such as relationship building within public meetings and police responsiveness to allocate resources to community requests.

It seems that available measures are not fit-for-purpose. Gilling (2010) challenges the presumption that Neighbourhood Policing activities can be shown to lead to improvements in the latest public confidence measures. He suggests the proposed ‘cause and effect’ is too simplistic, difficult to trace and too complicated to measure. Likewise, Fielding & Innes (2006) point to difficulties with BCS randomised public surveys to measure changes in the reassurance gap. They suggest that these are not fine grained enough to reach specific respondents and will fail to show a specific effect in response to initiatives to tackle neighbourhood ‘signals’. This further undermines the capture of the true contribution of already ‘invisible’ Neighbourhood Policing, pointing to the need for specific ‘ward level measures [...] that track the cumulative effect of a series of single interventions’ (ibid:130).

Recently, Edwards et al (2008) found the motivation for police involvement in Neighbourhood Policing public meetings was their imposition as a target rather than a commitment to engagement and providing citizen-led services (NCPE 2006). They also found accountability to communities within CSPs are often tokenistic and rhetorical (Edwards et al 2008). They confirm that police, local authority and CSP partners are more comfortable with their own definition of issues - based on intelligence and problem-solving led policing, and their own statistics and hotspot\(^{14}\) data - rather than responding and redirecting resources to issues raised by residents (ibid:46). The key focus of official partners seems to be on developing inter-organisational multi-agency partnerships with an emphasis on horizontal (rather than vertical) coproduction (ibid, Innes & Roberts 2011).

\(^{14}\) Hotspots are identified using geographical information systems technologies to statistically map incidents and identify clusters of incidents / reports called hotspots for various crimes and disorders, such as antisocial behaviour, burglaries etc. These can be mapped to a few houses, buildings, or parts of streets.
They conclude that consultation is conducted to ‘tick-box’ without any real transfer of voice or power in the face of attempts to challenge official perspectives.

As part of this expert-led agenda, the police have developed a raft of ways to interpret and use locality-based data as a basis for service delivery and visibility. Neighbourhood based policing methodologies – such as the broken windows, signal crimes and POP philosophies - are used to interpret community concerns and intelligence (Innes 2005b). Further evidence of a managerialist and performance measurement approach to direct the effective and efficient use of resources is built on hotspot data (ibid, Goldstein 1990, Bullock & Tilley 2009). In Britain, this is promoted through use of the Scan, Analysis, Respond, Assess process (SARA\textsuperscript{15}), incorporating prioritisation, realistic resolution outcomes and costing of potential solutions (ibid 245-247). Evidence of this internal upward managerialist focus underlines Yang’s (2005) analyses. It also reinforces the privileging of professional and expert knowledge to translate communities issues into both viable policing options and cost-effective solutions (Barnes et al 2003, 2004 & Barnes 2008).

The police have been cast as a neo-bureaucratic organisation in which performance is surveilled and operationalised through performance management regimes and administrative procedures under the preface of effective leadership (Golding & Savage 2009:744, Gordon et al 2008). Driven by this police focus on intelligence-led decision-making and service delivery (cf Gilling 2007, Clarke et al 2007) it is likely that Neighbourhood Policing public meetings will be constructed as a mechanism for gaining essential intelligence. Police interest will be limited to how well (or not) they contribute to this professional-led agenda; police attention will be on their control and conduct. This reinforces the perception of citizen inputs as a source of intelligence in what has now become known as community-intelligence. This leaves little space for ‘experience based lay knowledge’ and community expertise (Elliott et al 2010).

These difficulties suggest community-focused policing - including neighbourhood public

\textsuperscript{15} SARA is a protocol used within POP to improve multi-agency and police identification of CDQL issues. It begins with data gathering to confirm the nature of the problem, followed by an analysis of a range of effective and efficient solutions. Critically, once a cost effective and suitable solution is identified it also involves an assessment and reporting process to assess the impact of the solution and, if necessary, adapt action/s (Goldstein 1990).
meetings - may best be conceptualised as a public relations and intelligence exercise primarily directed at reassuring publics rather than tackling achievable outcomes (Brogden & Nijhar 2005). Brogden & Nijhar (2005:17) suggest that promotional and public relations concerns influence many police statements regarding Neighbourhood Policing; official police accounts of successes should be treated with healthy scepticism as they often present a partisan and partial picture:

Research on community policing, for the most part, is very heavily weighted toward the reporting of ‘success stories’ and seldom entails a reporting of lessons learned from failed efforts (Lyons 1999:89)

It is important for research to consider how police dominance - as the lead partner and owner of this initiative - is performed within local Neighbourhood Policing public meetings. For example, through their efforts (or not) to control the conduct of these meetings, specify agendas, or retain their privileged position as holders of expertise with access to superior sources of information and analysis. In an investigation of the introduction of New Labour’s co-governance agenda, Westmarland & Clarke (2009) found the police were least able to adapt to collective citizen-consumer led involvement. Looking at policing, social, health and well-being settings they found the police were the most resistant and struggled with accepting the influence of vertical partnership with communities (Clarke et al 2007).

To explore the nature of these new co-governance relationships, Clarke et al (2007) produced a model to establish the extent of citizen-consumer influence. These authors investigated whether citizens - as well as staff - accepted their new roles and whether citizen-consumers were able to exercise this responsibility and claim their rights. They developed a framework for understanding new citizen roles which identified four main factors. These were: (1) Choice: whether or not citizens are enabled to exercise choice in the delivery of these public services; (2) Challenge: whether or not citizens have the ability or limits to challenging professional perspectives or solutions; (3) Responsibility: whether or not citizens are made responsible within these new governance arrangements and are drawn into this governmental agenda – almost the opposite of challenge; (4) Inequality: whether or not all are equal or some communities are disadvantaged and have less influence and capacity to participate in this democratic process. The power of this framework is its capacity to coherently integrate a diverse range of concepts. It can help us to examine the influence from the centre and the spread of governmentality, as well as providing some understanding of the potential of
communitarian ideals of influence and challenge and of the problems and barriers to the exercise of citizen choice.

The overall finding within policing (and to some extent all these social policy areas) was the limits to the exercise of influence by communities. The better-off, advantaged and already connected seem to have more influence than the traditionally disconnected and disadvantaged. As stated, the police struggle with both choice and challenge and with responding to collective citizen-consumers. Most of the police professionals that Clarke et al (2007) surveyed were reticent about co-governance and sharing power and decision-making with citizen-consumers. They conclude there was little evidence of either the acceptance of the citizen-consumer role by communities or professional responsiveness toward citizen-consumers (ibid, Westmarland & Clarke 2009). This is a particularly useful model for my research as it brings together the relational construction of the practice of NPM between professionals and citizens. It provides a mechanism to consider the situated agency, counter-agency and power struggles of all participants in vertical co-governance. The Clarke et al (2007) framework also integrates many of the concepts introduced in chapters two and three, and in chapter four I will show how and why this framework was adapted and used in my study of social interactions within Neighbourhood Policing public meetings.

3.6 Conclusion
Chapter three has reviewed the appeal to community and debated the disparate invocations of communities and citizen-consumers within sites of governance (cf Clarke et al 2007). It has included a review of the problems associated with changes from representative to deliberative participatory democracy and unequal power-relations and control by professionals. This focused on the ‘notoriously slippery’ concept, elusiveness and illusion of ‘community’ (Tilley 2003:315, Williamson 2005). The final suggestion is that communities are best conceived as pluralistic and diverse and more lightly connected than cohesive and homogeneous. Communities can act collectively, based on a sense of belonging and neighbourhood while also being capable of exclusionary and demonising tendencies in which some may be identified as ‘non-belonging’ (ibid:38). It identified a range of problems with deliberative democracy, including unequal power-relations and control by professionals, and the possibility that advantaged communities have more influence and potentially better levels of service. I also suggest that two potentials need to be considered in relation to each other: the potential to enable ‘communities of fate’ to share power with the potential spread of the
Managerial State social control and the maintenance of order (Newman & Clarke 2009). This is of particular importance given a history of the dismissal of citizen-consumers contributions as ‘counter-publics’ and ‘usual suspects’, and the lack of acceptance of their emotional contributions (cf Barnes 2008) which many theorists suggest shows participatory democracy has not developed sufficiently to cope with pluralistic community contributions and what needs to be an agonistic view of democracy (cf Mouffe 1999).

Co-governance initiatives were introduced as subject to paid officials (police and local authority) extensive scope for discretionary practice; for the police, this discretion may be driven by heavily measured performance and targets. It reviewed the privileging of professional identifications and perspectives, including public service officials’ preference to control and make decisions based on professional assessments aided by community-intelligence gained through consultation (cf Fairclough 2005b), and problems with the conflation of neighbourhood and community as a delivery mechanism (cf Sullivan 2009). British outcome-focused delivery of reductions in crime and disorder aimed to increase reassurance and public confidence with approaches that emphasised procedural fairness. The alternate procedural fairness approach focuses on how people are treated in their interactions with the police (whether communicating bad news or good news) and were introduced as having potential relevance for the conduct of Neighbourhood Policing public meetings. Bradford (2011) and others suggest this may be more important than the impact on outcomes from COP.

Chapter three has built on chapter two’s focus on implementation within situated settings and suggested two types of power – power and control over partnership and the exercise of power within their practice - are visible in looking at NPM and NPS governance and reform. It discussed how the centrally driven introduction of these initiatives was tied to a plethora of controls, measures and agendas (cf Gilling 2007) that created asymmetries. Such asymmetries and influences impact on power-relations within partnerships and implementations of new governance: some are less equal and less able to participate than others. It is Yang’s (2005) contention that horizontal and vertical partnerships are characterised by the upward and internal focus of service providers, allied with difficulties with trust. Both chapters draw on generic policy and implementation research on collaborative working as well as specialised research looking directly at CDQL partnerships such as CSPs, PCCs and COP. As part of these debates, I introduced the importance of
looking at implementations in-situ, taking into account specific geo-historical factors and contextualised findings in order to produce meaningful observations and conclusions (cf Hughes 2007).

We can conclude that connecting with citizens and communities presents challenges for institutions (as well as citizens) trying to engage and mobilise neighbourhood participation. As Hughes (2007:65) argues, they (citizens and communities) are difficult to find when you need them: it is difficult to decide who are their ‘usable’ and ‘legitimate’ representatives […] and when they do materialise [they are] often plural contradictory entities’. Also Clarke (2004:124) concludes that ‘despite the organicist imagery, communities are contested and changeable constructions [rather than] naturally occurring entities’. With respect to Neighbourhood Policing public forums, Westmarland and Clarke (2009:181) point out that ‘consultation, negotiation, and dialogue jostle uncomfortably alongside [obtaining] the ‘rubber-stamp’ by the community forum’ and it is difficult to see how power is being redrawn. Chapter three has discussed some of the potential difficulties, barriers, characteristics and ambiguities within new sites and forms of public governance (Newman & Clarke 2009). It has also examined the ability of the police to adopt a more community focused policing style.

Reference was made to the value of the research by Clarke et al (2007) who questioned the ability of the police to adapt to citizen involvement in public service decision-making. The analytic framework that they developed for understanding the practice of professionals and citizens in co-governance has been adapted and used in my research. Chapter four will examine the relevance and value of this framework for my focus on the practice of collaboration within Neighbourhood Policing public meetings, and the power-relations and different positions and identifications of the actors (residents, councillors, police and other paid officials). This reinforces the need for an in-situ investigation of these meetings based within their own situated socio-economic and historical contexts.

In chapter four I will combine the perspectives and concepts raised in chapter three with those from chapter two to present my research and analytic framing for the study of the local and lived experience of community collaboration within Neighbourhood Policing public meetings. Much of the extant research cited in chapters two and three comprises either macro-level cross-sectional survey or traditional case study and interview research (cf Yang
2005, Clarke et al 2007, Tyler & Fagan 2008, Bradford 2011). My study will make an important contribution in building on these findings through a focus on the micro-level interactions of co-governance in a study of actual police-community engagement within Neighbourhood Policing public meetings. This was contextualised within the view that police reforms and the introduction of new governance cannot solve entrenched social, economic and so called wicked issues, including the potential dominance of some sections of communities within governance (cf Brogden & Nijhar 2005, Somerville 2009).
Chapter Four Research Frame

4.1 Introduction
This study is an investigation of the practice and implementation of community co-governance through participation and partnership. It focuses on Neighbourhood Policing public meetings and examines in particular whether these are implemented to obtain communities seal of approval or as a normative progression to co-governance and power-sharing (Raco 2003, Hastings 2003, Gilling 2007:207). Chapter four introduces these meetings, my research questions and research frame.

4.2 Neighbourhood Policing Public Meetings
Neighbourhood-based public meetings were introduced as part of New Labour’s national introduction of Neighbourhood Policing, beginning in late 2005 and designed to be fully implemented by 2008. They are embedded within the Policing Pledge which indicates that the police must hold regular community meetings to discuss citizens’ concerns and set up three local CDQL priorities. This has been referred to as the ability to hold the police to account through this ‘call to action’ (NCPE 2006):

Neighbourhood Policing is the police service’s commitment to improving your quality of life by working together with local delivery partners to tackle local issues [...] and priorities identified by local people. It is vital that local people work with them to improve the quality of life in their area (www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk /accessed14.04.07)

I have studied examples of Neighbourhood Policing public meetings within a major city BCU in South Wales which is part of Southern Police Force. My research

---

16 The Policing Pledge specifies a number of Neighbourhood Policing commitments to local communities. This includes contact details of named Neighbourhood Officers (PC or PCSOs) for your area, giving feedback on actions to tackle CDQL issues in your area, and holding regular public meetings to find out community concerns and set up to three local priorities. It is not certain that the Policing Pledge or all of its commitments will survive under the Coalition Conservative and Liberal Democrat Government appointed in May 2010. They are conducting a range of reviews and consultations on the future of policing, including Neighbourhood Policing. Current statements seem to indicate a commitment to front-line services coupled with major cuts in central government funding (cf Morgan 2011, Radio BBC4 News 5th December 2011). The outcome of these could affect the continuation of the national provision of Neighbourhood Policing public meetings.

17 The name of the Police Force, locations, and people has been changed to provide confidentiality and anonymity. The city location is referred to as City.
specifically focuses on Partnership & Communities Together (PACT)\textsuperscript{18} meetings introduced by City BCU.\textsuperscript{19} City police are the lead agency responsible for the introduction and conduct of PACT meetings. Other partners - including Local Authorities and communities – do not hold any clearly defined accountability in relation to these meetings. As the NCPE (2006) guide points out, the formal partners in the process do not hold joint targets. The police are specifically tasked to hold these meetings and to work with other professional, elected and citizen partners; they therefore come to this initiative as both the dominant and lead partner. To mitigate this, the police guidance talks of ensuring that meetings are not dominated by official partners and the police (NCPE 2006, www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk/ 18.04.07).

My research is a situated and detailed analysis of partnership and collaboration between the police, other public service agents and communities. My focus is on the way that power and social identities are drawn on in the practice of partnership in some of City’s PACT meetings.

4.3 Research Frame & Questions
This section reviews the key concepts from my two conceptual chapters and shows how my three research questions emerged and developed. It suggests a number of factors that my research design needs to incorporate. I begin with a brief review of my position, as stated in the conceptual chapters.

PACT meetings are considered part of New Labour’s neo-liberal, democratic community co-governance NPS and consumer choice agenda. This is based on the Giddensian view that community participation will result in better decision-making and effective, efficient, responsible and accountable governance. They are a top-down specified initiative but the lack of local design does not mean that these partnerships and involvement - such as through PACT meetings - are unwanted at a local level. However, it is suggested that imposed community partnerships or ‘manufactured civil society’ can have quite different outcomes to bottom-up and local home-grown initiatives (Hodgson 2004b). It has been argued that to

\textsuperscript{18} Southern Police Force uses one of the common acronyms for these meetings – PACT. It is notable that PACT in other Police Forces means ‘Police and Community Together’ meetings. This includes Lancashire, the gold star rated Force that Southern Police used as a reference point for its implementation of these public meetings in 2006/7. It is only within Southern Police Force that PACT means ‘Partners and Communities Together’ meetings.

\textsuperscript{19} City BCU is one region within the Southern Police area.
succeed, crime prevention really needs to be owned by local communities. Crawford (2007:885) comments how ‘extra community [top-down] resources and bottom-up capacity building are often entwined’. Central to my research is the scope for resistance and contestation between the professional, elected representatives and residents concerning the purpose and conduct of these PACT meetings.

From my conceptual review it can be concluded that police culture and inward-focused performance targets and measures may limit the space for citizens and communities to exercise voice, choice and challenge (Clarke et al 2007). Additionally, there is clear potential for citizens to be co-opted and responsibilised within these new spaces of co-governance (ibid). Rather than acting as ‘communities of fate’ that are empowered, some communities may struggle through disadvantage, or be ‘doubly disadvantaged’ in these new arrangements. Therefore my research is designed to investigate the operation of PACT meetings based on a situated and detailed analysis of the practice of collaboration between the police, other public service agents and communities. The specific conceptual themes drawn on in my research are reviewed below.

4.3.1 Professional Dominance & COP

It is necessary to consider the potential (or not) of PACT meetings to contribute to outcome oriented expectations of community-focused policing. It has been suggested that traditionally outcome oriented COP has not had much success in either the coproduction of solutions or building confidence in policing and multi-agency work to solve wicked social issues. Also, its contribution isn’t measured accurately enough (Fielding & Innes 2006) and it may be better to focus on procedural fairness as part of community-police interactions (Tyler & Fagan 2008) within meetings. These issues raise the possibility that PACT meetings may be conceived as public relations, a legitimising and reassurance exercise and a ‘talking shop’ to ‘rubber-stamp’ professional decisions or meet a target. Police and other NPS public forums have been found to be driven by professional implementation timescales, performance management and service delivery requirements (Fairclough 2005a). Within the police’s dominant law enforcement modus operandi and its command and control culture (Gordon et al 2008) this could mean PACT meetings are run in ways to facilitate meeting police performance targets. Therefore, they exist to ‘tick-box’ rather than as a serious attempt at co-governance and power-sharing (Hughes 1994:259, Yang 2005).
Additionally, the dominance of professionals highlights their scope to apply real (or imagined) categorisations and stereotyping in their discretionary rationing of resources (Somerville 2009). This has real consequences with ‘much policing work [exhibiting] discretion and stereotyping [that] can be understood as administrative allocation [and how these] systematically influence the distribution of resources to particular categories of individuals’ (Jenkins 2008:192 citing Cicourel 1968, Turk 1969). Other research confirms that class and disadvantage effects the allocation of services, with the advantaged receiving better services (Lawton 2005, Gilling 2007); the disadvantaged receive less transparency in participation, thus finding it harder to hold public authorities to account (Skelcher et al 2005, Audit Commission 2005, Gilling 2007, Barnes et al 2008:3). This shows the potential for neighbourhoods to be differentiated by classifications such as class and disadvantage (ethnicity, race etc.) which can also interact with citizens’ desires to seek and gain voice. The citizen perspective and the potential influence of these factors are of equal importance to the professional.

4.3.2 Citizen-consumers in Co-governance

Brent (2004:222) concludes that these classifications all have their ‘own inexorable effects but none provide fixed and static structures to social life and like the desire for community, people will seek voice, meaning and connectedness in all their imperfections’ . This suggests class is a discursive resource and cannot be applied as a simplistic explanatory factor (Walkerdine et al 2009, Clarke et al 2007). For Hughes (2007:27) this reinforces the need to capture the normative project and how people act within vertical coproduction as power-relations are more fraught and intricate than simple binary ‘insider-outsider, us-and-them formulations [as] a consequence of the fact that our social geographies are overlapping […] and forms the micro- and macro-geographies of power in specific contexts’.

Within participatory governance, Wills (2008) found that identifications such as class, place and low-status were drawn on as part of a repertoire of discursive resources rather than employed as totalising and disempowering categorisations. This suggests there is potential for citizens to establish collective high order identities and alignments around common causes (Gilchrist et al 2010). Higher order identities enable joint action beyond both the traditional conservative communitarian view of harmonious communities and the postmodern territorial based identity groups and divided neighbourhoods.
Studies of participatory co-governance across disadvantaged communities has found that disparate and different community interest groups can find ways of establishing a collective identity and alignments to work collaboratively to achieve a common aim (Wills 2008). This collective identity is drawn on to resist, contest and present alternate positions to those of officials on specific topics and situations, including in public meetings (ibid). In contrast, organisation theorists suggest that effective collaboration requires establishing a collective identity that is performed and constructed by all the actors involved (Hardy et al 2005). The first suggests there is potential within PACT meetings for citizens to establish higher order collective identities that maybe used to contest and resist official views. The latter emphasises the need for a joint collective identity that includes police, other officials, councillors and residents. This has differential and important implications for the effectiveness of vertical collaborations. They both direct our attention to the necessity of looking at in-situ identifications, potential inequalities and collaborative practices across disadvantaged and advantaged areas.

It is suggested that not enough has been done to examine the non-linear tensions of community co-governance and its local implementation, including within crime and policing. This includes the lessons to be learnt from top-down and bottom-up innovations: whether these lead to improvements in service delivery, with a key focus on the critical issue of whether community participants are cast as clients, customers or co-producers within these partnerships (Hartley 2005). Co-governance has been established as a political arena within which front-line staffs and citizens make sense of - and influence - local implementations through the exercise of agency. Neither can be cast as passive recipients but both are intimately involved in the redrawing of power relationships in which their positions will be discursively negotiated, resisted and contested. This supports a focus on the importance of actors’ agency and identities within local practice. In particular, it emphasises the social construction of these settings and the problems and advantages of working in new joined-up ways with these new actors.

The focus on local contestation and resistance is based on a Foucauldian view of power as relational and considers the natural subversion that will occur within New Labour’s NPM and later NPS implementation of citizen involvement. This suggests studying situated practice at the point of service delivery to give visibility to relationships of power and agency between frontline staffs and citizens. My focus on the identities and agency of all actors includes what
Prior & Barnes (2009:17) call counter-agency. This can take three forms: revision, where staff adopt alternate strategies and technologies that bend or modify policies to suit their assessments; resistance, when citizens / users, alone or with staff, develop alternate responses rather than follow policies; refusal, where citizens / users reject official strategies and even the definition of the problems (ibid). This reinforces my adoption of a research strategy that can elucidate the struggles to create shared social meanings within situated practice, specifically on how agency and counter-agency operate within these settings, and the implications of this for PACT meetings as sites of social policy implementations.

4.3.3 Locality, Disadvantage & Marginalisation
The locality based nature of Neighbourhood Policing reveals demographic neighbourhood differences which are an important feature within these settings of co-governance. These differences reflect entrenched inequalities in many inner-city neighbourhoods, resulting in deprivation, unemployment, poorer health and educational outcomes; social cohesion, ethnicity and age profiles are often in stark contrast to more stable, established and better-off localities. These locality factors, along with levels and type of CDQL issues within an area, contribute to its geo-demographic neighbourhood profile; it is on the basis of this profile that policing resources and police-community engagement opportunities are allocated.

The critical issue of the trust and confidence within community-engagement and the higher levels of distrust of the police within certain communities may create groups that are further marginalised and excluded from participating in these public meetings. Examples include minority ethnic groups, transient populations, young people, disabled or gay, lesbian, bi-sexual and transgender (LGBT) groups. Some communities may therefore be more unwilling to engage with the police or attend public meetings and become involved in the ‘call to action’. They may feel that they are less welcome given the divisive nature of ‘other’ identities and the categorisation of some as bad neighbours (for example visible ethnic minorities, problem families, those who cause noise nuisance etc.) or less worthy or ‘lesser citizens’ (for example non-English speakers, transient populations, Muslims, troublesome youth, criminals) and so consequently feel unwelcome or unable to attend these meetings (Stokoe & Wallwork 2003, Isin 2009). The ‘good neighbours’ who do attend may seek to discipline or regulate the behaviours of ‘bad neighbours’ (Flint 2009). The formal Neighbourhood Policing policy guidance to police acknowledges that it ‘should provide a police service to all communities and it should not just deliver neighbourhood priorities’
This suggests that the police have substantive grounds to draw on their own generated constructions of the views and support of non-attending citizens as if they are moral ‘good citizens’. They must construct this context when they are allocating resources and responding to priorities set by the minority of the local population who are interested, able and willing to attend these meetings (Skidmore et al 2006).

This suggests certain communities may experience PACT meetings as sites of marginalisation and exclusion within which they are ‘doubly disadvantaged’ (Foot 2009:14) by barriers to gaining and exercising influence. They frequently fail to participate or feel actively excluded ‘doubly disadvantaged’ by these arrangements. Importantly, my research contributes to illuminating whether ‘communities of fate’ - the poor, disadvantaged underclasses - are further disenfranchised and excluded from these new sites of influence over resources and co-governance or whether they are enabled and empowered by the national implementation of these public meetings as suggested by Braithwaite’s (2000) radical communitarian thesis, potentially gaining voice, choice and challenge. Previous research on co-governance and COP suggests the possibility that these public meetings might become the province, and privilege the talk and views, of ‘good citizens’ (Herbert 2006:193). Those in most need may find themselves struggling with the additional responsibility of engagement as well as having to cope with the high levels of CDQL and the demands of holding basic living together. Herbert (2006:61-2) concludes that the devolution of co-governance punishes disadvantaged communities because it asks them to bear too much weight when they are ‘too light’ and less able to mobilise effectively.

4.3.4 Micro-level Practice & Identities

Finally, the three research questions underpinning this thesis are designed to facilitate a micro-level analysis of the practice of PACT meetings. This has become increasingly accepted in the study of organisational and horizontal inter-organisation collaborations (Hardy et al 2005) and the implementation of public policies (Muir & Wetherell 2010). Few studies have extended this to consider actual instances of interactivity in governance (Derkzen & Bock 2007) or to examining individual identities within public meetings (Llewellyn 2005, 2008a). My contribution is to utilise a relational identities approach to examine how those involved in PACTs - police, other officials, councillors and residents - position themselves and work collectively (or not) within these meetings. This will reveal the
scope for agency and counter-agency through their identifications, resistances and contestation.

This requires consideration of the difficulties within spaces of co-governance and deliberative democracy for professionals to hear lay and citizen voices against the privileging of their own professional inputs. It focuses attention on the struggles between professionals and publics with the latter frequently constructed as both ‘counter-publics’ or ‘usual suspects’ and from whom the professionals wish to potentially keep their distance as separate and independent while at the same time being seen to fulfil a public servant role within interactions (Barnes et al 2003 & 2004, Herbert 2006). There are also concerns about the level of confusion and contestation regarding the roles of all the actors involved. We can conclude that collaborating with the police and professionals is not a straightforward or uncontested activity for citizens, councillors and communities in the face of the barriers to vertical coproduction within police-community engagement and co-governance. Particularly, the complicated overlay of new participatory governance on the elected representative systems highlights the importance of investigating the role of councillors in PACT meetings (Sullivan 2009).

4.3.5 Research Questions
I have developed the following three research questions to address these themes and issues, and to reveal participants’ contestations, struggles and power-relations within the practice of locality based co-governance. Each research question relates to the themes discussed above. The first focuses on the practice of professionals and their potential dominance; the second on communities and the potential of acting as citizen-consumers in local democratic settings; the third on locality differences in the practice of co-governance.

1. How professionals perform their roles in collaboration?
2. The extent that the community – or variety of publics - feel able to exercise voice, choice and challenge?
3. How community collaboration is experienced in different socio-economic contexts?

4.4 The Development of the Research Analytic Frame
The analytic framework for my thesis developed not only out of a detailed conceptual review but as a result of my engagement with the field and the type of data I collected. My focus on power struggles and social identities within collaborative governance required an analytic framing that was comprehensive in its coverage of concepts that were applicable to
understand the roles and behaviour of a range of different actors. The Clarke et al (2007) framework was drawn on as it accommodated my data as well as integrating a number of themes within my research. Within Neighbourhood Policing public meetings, like other community police initiatives, it is likely that there will be communities and localities for which issues of trust, social exclusion and social cohesion may critically influence community involvement. I adapted the Clarke et al (2007) framework to incorporate the key issues of marginalisation and exclusion as well as an identities focus. Therefore, my research frame goes beyond that of Clarke et al (2007) by extending its dimensions and utilising a relational discursive identities approach to study in greater detail the micro-level practices, power-relations and identifications of those involved. In particular, this enables a focus on the resistances and struggles at these sites of conjuncture in the local implementation of new forms of co-governance. Combined with my identities focus on lived experience, this ensured the primacy of the participants’ voices and meaning-making in the practice of vertical co-governance within my findings.

My adapted research frame includes the following dimensions choice, challenge, responsibilisation, inequality, and the additional marginalisation and exclusion. This section outlines the Clarke et al (2007) model as well as my interpretation and developments.

Firstly ‘choice’, which draws on the Giddensian and communitarian perspectives to consider the potential of, and the resistances to, the recasting of citizens as consumers. Based on the construction of the citizen-consumer position, what is the ability of the range of publics to exercise choice? Within New Labour’s NPS discourse, choice is constructed as the key mechanism for influencing service delivery and a signal of effective citizen partnership. Utilising the dimension of choice in my research frame allows a focus on the ways that citizens, the police and other public officials use particular identity positions in the struggles and contestations around attempts to exercise (or resist) choice within these public meetings.

Secondly ‘challenge’, which considers the capacity of front-line staff, and institutions such as the police, for accepting challenges to their perspectives from community members, as well as citizens’ willingness and capacity to mount individual and collaborative challenges within PACT meetings. Clarke et al (2007) found that the police dealt least well with the collective citizen identity (the public) and coped least well with their challenges. My additional
contribution is to utilise the debates and issues surrounding deliberative democracy to consider the possibilities and limits to challenge within these locally situated public meetings.

The third dimension, ‘responsibility’, focuses on how power-relations are enacted within these public meetings and also allows consideration of responsibilisation. Foucault’s (1980) theorisation of governmentality suggests the co-option (rather than coproduction) of citizens and other new players within these new sites of co-governance and this serves to progress and legitimise government and official agendas (Garland 2001). This provides a direct contrast to the potential for citizen empowerment and the communitarian thesis that identifies the potential for ‘communities of fate’ to be enabled to exercise challenge and choice.

Fourthly ‘equality’, which refers to the potential of inequality of access and influence. It is an important dimension from critical political economy and is used to examine whether public service reforms produce, reproduce and deepen social inequalities. Research has shown that the disadvantaged may continue to experience high levels of crime and disorder and poor quality of life and receive inferior levels of service compared to more advantaged neighbourhoods and citizens (Foot 2009). Ruppert (2006:185) suggests that while ethnicity and class are never overtly mentioned in professional discourses they are acknowledged by professionals and can be seen as underpinning the differential levels of service that these different publics receive (Newman & Clarke 2009). Utilising equality and inequalities allows the examination of the experiences of co-governance in both advantaged and disadvantaged communities and on the ways that citizens and professionals construct their identities within these different neighbourhood meetings.

Finally, my additional dimension of ‘marginalisation & exclusion’ examines how public meetings can be seen as the province of ‘good citizens’ who are privileged and feel welcome in these new governance settings. My research frame allows consideration of who is disenfranchised and will examine the identifications of ‘absent citizens’. These silenced voices may undermine the level of diversity necessary to fulfil the promise of social democracy. How exclusion operates and who is marginalised is an important aspect of the practice of these public meetings.

The conducted research focuses mainly on the interactions within PACT meetings and the power-relations within these collaborative meetings; these are the important aspects of my
research process. Firstly it highlights the differences across meetings in relation to advantaged, disadvantaged and mixed BME areas. I illustrate how professional dominance and community voice and influence are performed in these local settings. Secondly, it examines the micro-level talk and practice of professionals to provide an in-depth and detailed analysis of centralising pressures as well as local needs. Thirdly, it draws on the micro-level talk of all actors to establish the potential for collective identifications, resistances and struggles. The research therefore contributes to existing literature on co-governance by providing an in-depth locality focus and detailed long-term ethnographic analysis of situated meanings and identities; particularly the importance of collective and individual identities in what has been described as the under researched setting of public meetings and co-governance (Llewellyn 2005, 2008a & b, Ansell & Gash 2007, Derkzen & Bock 2007). It provides an insight into the manoeuvres and developments through time in naturally occurring interaction. The local context is a unique experiment in sustained community engagement through regular public meetings based on universal geographical coverage. It offers an ideal opportunity to study the implementation and operation of community co-governance within different localities of social meaning and geo-histories.

4.5 Conclusion
This chapter has reviewed my conceptual themes, linking these to the three research questions that were developed to examine how power and agency are enacted within public meetings. It showed how the adaption and modification of Clarke et al (2007) was based on my engagement with the field and the type of data that I collected, as well as the conceptual reviews that had been undertaken. The chapter also identified the key analytical dimensions used in the research, highlighting the importance of choice, challenge, responsibilisation, inequality, marginalisation and exclusion for examining co-governance within PACT meetings.

My research is designed to make a key contribution to knowledge by studying naturally occurring Neighbourhood Policing public meetings and participant (professional and residents) interaction and talk about these meetings. This also leads to my choice of an ethnographic and longitudinal approach to study these public meetings in areas with different levels of advantage and disadvantage, including different levels of ethnic composition. Longitudinal study allows a proper account of their situated and social constructed nature and of the creation of shared meanings, ensuring that my findings reflect the process of
interaction and co-governance rather than what may be an unrepresentative snapshot. Ethnography suits such longitudinal research and enables tracking across individual sites of naturally occurring data to elucidate the power-relations and identifications of participants. The rationale and strengths of my research approach will be developed in chapter five, including an account of the setting of my study within City, South Wales.
Chapter Five Methodology

5.1 Introduction
Chapter five outlines my ontological and methodological position. It includes the construction and specification of my social constructionist epistemology, comparison and use of CDA, and choice of ethnographic methodological approach. It also reviews my research method, the informed choice of research site, data collection and analyses. It concludes with a discussion of my reflexive positioning, ethics and some detailed reflections on gaining access.

5.2 Adopting a Social Constructionist Position & Ontology
Ontology refers to assumptions about truth and knowledge in the social world. It explores the nature of social entities and questions whether they have an objective reality, external to the social actions of social actors. This contrast is often referred to as objectivism versus constructionism (Bryman & Bell 2007). An objective - or realist - perspective suggests that we can treat language and events as potential signifiers of deep, unseen structures that can produce a ‘god’s eye view’ or a window on the true reality that underpins our social world (Sayer 2004, Bryman & Bell 2007). From an objectivist approach, an organisation can be discussed as a tangible object with pre-given structures and constraining force that acts on and inhibits its members. The alternative constructionist approach does not suggest the possibility of - or access to - an underlying or single reality, knowledge or truth as ‘social phenomena and their meanings are continually being accomplished by social actors’ (ibid).

Social constructionism focuses on how individuals, groups and societies construct understandings of reality and lived experiences. This recognition of the socially constructed nature of social arrangements allows the possibility of them being (re)constructed along different contingent parameters (Mitev 2006). The focus on performance and practice is also a rejection of a dualist position that separates mind and body. Social constructionism covers a spectrum of approaches: from acknowledgement that agency is a component that needs to be considered along with structure (Skelcher et al 2005; Silverman, 2006) to placing the focus more directly on issues of agency and power where dialogic process is the prime focus of study (Sayer 2004, Thomas & Davies 2005, Bryman & Bell 2007). Softer forms of social constructionism accept the influence of the material world; Fairclough (2005b) recommends
that this dialogic process is studied within its contextualised and situated settings (McKee 2009).

My adopted social constructionist approach is based on an anti-essentialist ontology that focuses on construction as an active process that employs subjective and relational meaning-making (Young et al 2004) as an interpretive process. This combines a constructivist focus that emphasises meaning-making with what is made real and (constructed) through social processes and interaction, known as social constructionism (ibid). Gergen (2001:2) suggests that for constructionists ‘all claims to knowledge, truth, objectivity or insight are founded within communities of meaning-making – including the claims of constructionists themselves’. In epistemological terms, this places knowledge as the product of our social practices, interactions and negotiations; it is ‘an interactional and rhetorical process that reifies and externalises the material world which itself is constructed through discourse’ (Young et al 2004:376). This methodology elucidates dominant and alternate constructions and discourses. I also focus on a softer form that emphasises the contextualising of discourse (ibid) to place social constructions within their context; this approach considers ‘how people draw on, and indeed deploy or deny, common and institutionally [situated] understandings […] to construct their own account’. This places action and discourse within their historical construction with the potential to focus on both ‘context, culture, the person-environment interaction and practice’ (ibid:377). This grounding of constructions within their historical settings challenges the critique of some approaches to social constructionism as overly relational and anti-realist. The strength of this approach suggests the possibility that a constructivist epistemology of knowledge and truth can be used to conduct empirical research and compile findings of situated social constructions. It can potentially make a contribution to both understanding and practice (ibid).

Social constructionist approaches have been utilised within critical organization studies, critical criminology and inclusive / collaborative governance literatures to consider issues of representativeness, visibility and missing voices (Hardy, Lawrence & Phillips 1998b). Some inter-organisation studies of collaborations have focused on socially constructed power-relations within their context (Beech & Huxham 2003, Gasper et al 2008). This epistemology permits direct access to the lived experience of what has been called the ambiguous and complex research field of partnership and collaboration (Skelcher et al 2005, Munroe et al 2008). Of key relevance is my approach to the study of texts and the discursive construction
of identities and power-relations. The next section introduces Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as the approach adopted in my research.

5.3 Critical Discourse Analyses

In line with my social constructionist and identities focus, discursive texts are not viewed as neutral or a window on inner realities of identity or beliefs but as socially constructed speech acts that sustain shared meanings that are themselves constructive, and which (re)construct different, more or less stable versions and positions. In this sense, discourse is action-oriented; a means through which people accomplish and perform social actions such as blaming, justifying, dismissing, complimenting and supporting. Discourse is also situated and sequentially positioned in relation to what has come before and what comes after within interactive talk or an individual’s narrative. This emphasises the contextual factors surrounding social interaction and the importance of these to the meaning and interpretation of discourses. For example, what would be a credible or appropriate contribution within or about this PACT meeting (Phillips & Hardy 2002). Discourse has also been used to study differences in capacity to participate between communities (Clarke et al 2007). This has included identifying the different struggles with consumer-citizen identities that might be experienced by ‘communities of fate’ and disadvantaged underclasses compared to advantaged, white and middle-class communities (cf Gilling 2007, Utting 2009). A key value of discourse analysis is the visibility it provides to the identities and struggles of all actors in this process, be they councillors, officials or other partners.

Discourse has been defined as the range of texts - including spoken, interactive talk and written - on a topic or object that constrain, sustain understandings and recreate this object (cf Phillips & Hardy 2002, Benwell & Stokoe 2006). There are numerous and different approaches to working with discourse: the positivistic, decontextualised thin counting and sorting of content analysis; narrative analysis that involves little or no researcher analyses; discursive psychology and conversation analysis that attend to text as ‘topic’ and look at the work the text performs (such as in the devices used to construct power-relations) (Guba & Lincoln 2004, Denzin 2004, Benwell & Stokoe 2006). CDA concentrates on text as a ‘resource’ to investigate an issue or topic and examines how it is performed in micro-situated discourses while drawing on wider macro-discourses and discursive resources (such as power-relations within co-governance). This has led to the criticism that CDA focuses too much on the development of theory and concept building and does not sufficiently examine
the empirical analysis of situated practice (ibid, McKee 2009). Authors such as McKee (2009) and Fairclough (2005a & b) address these criticisms by conducting situated empirical research. I follow their approach; my theorising - like theirs - arises from the cumulative and empirically based study of practice.

It is important to consider how the use of CDA can reveal differences in power-relations and nuanced performances within situated practice. Fairclough (2003) offers a model that combines the analytical traditions of close textual analysis: an interpretivist or micro-sociological approach to actively created sense-making and practice to produce ‘orderly’ or ‘accountable’ worlds; together with the macro-sociological traditions of analysing social practice in relation to social structures (Fairclough 1994). It requires the simultaneous analysis of three levels of discourse: text (micro-level textual elements), discursive practice (the production, distribution, consumption and interpretation of texts), and social practice (the situational and institutional context) (Fairclough 2003, Vaara et al 2008:3). Its strength is the possibility of tracing the explanatory connections between social practices and their discursive practice, including the way social structures can be seen to shape and influence - and in turn be affected by - the outcomes of members’ practices (Fairclough 1994). I adopt this approach and describe the mechanics of utilising these three levels in the data analysis section.

By focusing on CDA, it will be possible to look at the role of discursive activity in constituting and sustaining unequal power-relations (Fairclough & Wodak 1997, Phillips & Hardy 2002:25). CDA enables us to ‘describe and explain how power abuse is enacted, reproduced or legitimated by the talk and text of dominant groups and institutions’ (Van Dijk 1996:84). Within this study, the approach enables analysis of ‘dialogical struggle (or struggles) as reflected in the privileging of a particular discourse and the marginalization of others’ (Keenoy et al 1997:150) in, for example, professional and lay discourses. The approach draws particularly on the work of Fairclough, focusing on how discursive activity structures the social space within which actors act through the constitution of concepts, objects and subject positions. It emphasises the distal context: how it privileges some actors at the expense of others, and how broad changes in the discourse result in different constellations of advantage and disadvantage, emphasising the relational nature of power. Taken-for-granted practices will be revealed through the new subject positions from which actors speak and act. The cumulative effect can result in the problematisation of existing
discourses and the gradual normalisation of new bodies of knowledge (Maguire & Hardy 2009). Maguire and Hardy (2009:148) introduce the concept of ‘defensive institutional work’ and illustrate how actors carry out disruptive and defensive work by authoring texts. This has been discussed as the operation of discourse as a normalisation process that makes the taken-for-granted invisible. It also suggests that discourse analysis allows the normalised invisible to become visible (Rowe 2007). As Phillips & Hardy (2002) show, the discourse perspective and method allow us to empirically and theoretically incorporate an analysis of identity work and, beyond this, establish the identification of broader contextualised themes.

The three levels approach to CDA is suited to my study as it enables close examination of the politics, power and lived experience within co-governance settings, including the comparison of practices across different localities. This is of critical importance to my study of the practice of co-governance with its focus on context, situated performance and discourse in revealing how identities and power-relations are constructed and reconstructed in practice. Importantly, it also builds on Rasche & Chia’s (2009:721) suggestion that identity work encompasses more than just talk; it also involves performances which include ‘bodily sayings’ and ‘bodily doings’. This concurs with views of identities as situated, embodied and action-oriented discourse that has consequential, discretionary implications for individual and collective lived experiences (cf Jenkins 2008). My research is a situated ethnography of practice and discursive performance. Section 5.4 demonstrates that ethnography is the most appropriate frame through which to conduct social constructionist and empirical research that involves the longitudinal and contextualised performance and practice of co-governance within different neighbourhood PACT meetings.

5.4 Methodological Approach: Ethnography

A qualitative ethnographic approach provides a mode of research and study of local social practices that is open and exploratory. It offers the most natural solution to gain access to adequate research data through which to understand relational power processes in situ (Alvesson & Willmott 2002). This maximises the possibility that the object of study is seen as naturally as possible - ‘the way things normally go’ - or what others call the taken-for-granted (Hardy et al 2005).

There is a long history of organisational (cf Kunda 1992) as well as cultural and anthropological ethnography; Van Maanen’s (2003) study of beat police work is a classic
example of ethnography in the police setting. Ethnography focuses on contextualised performance and practice of longitudinal fieldwork. It examines how things are done to reveal actual practice that pragmatically draws on and provides an alternative to expert theorising (Van Maanen 2011:21,31). One of its key strengths is its longitudinal and embedded nature which seeks to avoid the snapshot approaches associated with positivistic and quantitative research, as well as qualitative blitzkrieg research involving short shadowing or observation. The embedding of the ethnographer allows the production of a research account that problematises the things natives or members take-for-granted (ibid). Its primary focus on naturally occurring performance differentiates it from other qualitative methods that rely solely on reported data or talk about a topic. Ethnography provides both a means through which data – including discourse – is collected for analysis and a means through which the researcher engages with understanding local meaning and systems within the field of study. The text generated in the research process from my recordings and field notes becomes the main resource from which I present my readings of research material. My aim is to give voice to all, and reflects the view that the privileged single voice of the ethnographer and hegemonic master-participant voices is no more (Van Maanen 1988). By immersion in the field of study, I - the ethnographic researcher - am able to make sense of the situated meaning of what is being said, by whom, with what purpose and with what outcome.

Ethnography is characterised by providing situated rich thick analyses, historically based in one location. However, in modern complex societies it is sometimes hard to draw clear physical boundaries around a site or topic. Recent theorising has discussed ethnography as a ‘thick and thin’ mid-range methodology that is suited to researching life because it allows the temporal connectivity and tracking of objects, issues and people (Marcus 1995). This expands the boundaries to include other physically located and relevant sites (Marcus 2002, Hine 2007). This multi-sited perspective aims to locate phenomena - or the locale it studies - in a global (or wider) context, mapping its connections to other often distant sites (including economic, political and symbolic events and processes) (Saukko 1998). It enables understandings to be seen as distributed, de-territorialised, less coherent and bounded, displaying a range of indeterminacy, indifference and ambivalence tied together within the sphere of social relationships, and indirectly to place (Van Maanen 2011:12). Connectivity has been used in other qualitative research methods to consider extended cases. Multi-sited ethnography is proposed for the study of communities, citizenship, inter-governmental
collaborations, identities, networks and social movements, including public participation and political organization (Vertovec 1999).

My main focus is on the collection of ‘thick’ data that explores performance and power-relations through empirical and ethnographic work that looks at agency in practice within specific PACTs. My data is richly embedded in the localised contexts (McKee 2009). This approach produces interactive and discursive data that are best interpreted by discourse analyses to reveal relational identities, identifications and contestations. Adopting a multi-sited methodology allows me to look at the practice of PACT - the construction of citizen-consumers and power-relations - as a multi-sited and multi-locality phenomenon connected through the multiple ties and interactions that link people and institutions (Vertovec 1999:456). The multi-sited focus permitted the comparison of the enactment and lived experience of PACT in three localities of advantage, disadvantage and mixed advantage, including ethnic composition. The strength of multi-sited ethnography is the possibility of coherently tracing the practice of PACT and talk about PACT, as well as the connection to other empirical settings.

5.4.1 Research Methods
My longitudinal research design involved attending PACT meetings at three main sites over a period of 26 months and tracing the construction and reconstruction of PACT identities and power-relations through time and locations. Meetings have been studied as episodes of conversational identity work which achieve, maintain, change, elaborate and communicate identifications (Karreman & Alvesson 2001). This perspective can be employed to look at public meetings. Studies have critiqued formal public consultations as stage-managed, with highly controlled agendas and chair functions in which citizens have to contest existing power-relations and struggle to move the goal posts to enable them speak out (Fairclough 2005a). This suggests that more research is needed to look at the organisation of the cut and thrust of political debate, particularly how audiences intervene, interrupt, disrupt and spontaneously talk within both formal and informal public meetings (Llewellyn 2005).

PACTs represent a new, highly informal public meeting to collaboratively set three local CDQL priorities. Any member of the public can attend to speak about issues within their locality; there is no need to pre-register questions and - while involving police and partners’ information and feedback - the floor is meant to be open to residents to speak and obtain a response (and possibly reassurance) from police and other officials. It is therefore possible to
focus on how co-governance through these informal public meetings is enacted in the talk and conversations within different PACT meetings and localities (such as advantaged, mixed and disadvantaged neighbourhoods) and how and what identifications and positions are constructed and resisted (such as citizen-consumer, responsibilised, enabled or other). This allows examination of how power-relations are performed and enacted within a site of co-governance and deliberative democracy that is part of local community-police engagement.

As well as examining PACT meetings, I traced professionals’ talk about PACT within the development and introduction of City’s six sectorial Area Neighbourhood Management (ANM) meetings. These meetings are neighbourhood-focused horizontal collaborations and multi-agency initiatives between official partners; addressing PACT priorities forms part of their agenda. This is supported in some sectors by sub-consultative meetings to which councillors are invited. The focus examined discourse through different identifications, including the collective identities and collaborative work within and about PACT. I also traced the talk about PACT by residents and councillors, and attended two of the four PACT Chairs’ meetings. These were an attempt by some of the chairs to bring together chairpersons from across City to develop an overall picture on the operation of PACT and potentially develop a more strategic avenue of communication with City BCU police.

I also held interviews and focus groups. My elite interviews included senior police staff within City BCU and community and partnership specialists within Southern Police headquarters. My aim was to gain an overview from decision-makers and seniors regarding PACT and its introduction; I interviewed the six sector Neighbourhood Inspectors, some Neighbourhood Sergeants and the front-line staff involved in PACT. It also drew in non-uniformed Front Line Support Officers (FLSO) who administer and sometimes attend PACT as well as Police Beat Managers (Police Constables, PCs) and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) who are the most regular attendees at PACTs, sometimes with a Sergeant.

Area Neighbourhood Management Meetings are a key part of City’s introduction of the recommendations from the Beecham Report (2006) to introduce neighbourhood-based service delivery of public services based on multi-agency joined-up working to provide focused neighbourhood solutions. In City, these began in 2007 with an initial focus on CDQL issues. Initially, Local Authority Officials ‘volunteered’ to be involved; formative Network initiatives began to establish collaborative work and remits. At this time, the City BCU Commander and Deputy Head of the Council led this initiative. It is intended that Neighbourhood Management and its area meetings will have representation from all relevant Local Authority service areas: Police, Fire Service, Health and relevant voluntary agencies. The formal ratification of Neighbourhood Management, its structures, terms of reference and membership came in mid-2009.
of Inspector. This gave the perspective of the staffs representing the police and the conduct of PACT, as well as the view of the Inspectors who ultimately control and manage the numerous PACT meetings, the allocation of resources and the delivery of priorities within their sector.

Within the local authority (and partners) I interviewed a range of public service officials ranging from senior operational managers to their department heads within the community, partnership, housing, cleansing and rubbish, trading standards, youth services, parks, and CSP and arson team. This gave me a senior and operational perspective, including those who had and had not attend PACT and worked on CDQL issues that arose within PACT or might be involved in dealing with PACT priorities. Some of these people were involved in ANM meetings and were able to comment on PACT and its relationship to the establishment of this horizontal partnership. I also interviewed councillors who attended my three main PACTs, as well as some of those involved in other PACTs across City, to gain their perspective on PACT. Finally, I interviewed PACT chairpersons from the PACTs I followed and some other key PACTs within City; this was based on tracing issues or particular PACTs brought to my attention through earlier meetings and conversations. I focused on their experiences and views of successes, strengths, hopes, disappointments and assessment of PACT, and their relationship with councillors and police within the PACT process. With this perspective I also interviewed a number of regular resident attendees, although it was easiest to make contact with the majority of residents through holding brief 5-10 minute conversations before or after PACT meetings. I supplemented this with a focus group at each of my three main PACTs; to capture views from those who were attending and allow them to comment on the success, failures, strengths and weaknesses of the PACT process. Elites, councillors and residents all commented on levels of attendance as well as the type of people who do or do not attend PACT meetings. To trace this theme, I conducted some interviews with those that can be described as absent residents. These interviews included people from a range of ethnicities, those from advantaged and disadvantaged areas, and young people.

The range of methods I used included observation of meetings - both PACT and associated meetings - focus groups and interviews. In meetings, I acted as a non-participant observer of PACT meetings, making recordings (tapes and notes) of the meetings I attended. I supplemented these recordings with field notes and follow-up conversations with participants (Guba & Lincoln 2004). This is a traditional ethnographic method and allows the researcher
to obtain accurate and detailed material to facilitate micro-level exploration of practice and texts (Van Maanen 1988). This method allowed a rich understanding of this type of deliberative democracy, unachievable through solely observing meetings. Interviews are an accepted qualitative methodology and I conducted these in a semi-structured and reflexive way that coproduced data arising from the interaction that involved both the researched and researcher (Hesse-Biber & Leavy 2004). The focus groups were timed when residents were comfortable interacting with myself as researcher (Bloor et al 2001). With permission, these were recorded and transcribed, supplemented by my field notes (ibid).

5.4.2 Research Setting & Selection of PACT Meetings
This section explains my selection of PACT meetings within City. It includes a review of key contextual factors important to the conduct of my situated research, including indicators of advantage, disadvantage, mixed and BME composition for the tracked PACT neighbourhoods. My field work was conducted within City BCU (part of Southern Police Force) that covers this major city with its international sports and entertainment venues and a mid-2006 population estimate of 317,500 (Office of National Statistics). It is a small city compared to conurbations in England (e.g. Birmingham, Manchester etc.) and experiences city and urban types of crime and disorder at lower levels than many of its English counterparts. As reported by the local authority Senior Manager for Community Safety and Regeneration:

> City has such low levels crime and disorder – nothing like other UK cities - that Crime and Disorder Reduction and community safety duties are given a very low priority with no set targets and little understanding of the implications of duties on all council departments […] in the scheme of things this means PACT comes even lower in the scheme of things […] Off radar for many (InterviewOMMike29.08.07)

The first PACT meeting in City took place in April 2006. Southern Police had a blueprint for PACT - and timescales for its introduction - from the Home Office, including guides issued by the National Centre for Policing Excellence (NCPE 2006). This emphasised the community’s right to ‘call to action’, to increase accountability and to demand community engagement by Police Forces as encapsulated in the Police Justice Act 2006 (Crawford 2007: 891). At the commencement of my study there were approximately 44 PACTs across City’s 29 Wards.
The 2007 HMIC Inspection for Southern Police highlighted that a key issue for this Force was the maintenance of sufficient channels of communication with the public and users of its services. These problems were experienced across its operational area, resulting in it being ranked 43rd out of 43 Forces (across England & Wales) for their capacity and maintenance of public ‘access’ and ease of ‘contact’. As with many other Forces, this included issues with keeping the public informed of progress and outcomes on reported incidents. At the time PACT was being introduced in City, the police and their local authority partners were trialling a new contact system based on the use of a 101 non-emergency contact number to report less serious crime, disorder, ASB and quality of life issues (e.g. noise, rubbish etc.). This was the partnership focus and background within which PACT and neighbourhood management were introduced. PACT meetings and the Neighbourhood Policing Pledge were also directed at improving relationships and communication with the public. The police prioritise using PACT meetings to inform people of local police action and stress the importance of reporting information via 101 as this produces hotspot data that influences tasking decisions. By the time my fieldwork ended, the 101 non-emergency system had been extended to the rest of the Southern Police and its six other Local Authorities.

Selecting the three PACTs to follow in depth was based on two key sources of information. I used demographic, education, income, health, crime and ASB data to identify advantaged mixed or disadvantaged areas. Secondly, I consulted with City’s Neighbourhood Police Inspectors and their FLSOs to obtain their analysis of PACT meetings, the pros and cons, local history and what they saw as the successes and difficulties. This included their view of the different neighbourhood contexts - types of area, residents and issues - of the various PACTs. It became immediately clear that PACTs were not uniformly the same: issues varied, as did the tone, ease or difficulty of meetings. Some of this was reported as related to the area (such as levels of disorder or disadvantage) and some to attendees who may be considered easier or more difficult to handle. I identified three key issues from the Inspectors’ points of view: the role played by councillors, whether or not the meetings had an independent community chairperson and the general levels of attendance. There was a view that police staff who attended - whether Sergeant, PC or PCSO - should have some skills and confidence in handling the public and running meetings. It was recognised that not everyone had the required ability or confidence. Appendix One shows the initial tabulations from these first interviews.
The factual information used in my final selection is publically available Ward-based data compiled from census information (see Appendix Two), combined with identifying areas as advantaged and disadvantaged utilising the updated Welsh Multiple Index of Deprivation (WIMD 2005) and the Neighbourhood Improvement Plan (NIP 2007). The WIMD is also used by Local Authorities, European, governmental and non-governmental funding bodies to target funding and services, as well as by the police as part of their profiling of areas. It is an established and tested method that combines separate indices - including census and other data - on income, employment, housing, educational achievement, crime and disorder. The areas of advantage and disadvantage tracked in this study - Whitewood, Evergreen & Redbank - are among the most disadvantaged and most advantaged within Wales as well as City (WIMD 2005).

Ethnicity data was taken from City Local Authority published statistics that are based on census data updated from other data sources. This is the same data that has been used in practitioners’ initial Neighbourhood profiling and Council plans. Within City, the range of BME / ethnic minority population was highest in three wards (with19-16%); the other wards in city were mainly under 1%. The original figures were taken from City Local Authority Neighbourhood Renewal Plan (NRP 2007). These were updated in 2010 with their availability for smaller areas of 1,500 residents. Redbank is an area of mixed ethnicity (18%) and advantage, while Evergreen and Whitewood are 98-99% white. Table 5.1 below outlines PACT selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>14,754</td>
<td>Ranked 2nd most deprived Ward in City (10% most deprived in Wales)</td>
<td>White (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbank South</td>
<td>Mixed (Predominantly disadvantaged)</td>
<td>12,009</td>
<td>Combined North &amp; South Redbank is 11th most deprived Ward in City (15% most deprived in Wales). North Redbank ranks as one of least deprived areas in City.</td>
<td>Mixed (Combined is 18% ethnic) WIMD (2005) South Redbank Super Lower Output Areas Range 27-34% BME / ethnic²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitewood</td>
<td>Advantaged</td>
<td>11,281</td>
<td>One of top two least deprived Wards in City (5% least deprived in Wales)</td>
<td>White (99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Advantaged, Disadvantaged</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>White &amp; Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Selection of PACT Meetings
Note¹: See Appendix Two – Population figures ONS adjusted 2006
Note²: See Appendix Two - Super Lower Output Area figures (1,500 pop) are from updated local authority data
5.4.3 Data Collection & Sources of Data

A key strength of my research is the depth of naturally occurring data I collected with an emphasis on embodied discourse and identity work. The longitudinal collection of rich thick data avoids snapshot observations that would potentially give a superficial or limited view of meetings. I achieved this by tracking PACT meetings for a substantial period to reveal potential differences and continuities of identity positions and collaborative working through time. Table 5.2 below outlines my data collection and 26 month fieldwork between March 2007 and October 2009. It shows the number (44) of PACT meetings I attended for the three main PACTs (33) and additional City PACT meetings (11). These three locations respectively reflect a disadvantaged, mixed and advantaged neighbourhood. I attended 15 meetings in Evergreen, 11 in Redbank and 7 in Whitewood. I attended additional PACTs to scope my initial selection of three PACTs and to trace key issues raised about the operation of PACTs. As part of building my own understanding and following the talk about PACT, I attended two City PACT Chairpersons’ meetings, a range of 24 other meetings, ANM, sub-consultative meetings and partnership workshops. By attending ANM meetings, I was able to trace discussions between formal partners and councillors concerning PACT priorities and the PACT process, not just PACT meetings per se. The three focus groups gave residents an opportunity to directly express their voices concerning PACT meetings. I supplemented the real time observations of meeting interactions with individual interviews with a range of local authority and service providers (16), police (34), local voluntary sector partners (9), councillors (8), PACT community chairpersons (7) and formal interviews with residents (12) and informal conversations (70 plus). I also drew on some written texts, including local policy documents, reports, websites and national statements. This resulted in a total of 44 Neighbourhood PACT meetings, 26 other meetings (including two City PACT Chairpersons), 86 interviews – plus conversations – and three focus groups. The methodology provided a wealth of rich, longitudinal data but it was a challenge to deal with the amount of live data, transcripts and recorded data collected.

Building on my primary focus - the experiences of collaborative working within PACT - I attempted to follow outcomes and track PACT priorities within ANM meetings. To do this I drew on statistical data and reports, including the restricted access report Safer Capital Strategic Assessment (Issue May 2009), and the UPSI (2009) study. I also attempted to trace action on PACT priorities within partner organisations – particularly the police – but found
there was no clear or separate tracking of actions, tasking trails or audit of activities to follow. This is discussed in more detail in my findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research site / Type of coproduction</th>
<th>Longitudinal Time-line</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood PACT Meetings</td>
<td>March 2007 – October 2009</td>
<td>15 of 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 2007 – October 2009</td>
<td>9 of 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 2007 – September 2009</td>
<td>6 of 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 2008 – November 2009</td>
<td>1 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian Women’s PACT Redbank</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autumn &amp; Winter 2008</td>
<td>2 of 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other City PACTs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City PACT Chairs Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership &amp; Network Meetings</td>
<td>June 2007 - September 2007</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 2008 – May 2009</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Partnership Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Network Meetings/Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Neighbourhood Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Sector (SWS)</td>
<td>January 2008 – July 2009</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWS sub-consultation meetings</td>
<td>August 2008 – June 2009</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sector</td>
<td>November 2008 &amp; February 2009</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite &amp; Resident Interviews</td>
<td>March 2007 – March 2009</td>
<td>Total = 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officers (incl 101 &amp; FLSOs)</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority Officers (incl City CSP)</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Councillors</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Sector Officers/Partners</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Residents</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>12 (70+)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACT Chairpersons (not including PACT conversations)</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three PACT Resident Focus Groups</td>
<td>July 2008 – December 2009</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Evergreen, Redbank &amp; Whitewood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional texts</td>
<td>Various dates (as given where this material is cited)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Local Authority Committee Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Internal Community Safety Partnership reports on PACT, ASB, and Neighbourhood Sector Incident Profiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Southern Police PACT Meeting Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Websites (e.g. our bobby.com and Home Office, Police etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher Recording &amp; Transcripts</td>
<td>PACT meetings were occasionally recorded / all were noted. Most formal interviews were recorded some were notes only. The researcher also made field notes. An example of a verbatim transcribed PACT meeting is given in Appendix Three.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· PACT &amp; other meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Field Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Data Collection/ Recording Time Line
Note 1 70+ refers to the numerous PACT meeting conversations held at the beginning or end of meetings. There were many of these particularly with resident attendees.

5.5 Data Analysis
I have established that we can examine how partnership and identities are constructed within discourse (spoken, interactive talk and written texts) and how this organises the experience of collaboration. This emphasises the need to understand the discursive struggles that
participants undertake to create and control shared social meanings within the implementation and practice of public service policies. Co-governance becomes a site for the potential ‘construction and reconstruction of agreed purposes, objectives, outcomes and consequences through continuing interaction between officials and citizens’ (Prior & Barnes 2009:201). This suggests the importance of maintaining a focus on the different and potentially conflicting positions of participants – the actors - in co-governance within this space for ‘openness and indeterminacy’ (Alvesson & Skoldberg 2003a:364). I utilise Fairclough’s three level model of simultaneous discourse analyses to reveal and denaturalise the taken-for-granted truth claims and the operation of power revealed in the talk within and about PACT meetings (Fairclough 2005b, Davies et al 2007). This means the texts produced can be explored to identify both the predominant or hegemonic discourse as well as the range of other available discourses (Williams 2006). My approach to discourse aims to counter claims of a single coherence or truth by exposing power-relations and tensions to reveal the underlying contradictions, paradoxes and contested nature of texts (Thomas & Davies 2005). CDA allows us to look at power as a relational and constructed entity rather than a fixed essentialist categorisation. Within a specified context, this enables the possibilities of identifying which voices and positions are either privileged or silenced (Simpson & Lewis 2007).

My study’s main focus and data is drawn from the observation of interactive public PACT meetings as an example of the citizen-led co-governance initiatives introduced as part of NPM and NPS reforms. The local situated practice of vertical coproduction and co-governance is the key issue. The constructions of the consumer and the provider of services are problematised within these changes. This is explored through a focus on identities and power-relations. I study lived experience, issues of agency, and power-relations within the situated and dialogic process and practice of partnership and collaboration that emphasises situated discourse as a performative expression of local history and context (Hughes & Rowe 2007). The critical focus is the study of interactions within PACT public meetings supplemented with a range of texts produced in other partnership meetings and workshops, in interviews and in focus groups.

My analysis utilises Fairclough’s (1994) three levels of CDA as a way of prioritising the participants’ voices and situated meaning-making. Level one, micro-level textual analysis, is used to undertake a close reading of texts and their ascribed social forms and conventions.
within text production and interpretation, rather than grammatical meanings. Fairclough (1994:75) suggests these conventions will reveal ‘generally heterogeneous, a complex diverse, overlapping, and sometimes contradictory meanings […] as texts are highly ambivalent and open to multiple interpretations’. This draws on choice and use of vocabulary, cohesion (how clauses and sentences are linked together) and text structure (the large scale, organisational properties of texts that reveal what episodes are combined in what ways and in what order). For example, vocabulary allows us to identify alternative wordings that might reveal the struggle over meaning and the relationships between the meaning of a word as a form of hegemony; as well as revealing the conflict between alternate stances by reliance on particular word domains (ibid). My micro-level textual analysis focuses on the struggles over meaning within the choice of vocabulary and intensive use of word domains by the different actors, and the identifications and positions these reveal.

Level two, discursive practice, looks at members’ social production and how texts are used as resources, brought in, given dominance or less weight. It draws on three additional categories or features of texts: the force of utterances or acts of speech (promises, requests, threats etc.), coherence (how the whole text and its meaning are constructed and makes sense through either explicit linkages or revealed ideological and political assumptions), and intertextuality of texts (Fairclough 1994). Intertextuality is particularly important to my longitudinal ethnography. Intertextuality is the extent to which texts are demarcated or exist as ‘merged snatches’ of other texts, thus displaying their historicity and how they ‘always constitute additions to existing chains of speech and communication’ (Bakhtin 1986:94 cited in Fairclough 1994:84) and the prior texts to which they respond. Text production and consumption within the local context will vary and have variable outcomes. Consider the different ways that a journal article, a casual conversation, an argument or a declaration of war are produced, and the differences in their outcome (ibid). Therefore, it is important to examine how, which, and for what purpose discursive resources are drawn. There is also need to understand the effect of context on discourse. Context is utilised in two ways: to signify sequential placement and force within the text itself, and the overall nature of the social context of the text which reduces ambivalence and aids interpretation through the foregrounding or backgrounding of certain elements (ibid). My analysis of discursive practice looks at how texts are used as resources to build identifications and positions as well as challenge and contest other interpretations. I draw on the intertextuality of texts as part of chains of speech and communication within PACT meetings, between PACT meetings, from
talk about PACT in partnership, in the focus groups and in different interview settings. It also utilises the force of utterances, particularly their status as promises, requests, threats, politeness and force of emotion, including anger and frustration.

Finally, I utilise the third level, discourse as social practice, to explore the relationship of the local PACT to broader institutional hegemonic struggles, for example over co-governance. Fairclough (1994) suggests it provides a matrix to examine the constitution of alliances, the integration rather than mere dominance of subordinate groups and the potential to win consent. This illuminates the precarious and contested equilibrium that integrates local and semi-autonomous institutions and power-relations, and enables local struggles to be partly shaped and interpreted as hegemonic struggles (ibid). It directs our attention to orders of discourse and linkages, framing and movements between national, institutional and local discourses. I show how local texts reference and use the resource of ideological and political texts concerning co-governance and vertical coproduction that link social practice to these broader discourses.

The skill and challenge for the researcher or discourse analyst is to reflexively reveal how text and talk produce identifiable subject positions that extend beyond the immediate message and produce and disseminate particular and legitimate ways of knowing (Muncie 2006). Phillips and Hardy (2002) describe discourse analysis and discursive research techniques not as a method but as the interpretive analysis of some form of text (written, spoken, and multimedia) to build an understanding of the role of discourse in constituting social reality. This suggests an iterative and reflexive approach based on immersing oneself in the discursive data, and using this to guide theoretical and analytic insights to support discourse, identities, and narrative analyses (Czarniawska 1997, Huxham & Hibbert 2008). Working in this iterative and reflexive way with the data led – in 2010 - to my adoption and development of the Clarke et al (2007) categorisations to look at the problematics of the collective citizen-consumer identity and the identifications of residents and councillors. This emergent aspect of the analyses makes it impossible to provide a single template as themes may emerge as researchers work with their data (Phillips & Hardy 2002). They suggest (a) establishing what the actors construct and (b) examining how the constructions relate to the actors’ strategies in the emergent object, in this case the collaboration and partnership space (ibid 2002:76). I originally attempted to use Nvivo (7/8), a qualitative data/coding computer package. This proved difficult as too early thematic coding of decontextualized interactions were produced:
it was important to read the interaction as it developed and flowed through meetings. However, Nvivo can be useful to store and access thematic extracts once a final coding scheme (understanding) is developed.

The key analytic approach was to maintain the contextualised ‘diverse and necessarily social and subjective’ (Whipp 1988:24) contributions of the actors as part of longitudinal chains of interactions and in the development of discursive positions both within individual meetings and from previous meetings / incidents. To preserve the text’s integrity requires careful managing of the research process and analyses of complex and contextualised reality. This involves adding the analytic and conceptual dimension through undertaking a close reading of transcribed meeting texts and recordings utilising the multi-layered sense-making and analytic approach of observation, induction, deduction, verification and further observation proposed by Pettigrew (1990:285). Pettigrew (1990:281) suggests this is a complex process and pathway ‘to avoid data asphyxiation’. Through levels of analyses that begin with immersion in the narrative and ‘analytic storytelling [then moves] to interpretive and theoretical analyses [which explicitly] attempt to link emerging conceptual and theoretical ideas. [Made stronger by connecting with] analytical themes within the case and wider theoretical debates in the literature’ (ibid:280). As is clear from Table 5.2, I had a wealth of meeting and interview data. Within the confines of PhD requirements, what is presented is a fraction of this data chosen to illustrate the themes and nature of the social construction of these PACT meetings.

5.6 Reflexivity
My approach represents a modern polyvocal and reflexive ethnography with the value position of participants and the researcher accepted as influencing - and being influenced by - participation (Alvesson & Deetz 2000). As Czarniawska (1997:4) reminds us, both researched and researchers are ‘continuously’ involved in ‘formulating, editing, applauding and refusing various elements of ever-produced narrative’. Thomas & Davies (2005) refer to this as coproduction of the research space. This places the researcher at the heart of coproduction rather than the simple ‘mediator’ of pre-existing interests, making them an active agent in the ongoing, mutual co-construction and reconstruction that is ever-changing within the research process. The conduct of ethnography is seen as processual, including what is involved in constructing, maintaining and redefining ‘what you want’ and ‘what I want’, handling both divergent sensemaking (such as a powerful gatekeeper or set of
gatekeepers opposition to giving and maintaining access) and building convergent sensemaking (such as finding an alliance or compatible basis to proceed, perhaps by agreeing an exchange of expertise for access or mutual benefit for continuing participation) (Neyland 2008). This emphasises the negotiation of accountability within the continual flow of meaning-making (Boden 1994). It also reminds us that research and the researched are not neutral, and that for the researcher the choice of topic, methods, analysis and writing-up will be made and best considered in a reflexive and positional way (cf Hammersley & Atkinson 2007, Crang & Crook 2007). I am therefore co-producer and need to own my value positions and choices as these interact and form part of the shaping of my participation, conduct and write-up of the research. It is within this reflexive processual framing that I will discuss ethics and access.

5.7 Ethics, Access & Personal Reflections
My research was funded by a Richard Whipp Scholarship at Cardiff University and was tied to interdisciplinary research of Neighbourhood Policing. As researcher, I had prior experience of working with inner-city communities post the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry, with issues of potential institutional racism in police forces affecting both BME communities views and interactions with police, and with the experiences of BME officers within Welsh Police Forces. My history with police and community development activities means that I am experienced and comfortable in these settings and with these actors. My funding coincided with the recent introduction of Southern’s police-community engagement public meetings and co-governance (namely PACTs). Coupled with my preference for qualitative research, this led me to consider a core focus on the lived experience of these meetings. Additionally, they provide a public source of naturally occurring data available in the public domain and present no ethical issues in either recording electronically or in note-taking. Ethics approval was based on maintaining the anonymity of participants, such as removing names and location specific information (see Appendix Four). This fits the conduct of PACT as police discourage the naming of specific intelligence in open forums which they clarify privately with residents. I did ask permission to take photographs, and considered video and multi-modal methods to capture situated verbal and non-verbal actions, but residents at all three PACTs were firm in their opposition and did not give permission for photographic evidence of their attendance. For disadvantaged Evergreen, this seemed to be linked to real fears and concerns at being known to attend (fear of retribution) as this was a community where people traditionally ‘don’t talk to the police’. At advantaged Whitewood - where
people came smartly attired and seemingly with new ‘hair-do’s’ - no explanation was provided but my request was flatly declined. Multi-modal methods were dismissed as unacceptable to resident participants.

I obtained full written ethical consent and approval from individuals involved in the one-to-one interviews, focus groups, ANM and other partnership meetings. A copy of the form is provided in Appendix Four. It provided anonymity and confidentiality, and consent for information to be used for academic research and publication. With regard to access to organisations (for example Police and Local Authority) and pre-attending PACT public meetings, access was negotiated and approved by key gatekeepers from these organisations. This gave permission to ask staff (such as Inspectors, Sergeants, PCs and PCSOs) if they were prepared to participate, and for me to record interviews and/or meetings.

As Crang and Crook (2007) suggest, organisational gatekeepers have their own agendas in taking the risk of contributing to research. Gatekeepers were positive about co-governance and their organisation’s response to the introduction of PACT meetings and Neighbourhood Management. They openly suggested that they did not expect all staff to be as positive but saw this as the way forward; they recognised a reforming aspect of the NPM and NPS agendas that needed to be, and was increasingly being, taken-on-board. Reassurance was needed: the data I collected would be confidential and used only for academic research (not wanting surprises or bad press), and they tested, in their relationship with me, my account of being trustworthy and what might be called an ‘honest broker’. I was under pressure to credentialise myself and my research. This continued through introductions to different participants and settings, and was essential to maintaining access.

5.7.1 Researcher Identity

I was ‘outsider’ in the conduct of this research as I did not have participant status as either police, official or local resident (Hesse-Biber 2004, Jupp 2007). While I argue that reflexive research goes beyond the ‘insider-outsider’ dimension, I did need access (Van Maanen 2003:58). Initially my access was facilitated and vouchsafed by my supervisory team who

21 Insider-Outsider refers to the researcher’s position as a member or accepted as ‘inside’ the group / organisation being studied historically. This has included covert and overt research (for example Van Maanen’s early career ethnography of the police). An ‘outsider’ has a different level of permission, knowing, access and influence and functions as a separate observer - be it participant or non-participant. As researcher, this status will reflect and influence our performance as well as the performance of actors around us; this status will also colour our analyses and writing. Examples of fuller debates can be found in Van Maanen (2003), Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) and Jupp (2007).
were already conducting research within Southern Police. This resulted in an invitation to attend key partnership development meetings in June 2007. These meetings, and a subsequent one in September, reviewed the initial introduction of PACT since 2006 and the plans to introduce Neighbourhood Management meetings (these commenced within the South West Sector of City in late September 2007). Neighbourhood Management was borne out of the Local Service Board (LSB) model reviewed in Wales by the Beecham Report (2006:5-7). This introduced the agenda to develop neighbourhood based joined-up delivery (across services such as Local Authority, Police, Health, Fire etc.) and citizen-led services. Beecham favoured increasing citizen voice within the Welsh devolved context rather than the English choice model.

I was able to negotiate access through these attendances; permission for my research ‘to look at the conduct and experience of PACT meetings within CITY BCU’ was approved by the HQ Southern Police Community & Partnership Chief Inspector and the recently retired Deputy Chief of Police. It also enabled me to make relevant contacts with the six Neighbourhood Policing Inspectors within City BCU. This gave me permission to attend PACTs and interview their staff, make links to the senior staff within the CSP and Local Authority who represented partnership work in relation to CDQL for City, as well as gaining access to the first Neighbourhood Management meeting and their staff. My open-ended research rational confounded some officials who had different conceptions of what should be researched and how it should be conducted. For example, some Inspectors were hoping for a short-term piece of research that might provide them with best practice advice and an early report assessing what they regarded as successful and less successful PACTs.

My self-accounting included presenting my position as both independently financed and supervised, researching neither on behalf of, nor representing, any of the stakeholder residents, communities, the police or local authority. Participants would then be reassured that what anyone said to me outside the open PACT meetings would remain anonymous and confidential. This justified my stance and developed trust and mutual respect. I explained that I wished to look at what happened within meetings and come to fair and justifiable conclusions. This would require attending meetings on a number of occasions to get a full picture of the way they worked, the types of issues raised, etc. My accounting was contextualised with relevant details of my experience as an academic, a community development worker and my prior experience of working with Southern Police. This
information helped establish my personal credibility and competence. This was repeated throughout my first meetings with residents and officials. With residents, my accounting included presenting myself as a City resident. I added the disclaimer that I was not local to their neighbourhood but still claimed a distant ‘one of you’ identification. I hoped to convey impartiality coupled with interest, empathy and understanding as ‘City resident’. My own neighbourhood PACT was in the final selection of meetings. I handled this boundary by presenting myself as a local resident but adopted a non-participant observer and ‘independent researcher’ position so that my role and stance was similar across all PACTs. I was comfortable with my ethical position, and confident that I could uphold it in practice. Taken together, these presented a position that I was comfortable with ethically and one that I could uphold in practice.

My level of access and the willingness of staff and residents to participate in my research reveals how I constructed myself and was co-constructed in an identity and status of ‘trusted researcher’. This attests to the value of longitudinal ethnography. By my fourth Evergreen meeting for example, regular attendees felt able to let me join their chat, grumbles and laughter before and after meetings:

   Researcher: I spoke to some more residents tonight
   FLSO Maureen: Good. They’ll speak to you now they’ve got to know your face (07.01.08)

This did not mean that my boundaries - for example to maintain an impartial and confidential position - were not tested

   Bob: I know you go to other PACT and I want to know how Evergreen compares with other ones, do the police attend most other PACT?
   Researcher: A few, a few, err [thinking about what to say] I don’t go to every PACT but it sounds like you know the police attend some. Have you attended any others? (04.03.08)

Following my conduct of formal resident focus groups at the three tracked PACTs, it was common for residents to seek me out to pass on information or what they saw as relevant comments. Maureen, the FLSO, also commented how well my presence had been accepted by the police:

   It’s amazing how accepted you are by the Police and Local Authority I don’t think many people could achieve that particularly with the Police… I think it’s because they know they can trust you (FLSOMaureen18.07.08)
The above examples illustrate that the researcher’s presence and acceptance is more nuanced than revealing the purpose of research and simplistic distinction of covert and overt. Broader consideration needs to be given to what is down-played, concealed or revealed as compared to what happens within the momentary discursive constructions of researched and researcher (Crang & Crook 2007:40, Neyland 2008:140, Whittle et al 2011). Researchers have complained that the self-reflexivity and personal role and conduct of the researcher is too often played down or written out of much research (cf Crang & Crook 2007).

5.7.2 Reflections on Becoming Co-opted & Ethical Dilemmas

As part of ethics, there is a fine line within research between being accepted and responsibilised or co-opted in some way. Key players often asked me to comment; this occurred in ANM meetings as well as PACTs. It can be seen as part of the coproduction and negotiation of power relationships between researched and researcher (Whittle et al 2011). For example:

Jill Chair: What did you think of that then?
Researcher: [nodding] there were certainly a lot of people who felt strongly about xxx what do you think? (EvergreenFeb2008)

At ANM meetings and their sub-consultative meetings, I was frequently co-opted by both the FLSO and Councillors to provide an account of information reported from PACTs. After all, I was seen to take detailed notes. I was identified as a reliable and ‘quasi-resident researcher’ and positioned as independent of any local politicking or agendas. The Chair, OM Mike, positions me (as I do) as ‘neutral’ of professional and resident agendas, and asks for my ‘personal recollection and contribution’.

Chair ANM: What do you think about xxx I’d like to hear from you?
Researcher: I can’t comment specifically on any information I’ve been given and I can only reflect that based on those I’ve spoken to, which may prove to be a small proportion, it did seem to be important to many but not all of them. (July2008meeting)

More proactively, in summer 2008 when the FLSO is tasked with doing the minutes she panics and asks me to help her. I do the next meetings with her, show her the format and style the council use and teach her to produce these minutes. In winter 2008, I am asked to make a contribution by developing a format for tracking action points for ANM meetings (following the issue of their draft terms of reference and a Network briefing session that I was
invited to attend). I negotiate undertaking this as a consultancy task to provide my input to support the Chair and another member who ‘own’ this task and its outcome. This involves a few days’ work and a couple of meetings. I decide that it is a reasonable contribution to make, having been given open access to interviews and invitations to workshops. Later, I politely decline as inappropriate an invitation to present a review of City’s antisocial behaviour (ASB) issues, including City wide PACT perspectives, to a Network Management meeting. This takes me too close to contributing ‘as if an official’ and being aligned with official perspectives such as would be the case in a more action-research role (Huxham & Hibbert 2008).

I was also less comfortable with being invoked as ‘witness’ in an information-gathering exercise concerning councillors’ complaints about an official’s comment, made within an Evergreen PACT regarding a particular issue of concern. It seems that conventional protocol was broken because the councillors had not had a specific pre-briefing regarding what this official would say. This seemed to be a ‘slapping down’ manoeuvre, and I was told privately that this official had ‘got beyond themselves’ and had not followed the ‘correct way things like this work’. However, the official and councillors were adamant that my testimony was needed. I reported from memory the record and tone of this section of the meeting, openly in front of both parties. This did not have a negative effect on my access, and research relationships continued: I had been an ‘honest broker’. Finally in 2009, on request from the CSP Police-Partnership Co-ordinator, I did brief a newly appointed CSP Partnership Manager on my experiences with attending PACTs over the previous two years. I kept this to what was revealed within the public domain of the meetings by staff and residents. Therefore, as part of maintaining and operating as field researcher over the two years of the research, I did get co-joined and responsibilised and was always faced with ethical issues concerning appropriate boundaries, my conduct and disclosure.

The presentation of my research as an investigation of ‘the conduct and experience of PACT meetings within CITY BCU’ was not disingenuous or misleading. It could be said that this does not include my interest in potential asymmetries of power within PACT, or generally in power-relations, and whether PACTs allow citizens to exercise choice and challenge and exercise co-governance particularly across different neighbourhoods (such as those identified as advantaged or less advantaged). However, I always revealed this level of detail if participants engaged me in more depth, with the emphasis that I was interested in what
happens and how, and in their views and experiences rather than my own. It became clear in my initial meetings with Neighbourhood Inspectors that some feedback was expected in return for their co-operation and participation. Therefore I offered some. The final bargain, which I clarify on my consent forms, is to provide participants (official or resident) the chance to be sent a brief report (once my PhD is presented) comprising a few sides of A4 of key findings. Many took the opportunity to give me relevant contact details. My research questions in chapter four were developed in the light of this research focus, my literature review and choice of methodological approach. I do not see these as covert in their construction, or in how I conducted myself and this research.

5.8 Conclusion
Chapter five has outlined my social constructionist epistemology, ethnographic methodological approach and use of CDA as an iterative and appropriate model of discursive analyses (Fairclough 1994). The advantages of using a discursive method to study identity can be summarized as incorporating a view of social phenomena as constructed in language / texts which provides a window to study social identities in situ; it enables a move beyond traditional critical views of power to its relational construction and provides an opportunity to contribute to theoretical debates, honing in on the importance of identity and micro-processual level performative actions that are both enabled and constrained through discourse (Hardy & Phillips, 2002,55; Thomas & Davies 2005). I have also discussed my reflexive stance and positioning as researcher from an efficacy and personal perspective that places me as co-producer of my research findings.

The chapter details my longitudinal research design with its focus on the lived experience of PACT meetings as an example of the citizen-led co-governance initiatives introduced as part of NPM and NPS reforms. This included the selection of PACT meetings from advantaged, mixed and disadvantaged localities within City and the supplementing of naturally occurring meeting data with additional interviews and focus groups. This methodological approach will allow me to address how professionals perform their roles in collaboration, the extent to which the community feel able to exercise voice, choice and challenge, and how community collaboration is experienced in different socio-economic contexts. Appendix Five gives a contextual ethnographic background to City, the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing PACT meetings, local politics and the related introduction of Neighbourhood Management.
Chapters six and seven present my empirical findings, beginning in chapter six with a focus on resident identifications and perspectives.
Chapter Six Residents: Identifications & Resistance

6.1. Introduction

This chapter focuses on the heterogeneous communities and citizens – subsequently referred to as residents - who attend PACT. Adapting the Clarke et al (2007) framework, I draw on an understanding of relational identification to help reveal the subject positions and identifications of residents, traced through their attempts to exercise voice, choice, challenge, responsibilisation, inequalities and marginalisation and exclusion, as introduced in chapter four. Voice, choice, challenge and responsibilisation afford the opportunity to look at the performance of these hypothesised aspects of citizen-consumer identifications within the NPM and NPS discourses of deliberative democracy within PACT meetings. Why are some residents able to gain a voice at these meetings, and who are they? This is important because it allows us to understand the different ways that PACTs are experienced in advantaged and disadvantaged areas, and the implications of this for the communitarian theses that suggests that this new space of participatory governance may enable disadvantaged communities to gain voice and influence (Braithwaite 2000, Hughes 2007:16). This is supplemented by a focus on the influence and material practices that are emblematic of inequalities and aspects of marginalisation and exclusions, such as advantage, disadvantage, class and ethnicity. This includes an analysis of those who are marginalised or excluded within these meetings, including some discussion from interviews with people who do not attend.

This chapter addresses the themes of COP, including legitimacy, trust, satisfaction and coproduction and procedural fairness. Procedural fairness is particularly relevant to the analysis of public meetings because it emphasises positive outcomes that can be gained from how we are treated within police-community engagements as opposed to more traditional COP perspectives of outcomes and distributive and outcome justice (what we receive compared to others) (Tyler & Fagan 2008). I consider residents’ situated and embodied identifications performed in their talk in PACT, including the potential sources of social or cultural capital (Putnam 2000) they draw upon within PACT through, for example, the exercise of collective capacity based on stable residency (Sampson 1988). Using identifications and focusing on micro-level interactions within meetings allows us to see the situated performance of social identity, power-relations and agency in the performance of collaborative working (Alvesson & Willmott 2002, Hardy et al 2005). In essence, this
focuses on enactment and agency within the iterative collaborative process within PACT meetings (Ansell & Gash 2007). Importantly, my findings suggest that resident attendees can be seen as accepting varying degrees of responsibilisation as citizen-consumers (also called active citizens) in their attempt to exercise choice and challenge; in this respect, my findings partially contradict the Clarke et al (2007) finding that the citizen-consumer identity is rejected. In addition, I show clear local differences in the talk and lived experience within these governance settings and how lived experience and practice differs within ‘communities of fate’ compared to the ‘better-off’.

It can be argued that community involvement in PACT for residents from disadvantaged Evergreen and South Redbank is a cause of frustration while for advantaged Whitewood it is one of satisfaction with maintaining standards. The chapter begins with a review of attempts by residents to exercise voice, choice and challenge and then turns to issues of responsibilisation in relation to community chairs. The analysis of these issues highlights the relevance of relational identities within and across three different PACT locations that reflect different neighbourhoods, ethnic composition, class, CDQL and service delivery. This concludes with a discussion of two contrasting experiences of these meetings, marginalisation, exclusion, trust and satisfaction.

With respect to PACT priorities, a snapshot picture from November 2008 illustrates the different nature of what are typical priorities for Evergreen, Redbank and Whitewood. For disadvantaged Evergreen, all three are listed as ASB with no details. For mixed Redbank, the priorities are youth annoyance, rubbish, recycling issues and dangerous traffic lights; for advantaged Whitewood, pedal cycling on pavements, parking and speed cameras. These give a good indication of the differences in severity and concerns in these disadvantaged and advantaged areas. Appendix Six shows the priorities for all City PACTs for November 2008 as well as giving detailed analyses of crime, disorder, ASB statistics and hotspots for the three PACTs I tracked during the time of my fieldwork.

6.2 Exercising Voice & Choice

This section considers who attends PACT meetings and how they attempt to exercise voice and choice. While the nature of the meetings as ritual (shared experiences) and organised sites (Jenkins 2008) of collaboration imposes some similarities between the three PACTs there are numerous differences. These seem to draw on a range of locality factors: who
attends, their views on services they receive, and reactions to issues they face. Residents’ attendance is interpreted as a willingness to work collectively with other residents and to engage with police and partners on matters of CDQL relevant to their locality. This demonstrates a sense of belonging to the neighbourhood, and interest in being both a participant and representative (Gilchrist et al 2010, Becher 2010). It can be argued that those who attend once or twice are either satisfied that their particular issue has been dealt with, are disillusioned with the experience or withdraw because they do not accept these subject positions.

Attendees seem to be ‘typical’ residents (of certain ages and ethnicity) within their neighbourhoods. Whitewood attendees are well dressed in co-ordinated, tailored apparel; the majority arrive in expensive polished cars and footwear, the women with their hair done. People arrive in due time and speak in hushed tones before the meeting, shake hands or nod to fellow residents; once the meeting begins they sit upright, listening attentively. Evergreen attendees wear Primark budget clothes which, like their shoes or trainers, are well worn. Older attendees may be in trousers or skirts and younger ones in jeans; while tidy, the women are not made up. The same is true of most regular South Redbank residents who, like Evergreen attendees, mainly arrive on foot with a few in older vehicles. In Evergreen & Redbank the chat is louder; people turn to greet each other as latecomers drift in, and conversations are held during the meeting. The rare attendees from well-off North Redbank sit quietly in meetings; they are more expensively dressed and also on time. The age range across the three PACTs is late 30s to 80, with a predominance of those between 50-70; younger attendees are infrequent. At all three, the core of regular attendees are characterised by being longstanding residents within their areas, frequently resident since birth or all their adult lives (a minimum of 15 and for some up to 70 years). At Evergreen & Redbank they draw directly on this resource to reinforce the legitimacy of their knowledge, contributions and requests, presenting themselves as ‘genuine residents’.

Bill.23 I’ve lived in Evergreen 78 years, my house Ibson Rd, and for years had to put up with nuisance. Summer’s here and it’s happening again after school, playing football on my property and in the street. I’ve sat here

---

22 Primark is a high street store whose name is used as a signifier of low cost mass produced clothes. They sell cheap versions of track suit pants, jeans, and smarter clothing usually made from synthetic fabrics.
23 All participants are referred to by pseudonyms to protect their anonymity.
quietly and listened all the time now I want to raise my issue [...] (Evergreen 11.05.09)

At Evergreen and Redbank it is clear that the majority of attendees speak from the heart either from personal experience as ‘victim’ or ‘knowledgeable residents’ who speak for neighbours and/or about incidents within their area: ‘we’ve lived in Badgers Lane for 70 years and put up with our cars being vandalised for all of 70 years as soon as the Sergeant’s car damaged its being closed’ (Evergreen 01.09.08).

What differentiates most Whitewood residents is that they do not attempt to justify their right to speak for themselves or their area but take this as a given. Their talk collectively constructs residents as having ‘equal status’ with the formal partners and successfully positions the police and councillors as their public servants. Most of the small groups of attendees are women but it is the men in these groups who speak, with the women looking at them and nodding. The meetings are characterised by assertive, formal, polite contributions and both parties thank each other for their time and effort. It is noticeable that some residents draw on their professional identities and ‘professional standing’ – a few literally standing to speak. This professional legitimacy and equal status are cited to emphasise these credentials as a source of power (Derkzen & Bock 2007) and sources of influence – for example, through MPs, Chief Constable, Chief Executive or Police Authority – and as resources that can be mobilised within and beyond PACT:

Mr Kemp: [clears his throat & stands to address the meeting] I ran City planning and I advise you [...] this is the type of issue that needs support of MPs and senior officers’

PC Ron: Thank you I will check with our planning unit whether they have responded already (Whitewood06.01.09)

The exercise of choice and voice proceeds smoothly in Whitewood; within these meetings it seems residents’ views are taken seriously and listened to with respect that amply fulfils the requirements of procedural justice. Within Evergreen and Redbank the situation is

---

24 Badgers Lane runs underneath the main intercity railway line. This line acts as the boundary between Evergreen and Bluewater Wards, and separates two policing sectors. It is renowned - over many generations - as a site of conflict between rival gangs of youths from Evergreen and Bluewater and in 2008 was the site of a stabbing. This access point also doubles as a highly effective escape route for these youths. For the many Evergreen residents who do not have cars it provides an access route to schools, work, shopping etc.
considerably different; the meetings are characterised by residents struggling to be heard as they exercise choice to improve their services. I will clarify how their attempts to exercise choice and challenge in these meetings falls short of receiving procedural justice and care in the conduct of these interactions.

6.2.1 The Struggle to be Heard & Exercise Choice

What is noticeable in Evergreen and Redbank is a wish for improved levels of service and different types of solutions – a new choice – to those that have traditionally been offered to the community. For Evergreen this is particularly to deal with youth antisocial behaviour and to provide distraction activities. Badgers Lane timed closure and gating are examples of this.

Peter: […] there is very, very little that we have in terms of dealing with the people. What the solutions that we are offered are fencing, gates, chains, padlocks, these serve to alienate people even more. Now with regard to Badgers Lane this has been a perennial problem, there’s talk now of closing it off. Now putting a fence or gate underneath the bridge, I think will be very, very, silly because what’s going to happen is kids will come climbing over the top

Lois: They will

Mr Williams: It’s dangerous

Peter: Someone is going to get killed (Evergreen01.09.08)

Jenkins (2008) suggests collective experience (such as Mr Williams, Lois, and Peter agreement on this issue) is a factor in building collective identifications; this qualifies as establishing collective ties (Hardy et al 2005), in this instance in defence of their position. These residents’ identifications reflect a recurring theme: their lack of support for – and opposition to - professional solutions and their distancing from problems. Persistent complaints and opposition by Evergreen attendees to timed evening and night-time closure of Badgers Lane are raised at PACTs throughout the remainder of 2008 and 2009. Despite these repeated requests for their oppositional identification to become a PACT priority, the police refuse. They feel that their views are neither taken seriously in the decision-making process nor within the PACT meetings. Neighbouring Bluewater PACT, who are known to identify with the police recommendation of closure, have been consulted. One Evergreen resident, Bob, sums this up as: ‘unfair that Bluewater PACT have been consulted when no one from the police hierarchy has even been to our meetings to hear our views’. It is known that Bluewater councillors also support the council and police wish for closure, the opposite
stance to Evergreen councillors. This example underlines the privileging by professionals of supportive over dissenting views.

Another example of the privileging of professional assessments was observed in the allocation of resources in 2008; this also highlights how decisions concerning service delivery are being made outside - and uninfluenced by - PACTs. In this example, we see how the City council allocated Community Safety funds via a bid within the Neighbourhood Management programme to offer play schemes in Mall Road near Badgers Lane in the summer holidays and half-terms. This allocation is part of a professional assessment of citywide distribution of funds across a range of areas, based solely on official agencies’ data and inputs. This congruence between a professionally identified need for holiday activities and PACT requests for diversion activities for young people at Evergreen is used advantageously. The PCSOs are able to communicate this good news and feedback on the success of the schemes to PACT meetings and this receives a positive response from residents. As will be shown even more clearly in chapter seven, residents exercise their voice in many ways but their voices often remain unheard and do not seem to result in access to partner resources such as the off-road motor-biking team or youth facilities. Likewise, their preference and repeated requests and choice of distraction activities does not mobilise a different style of police response from their short-term emphasis on lock em up and punishment approaches for dealing with local ASB issues.

This highlights two common issues arising within Evergreen and Redbank PACT meetings. Firstly, the failure of the PACT process to fulfil resident expectations of being able to exercise choice, despite persistent requests. Secondly, the complexities and messiness of exercising choice are highlighted by the disagreements and multiple views held by different members of the public. In relation to Badgers Lane, these disagreements occur between neighbouring localities but such conflict also occurs within areas. In the real world, why would everyone agree on either problems or solutions? At Redbank for example:

Cllr Welsh: Its good news wheelie bins will be brought in to most streets [...] this will deal with health hazard and unsightly problems of seagulls and animals opening bags

25 Neighbourhood Management involves relevant professional partners like the police, council, education, leisure and health. It is a new governance space for professionals to work on joined up delivery and planning of locality based services.
Mr Hickson: No we don’t want them
Mrs Hickson: Hazard on the street, ruin neighbourhood

Cllr Welsh: It seems that not everyone is happy about this. Other people I’ve consulted were pleased… we’ll have to speak more about this and council should be consulting residents as well (Redbank08.10.08)

Some are happy with this solution, a vocal few are not. This is particularly challenging for professionals and can result in a lack of confidence and trust in participatory citizen governance and true power sharing (Yang 2005). It can also be seen to impact on residents’ willingness to become involved in collective participation and public meetings. Like other methods of community involvement, the reality of PACT engagement is political, messy, fraught and difficult. It clearly reveals multiple positionings that range from ‘support’ for service initiatives - such as the play scheme - to ‘rejection’. While most present themselves as ‘genuine, knowledgeable residents’ and often ‘victims’ they also range from ‘being unheard’ – particularly in disadvantaged areas - to being of ‘equal and professional status’ in more advantaged neighbourhoods. These diverse participant subject positions are part of the complexities and challenges within the new spaces of participatory governance (Maguire & Truscott 2006).

A key aspect of choice is tied up with the ‘call to action’ and the setting of three local priorities at PACTs. This is a central driver of the meetings for the police, as Maureen the FLSO tells a new attendee:

New Attendee: Should there be priorities?
FLSO Maureen: That’s why you are here, Sir (Redbank20.02.08)

Citizens seem disempowered from making ‘real choices’ by police control of priority setting. For example at Redbank:

Phillip Community Chair: Priorities, let’s see, residents raised […] Firework nuisance Small Street behind the Sikh Mosque
PC: No, no I’ll deal with that separately DO NOT put that down as a priority
It is particularly interesting that residents at all three PACTs seem to disengage from this part of the meeting, as if their work and purpose for attending is already completed. The priority setting phase is discussed in depth in chapter six in relation to police control of meetings.

Residents in disadvantaged Evergreen and Redbank position themselves as being ‘at their wits end’ through the repeated failure to exercise choice and receive the services they require. Below, we see Evergreen residents complain of experiencing severe issues with their gardens being used as a toilet or being harassed by drug dealing and drinking at 4am but when they ring 101\textsuperscript{26} or 999, the police do not attend. The issues with 101 recur at both Redbank and Evergreen and residents feel that their requests are ignored by 101 and the police. We see how residents are made to feel that they are ‘on report’ and interrogated as if they are the wrongdoers or criminals when all they are doing is asking for a service they believe they should obtain. The credibility of their resident identity and right to ask for help is challenged, and they report struggling to justify this. Their distress and need is also dismissed and distanced by those who act as gatekeepers of resources.

Mr Williams: Our gardens, we got so many youths outside our house, use our gardens as a lavatory
Mrs Williams: The only reason why we’re [asking you to do something
Lois: [Where’s this happening
Mr Williams: It’s Acton Terrace and [talked over
Mrs Crisp: [talked over
Miss Crisp: [talked over
Mrs Williams: For the last month its gone big time, there’s drug dealing. There’s drinking, there’s all sorts, I mean it’s all around it’s over on the Act
Path and Acton Terrace [on the main road, its
Mrs Crisp: [It’s happening all the time now
Mrs Williams: They’re there until four o clock in the morning the other night I mean, I’m having arguments with 101 and the police

\textsuperscript{26} 101 is the non-emergency police and local authority reporting number. Based on police guidelines - unless there is an immediate danger to life - calls are graded as antisocial behaviour (ASB) and do not qualify for an immediate police response. Noise harassment is also passed to the council Noise Abatement Team. 101 require callers to provide detailed personal information, including full contact details, address, etc. Many callers within Evergreen and Redbank see this as invasive and unnecessary.
Mr Williams: Do they ever call the police or do nothing [what’s]
Mrs Williams: [What’s happening?
Mr Williams: [hang on luv] I’m having problems getting the police out, they don’t seem to want to call them out. I’ve had that many arguments with 101 I’ve even called 999, they’ve refused to come out
Mrs Williams: it’s not just that it’s their attitude to YOU, they make you feel, YOU’RE ALWAYS ON REPORT

This talk indicates their frustration that their expectations have not been met for a long time. This is passionate, fast paced and overlapping talk that gives examples of their experience of distress and bewilderment, and what prove to be critical positionings and discursive resources in the conduct of PACT. We see how residents draw on these to build a collective identification that goes further than the original sense of being ‘deserving’ and having the right to services. Their situated talk positions them as ‘let down, angry and speaking out’ and enables them to collectively express their wishes, choices, and challenge. In doing so, providers are relationally implicated and positioned as those who ‘should’ be providing these services. Within my study, the collective identification of ‘being unheard’ with ‘unmet expectations’ through lack of provision of an adequate service applies almost solely to residents from disadvantaged areas and this seems to add to the level of anger and emotion within their meetings. This example is indicative of repeated requests at Evergreen meetings for type 1 coproduction (Innes & Roberts 2011) when we see residents wanting to define the problem/situation but looking for police action to provide a solution; this is the predominant pattern exercised by residents within PACT. This clearly demonstrates that police acceptance of the power of citizens to exercise choice and challenge is as important as that of residents (Clarke et al 2007). The way police and partners consider the exercise of residents’ choice is considered in chapter seven.

In this section we have seen the multiplicity and diversity of identifications, the struggles in disadvantaged areas to exercise collective rights to services or to be heard as citizen-consumers, and the overwhelming appeal to type 1 coproduction. The following section considers in more detail how the micro-level power dynamics of challenge between residents and professionals are enacted and the willingness of residents to work collaboratively to challenge the hegemony of professional discourses and explanations within PACT.
6.3 Willingness to Challenge

Within Redbank and Evergreen there are evident challenges to the authority of police and attempts to claim empowerment. Challenge in Evergreen is highly emotional, often with long and angry exchanges in which residents’ collective positioning is one of frustration. Evergreen are the most fast-paced meetings and the ones in which residents enact collaborative and collective work to build their arguments and sustain pressure on PCSOs, the police representatives at this meeting. In this extract we see collaborative work begin when an attempt to exercise choice is returned to; it continues through the meeting and shows us how challenges are cumulatively and collaboratively mounted and sustained within the interaction. It shows how challenge by residents from different parts of the area, and immediate neighbours, is mounted through talk that involves emotional and passionate work, including shouting [capitals] and talking over each other, while everyone, including the PCSO, compete to have their say.

Bonny: Yeah but what are we supposed to do WHEN nobody turns up
Mrs Williams: That’s the issue night after night they’re there and nobody turns up. They [police] SHOULD
PCSO Carl: I appreciate that, but all I’m saying to you is if they’re doing something wrong, if you don’t know who they are that’s fine we’re not asking you to go out there and take their names for us, we’ll do that ourselves. But if you can provide us with some details and a description maybe because what tends to happen
Bonny: Oh but they’ve all got hoods on [laughs - other residents chuckle]
Mrs Williams: But THEY’VE got hoods ON how we expected to
PCSO Carl: But all I’m saying is without descriptions we’re not going to know who we’re looking for with up to 70 kids, you know we go in there, they all disperse all, they’re [gone]
Mrs Williams: [Yeah]

Again we see the collective positioning of participants as deserving residents let down by services. The use of ‘should’ is a highly pejorative term that suggests a strong obligation is not being met; its use is a key part of challenge within PACT (Benwell & Stokoe 2006). This is an illustration of protective coproduction (the third type, where the police define the problem and provide solutions) as well as type 1 coproduction where residents strive to define the problem (Innes & Roberts 2011). The PCSO response is that the police need more information by obtaining community intelligence; he is challenged on the feasibility of this.
The PCSO rises to this, indicating that the police would have similar difficulties to the residents in gaining this information. For the PCSO, such challenges are uncomfortable and difficult to experience, and throughout we see how he adopts a defensive position. The argument concerning the realistic expectation of getting descriptions at 1am in the morning continues and residents emphasise that they are putting up with this ‘every night’ and the police should be doing something.

[...]
Bonny: [Yeah] but they’re THERE EVERY SINGLE NIGHT and I don’t know how we’re meant to get their descriptions?
Mrs Williams: How are we going to see their shoes at 1am in the morning?
[...]
PCSO Carl: WE DO need to know about the situation, you do need to contact us so we know what’s gone on. We can patrol the area and we might be able to do something about it, we can be there then when they’re going to be there [I mean
Bonny: [I think that’s the kind of thing we’re looking for now. I mean the residents have put up it’s no good the police just driving past and doing nothing. I’ve been told you got to MAKE them stop and get out of their car. I want them to get out of their car and ask questions, I don’t care how much paper work got to do
Mr Williams: [Yeah]
Mrs Williams: [The] amount of paper work they’ve got to do when they get back isn’t, that’s not OUR FAULT that [you got] to do that
PCSO Carl: [I think]
Mr Williams: [HANG ON PLEASE] it’s so bad
Mrs Williams:[..] What we want is the Police to do something
[...]
Mrs Williams: OH YEAH
[For over 7 seconds many people are talking at once including PCSO, until the calm voice of BOB comes through]
Bob: This issue about time it takes to get attendance, it’s ridiculous, I think it was two weeks ago up at Acton recreation ground there was an incident of a motor cycle being driven around on the upper part off the road it was reported to 101 and within a few minutes a police van turned up but the
police van was only there for about 25-30 seconds and then it drove off in the opposite direction [lots of voices raised]

There is a brief exchange when the PCSO suggests that the police can patrol the area. Bonny responds that this is exactly what residents are looking for but adds that it’s no good if police just drive off without dealing with the situation and relates this to other demands on police time such as paperwork. This is taken up (with lots of nods around the room) by Mrs Williams who forcefully points out that this is a police - not a resident- issue and they should not suffer by receiving fewer services. This illustrates that the talk within PACT does not occur in a vacuum and that part of the sensemaking and meanings within the meetings draw on the broader discursive resource and context within which these meetings are located. The context here relates to police resources and difficulties that occur when police time is used to complete paper-work rather than engaging in ‘proper police work’. This demonstrates how identifications and discussion within the meetings move beyond a debate that only involves the professionals present; they have meanings in ‘popular consciousness’ and the discourse of these residents (Flanagan 2007). The meeting erupts for over seven seconds as everyone is trying to be heard on the issue of police time and duties, and - most particularly - the services that disadvantaged Evergreen residents do not seem to receive. Eventually Bob, one of the calmly spoken older residents, can be heard. He is respected by other residents and is often consulted by the FLSO, chair and other PACT members because of his wide knowledge of both local and public service matters. His self-identification and the way others (both residents and police representatives) position him is as a ‘voice of reason’. However even he adds to the criticism of the police for failing this community, making this point in relation to another persistent issue – off-road motorbike nuisance - which has serious implications for the safety of ‘good members of the public’, including children. People still simmer with anger and draw on multiple identifications of being deserving, let down, and/or endangered victim in their emotional, heartfelt contributions. This is typical of Evergreen.

At Redbank, the same frustration is more mutedly expressed and people do not try to talk all at once. It also indicates how residents mobilise their ambivalent identifications of being willing to attend PACT and talk to the police, and have issues and criticisms that form the basis of many of their challenges. These residents cast PACT as an opportunity to mount collective challenges. What is clear is how challenges are cumulatively and collaboratively mounted and sustained within the interaction; while people compete to speak, this is utilised
as part of collective building of arguments that defends and promotes residents’ identifications. We see how this relational identification also isolates and leaves the PCSO uncomfortably struggling to defend the contested police position. Redbank meetings are usually calmer and quieter. Throughout Redbank meetings residents invoke a collective identification of ‘resigned and let down’; directed at failures in local authority refuse collection, street cleansing and parking, and therefore involve frustration not only with the police but also with partners. Unlike Evergreen residents, they mainly challenge providers by raising their individual complaints but do not work collaboratively to build challenges:

Mr Charles: Why are our streets never cleaned, it is disgusting (08.10.08)
Mr Hickson: Lanes are filthy, never cleaned, vans drive up and dump building waste and all sorts can’t get council out to remove it (18.06.08)
Also with stadium events:
Mrs Charles: Block our lane with burger van, litter and food everywhere, and they’re peeing outside our kitchen window, we’re trapped in our flats (08.10.08)

These are enacted as individual positions and contestations; they present a different dynamic of power-relations and talk in the face of frustrations and being let down.

At one meeting, in response to a visit from senior council staff Redbank residents do mobilise their collective identification at one meeting in order to collaboratively challenge the oppositional positioning and identifications presented by officials. In doing so they also access and draw on the resource of anger within the interaction to build their challenge:

Enforcement Officer: […] officers looked through over 300 bags of rubbish and we’ve only achieved three fixed penalty notices based on the evidence found in the bags [addresses/names]. What’s important is if you see dumping let us know either using 101 which is 24 hours or Connect2City
Mrs Rose: It’s not information that’s needed its more collections you need to come and see the rubbish in the lanes on Fridays and at the weekends and the havoc caused by the Stadium, we need these lanes blocked off and alley-gated. And on match days when the lanes are used as toilets we need porta-loos set up for people to use to stop them using them as toilets

27 Redbank is the main drinking route into the city centre for the South and West of City and experiences the heightened impact of larger weekend crowds moving into and out of city venues
Even the Corporate Director is challenged and ‘held to account’ by the residents to explain and justify failures to provide services. This anger is also directed at police:

Mrs Hickson: WHERE are POLICE AND what is the COUNCIL going to do about illegal parking, nothing and WE SUFFER
Corporate Director: I sympathise with you, and I agree it’s illegal but the reality is it happens all over the city […] more and more cars in Redbank.
Mr Silver: Don’t pull that one, the council did that - you blocked off St. Angela Street and that’s when it got worse (20.02.08)

Whitewood residents fit most closely with the police image of the ‘ideal resident’ or ‘ideal meetings’. They are thankful and attentive. They don’t appear to need to challenge traditional authority, neither drawing on frustration or anger nor seeking further empowerment or influence (Clarke et al 2007). The nearest they get to challenging is when elderly residents want young cyclists off the pavements; the PC’s polite but emphatic response is that he will not tell children to cycle on dangerous roads, combined with his attempt to co-join them in not wishing to put young lives at risk.

Mrs Dean: […] on their way home from school, they should be on the road not pavements, its thoughtless and dangerous for the elderly…..
PC Ron: I’m quite happy to tell adults and older teenagers to use the road and I know in the letter of the law its illegal but when younger children – I know you’d never forgive yourselves if they were in danger on the road - so I just tell them to walk with their bikes
Mr Upton: I don’t think telling them off is the way to deal with it (Whitewood 08.07.08)

What we see in this extract from Whitewood is a consummate performance of respectful listening procedural justice and its importance in the communication of negative outcomes when responding to resident concerns in collaborative meetings. This introduces real differences in the practice of challenge within different PACTs and illustrates how - within disadvantaged areas - this can result in collaborative work that is emotional and angry.

6.3.1. Resources for Challenge

At all three PACTs, the core regulars or in-group are those who can claim the additional ‘belonging’ status of having lived in their neighbourhoods for a long time. This suggests that across all these PACTs it is less comfortable to attend - or is of less interest - if you cannot
claim this identification and status. There are, however, differences between the three PACTs and it is essential to consider ‘who’ attends and the context and resources available to them. Importantly, Evergreen, despite being a disadvantaged area, seems to tap into a cadre of well connected, well informed, local and already active residents. Attendees include a range of individuals and ground level ‘bottom-up’ interest-based resident groups which prove to be important resources that are drawn upon.

One is the Concerned Gardeners group which is comprised of residents from three or four streets. They originally came together to fight a local council and private landowner’s plan to knock down Acton Road community hall, nursery and some of the council houses to provide an access route into private land in order to build a gated estate. This group formed in January 2007 to fight the proposal; since then, they have taken it upon themselves to push for and provide some diversionary activities for youth in the area. By the end of 2008 they were running family football on Saturday mornings on Acton Recreation ground and, with the guidance of Communities First28, they organise community bonfire events at the community hall and generally provide entertainment facilities. Their attendance at the Evergreen PACT is as a collective pressure group; they seek to obtain further support for long term diversionary activities and also continue their fight against additional houses due to insufficient levels of policing, general practitioners and other services needed to support any increase in population. In 2009, the planning application to build the new gated estate was turned down in large part due to the proactive opposition and action of the Concerned Gardeners group. They are local residents who have been pushed into becoming active because of an event that directly affects them (Casey 2008).

Lois: We ain’t got any GCSE’s, we all left school at 15, some have jobs some don’t, and none of us have ever done anything like this. It’s been hard trying to deal with officials but we can’t let our area be destroyed. We get nothing, nothing, we are let down by all of them. With the planning thing we got to the point where we thought it’s up to us, and a few of us got together to do something for our kids and our area

Dana: Yeah we come to PACT because it’s another way of getting our voices heard; they need to know we are serious about this

28 This is a separate government initiative to promote active and sustainable communities in the most deprived areas of Wales
Lois directly refers to the struggle of working with officials, highlighting the importance of their lack of ‘credentialising’ identifications (such as education) and also draws on the collective identification of ‘getting nothing and being let down by all services’. These negative identifications form the basis of their positive, active and campaigning identification and actions. Through their diversionary activities and positive work in the Acton area of Evergreen, the Gardeners are respected by the professionals and elected representatives as an active group of citizens. Although separate to the PACT process, the PCSOs and FLSO present the Concerned Gardeners’ events as success stories of PACT police and community engagement and appropriate this ‘active resident power’ as an outcome of the PACT process:

Lois: […] WHAT ARE YOU [PCSO and councillors] going to do for the kids? Let me tell you what we’ve done as Gardeners right. You know this, you’ve witnessed this over the six weeks holidays, and I’ve got a picture here to prove it. We know all the children are going to be bored and have nowhere to go. WE provided them with activities right. Older boys to, people used to seeing them sit on the street, drinking, swearing at pensioners, giving them attitude. At those fields over a hundred children we took off the streets. We didn’t get money for them

Peter: It was a voluntary activity we did

Lois: At the Rec, you witnessed it you seen it. The COMMUNITY have seen it, they ALL SAID HOW FANTASTIC IT WAS, they were SO SURPRISED to see these kids that they’ve had trouble with face to face playing footie (01.09.08)

This illustrates the type of contribution, coproduction and responsibility that is valued in discourses of identification that are frequently promoted within the ideal of the active citizen. However, the catalyst to take on this identification is not through PACT: it is in response to planning threats to their street. The Gardeners – mainly women in their mid-thirties to mid-forties - are younger than some of the other regulars who attend this PACT. They can be described as typical residents from this area who are perhaps only untypical in that they have become active in CDQL issues. They present a forceful voice of challenge at Evergreen meetings, like the residents discussed below.

John is a respected older man, born and bred in Evergreen. He worked in local manufacturing until the demise of these traditional industries and the increase in unemployment in the
In his late 70s, he is an ex-trade unionist and is involved with a number of community and resident associations. He chairs a local forum attended by officials and councillors, and works closely with Communities First; as Secretary of the local Labour Party, he also works closely with the councillors. Like the Concerned Gardeners, he could therefore be identified by other residents - or categorised by professionals - as ‘counter-publics’, having their own agenda or based on having a political and local agenda on issues such as the elderly, residents association, youth or Labour Party (Barnes et al 2003, Barnes et al 2004). He is a well-informed attendee, experienced at dealing with the police, voluntary providers and council (e.g. housing, regeneration and youth services). His is an ambivalent identification that occupies multiple forms of identification, incorporating challenging, while volunteering at PACT meetings and sometimes assisting the FLSO.

Bob, as indicated earlier, is identified as a ‘voice of reason’. He is a resident with a history of public participation and active citizenship and has knowledge and experience of dealing with various professionals and community members on local issues. He is a long-term resident in his late 60s who is a founder of the Friends of Portsmouth Woods, another local interest group which voluntarily organises the cleaning of this Evergreen open space which has the highest arson rate in South Wales (including rubbish tipping and abandoned cars). This group has a history of good, close working relationships with officials and the police through CDQL and regeneration forums that predate PACT, and through which they already identify him as knowledgeable and reasonable. As has been illustrated in earlier examples, he persistently and quietly challenges police and councillors while at the same time both councillors and the FLSO ask him for information.

Peter, another regular, has worked as a youth worker and active citizen, including standing (and failing) for local council election in May 2008. He has a history of problematic relations with both local officials and the local elected representatives he stood against (representing the opposing political party, Plaid Cymru29) and they find him particularly challenging. He is outspoken and holds views most at odds with PCSO and police views of solutions. He also seems categorised by them as ‘counter-publics’ and ‘usual suspect’ (dominant,

29 Plaid Cymru is the National Party of Wales. It puts candidates forward at local, national and European elections.
unrepresentative) and his views are often dismissed because he is ‘difficult’ (ibid, Karn 2007). This issue will be illustrated further in section 6.4 on responsibilisation.

These individual and vocal residents are supported by a core of older regulars (late 40s to 70s) who attend and work collaboratively with each other to raise issues they feel the police, council and councillors should be tackling within Evergreen. These residents are mobilised to challenge because of the state of their area. They often talk in small groups about these issues before meetings begin, and stay to talk to each other at the end. They are committed to achieving better services and know they have to challenge to do this. PACT has provided a new forum and space of governance that brings them together; they mount challenges in their attempts to exercise voice and choice, bringing a strength of active citizenship to the meetings at Evergreen that is not visible at Redbank. The lived experience within these meetings of both challenge and choice reinforces engagement with communities and is more nuanced and messier than often conceptualised in policy rhetoric and discourse. We see how residents’ personal and collective histories and in-situ locality experiences influence their practices and identifications within PACT.

The other resources that residents of Evergreen and Redbank draw on (as already illustrated) are personal, experiential lay discourses which they express with emotion and passion (Barnes 2008). This is also used in the contestation and struggles to claim the position of ‘the expert’ and taking the ‘credit’ for successful youth and community engagement. In the example below, the Concerned Gardeners accuse the police, and in particular PCSO Mat, of not ‘properly engaging’ with youth through the football he ‘voluntarily’ runs at the local high school. This instance also shows the local councillors disidentification and separation of themselves from both the police position and the emotionally-laden talk of residents (Elsbach & Bhattacharya 2001). The strength of the response from the PCSO indicates that this is a challenge that strikes at the centre of their core identity as community officers who engage with the community, challenging the salience and normative identification of ‘what community police do’.

In the example below, PCSO Carl’s view on engaging is loudly ‘rejected’. We see emotions in the meeting increase as PCSO Mat raises his voice to object to this rejection as he and PCSO Carl try to justify their positioning. Emotions are high and residents drown out their objections.
Lois: THEY [youth] needs to be engaged
DONNA: THEY NEED SOMETHING TO DO
Cllr Jones: They don’t have to get hysterical [said quietly to myself & Cllr Harris]
Cllr Jones: That’s what you do [PCSOS] isn’t it you do engage them
PCSO Carl: THE thing is, the thing is [pause] all PCSOs are community police, we’re here for the community that’s what we try and do
Lois: IT’S OK ENGAGING WITH THEM, but it’s not really engaging with them though is it the way you do it, is it?
PCSO Carl: BUT we do try to
Lois: No, no YOU CAN’T SAY YOU’RE ENGAGING WITH THEM to really engage because they’ve got to have something to DO WE PROVIDED THEM [with this] [interrupted
PCSO Dan: WE PROVIDE THEM these children with [angry shouts from a number of residents drown him out]
PCSO Carl: WE ……WE……WE do……we [drowned out

This continues, and below we see Councillor Harris attempting to shift what is a contestation and challenge of a collective role (PCSO) within a situation and context-specific particularised relationship (what these PCSOs do and value) (Sluss & Ashforth 2006). His disidentification allows him to offer support to the PCSO by attempting to move the focus of the discussion to a broader discourse on the effectiveness and nature of engaging with youth as a generic solution. In doing so, he presents himself as ‘knowledgeable expert’, able to speak on behalf of constituents’ views on this issue. His position is rejected, nor does it close the argument down, and residents continue to want to speak for themselves.

Cllr Harris: Let’s be honest here, the problem hasn’t gone away has it? I’VE HAD COMPLAINTS JUST THIS WEEK from people from people in Daniels Avenue saying their cars been damaged, or their son’s car damaged for about the sixth time and he won’t visit them anymore
Lois: Well that happens around us they need activities and places to go
Cllr Harris: YES IT MAY ASSIST THE PROBLEM IT DOESN’T ELIMINATE the problem
Lois: No disrespect MISTER Harris, right
This is a rare example of councillors coming to the support of PCSOs within Evergreen meetings. It shows the difficulties that both councillors and public officials experience - in this case the PCSOs - when challenged on their activities, and on what are received as challenges to both core and peripheral aspects of their roles and identifications. It demonstrates the interactive and shifting nature of alignments and positionings within the flow of the meeting and how these alignments can either escalate or limit challenges.

Sections 6.2 and 6.3 have introduced some of the in-situ locality differences predominantly to do with voice, choice and challenge. This has revealed a variety of subject positions and the capacity to challenge, particularly in relation to the resources and broader discourses residents can draw on in their identifications and positioning. We also see how this relates to specific factors in the local history of those who attend, their relationships and experiences, and the emotional strength of their sometimes ambivalent identifications. Choice and challenge can be seen as a difficult and differentiated process for all those involved (professional, elected representative and residents). We can also see how challenge is enacted differently at different PACT locations: there is little or none in advantaged Whitewood; mainly individual and some collective at Redbank; and persistent emotionally-based challenges at Evergreen. It is important to consider how the full range of local complexities and influences affects the practice of PACT and its outcomes. These factors will be considered further in the remainder of this chapter within the broader themes of responsibilisation, class and inequality, exclusion and marginalisation and, finally, trust and satisfaction. The degree to which active citizens, like the Concerned Gardeners in Evergreen, have been responsibilised and co-joined to be part of the solution to their CDQL issues and to this governmental agenda is next explored.

6.4 Responsibilisation

This section considers attempts to responsibilise and co-opt citizens within governance agendas; this was referred to in the literature review as the Foucauldian governmentality approach to deliberative spaces. Clarke et al (2007) suggest responsibilisation can be seen as the obverse to challenge because it shows an acquiescence to take on responsibilities. Attendance can signify a minimal degree of responsibilisation to engage in the PACT process with police and partners on local CDQL issues. However, attendance for Evergreen and South Redbank residents includes the fear of retribution: 'I don’t want them knowing [I’m
here] or that I’m speaking to you [police], you don’t know what might happen’ (03.11.08). For these residents, even attending is taking a risk. As one of the Evergreen councillors says:

Cllr Jones: People have to be careful this is not an area where they are used to talking to the police… one officer used to drive past a lady’s house and flash his lights to let her know they were patrolling. We soon had to put a stop to that she was terrified of retribution because he was identifying her to her neighbours as someone who talks to the police (14.03.08)

This reflects the higher cost and personal commitment to engaging with police and responsibilisation that is incurred by residents from disadvantaged areas. This fits with literatures that talk of communities operating strong informal social control with its own boundaries and sanctions (cf Innes & Roberts 2011) and cultures of not ‘grassing up’ community members to outsiders and formal authorities (Karn 2007).

We can ask how and why attendees became responsibilised to attend and work with agencies within PACTs. Many suggest they self-identify as ‘care takers’ of their neighbourhoods on behalf of their neighbours; this is a resource many of them draw on in presenting themselves as ‘legitimate representatives’. They also hope that more people will become regular attendees.

Mrs Neece: Call us the ‘faithful’ if you like [laughter] we’re the ones who come whatever the weather on behalf of others, it would be nice if more came, but many busy and children to feed at this time of night and you can’t expect the elderly to come out!
Dana: Yeah I like that ‘faithful’ it’s good isn’t it? [a few nods]
John: We put [the] effort in on behalf of other residents […] would be good to have all streets represented, you know, that’s the aim. Some come when they have a problem and its good see some action [on their problem] then they don’t come as busy […] What we want [is] more to keep attending on behalf of neighbours [murmurs of agreement](Evergreen 07.07.08)

Even victims often present a ‘care-taking’ motivation and identify as the representatives of their ‘suffering neighbours’. These identifications are presented as conferring the legitimacy to speak for themselves and on behalf of others.
Bonny: Over by the bus stop it’s actually been going on many many years and I’m surprised not more calls about it […] they’re all elderly and I actually feel very protective of them. There are youths 50-60 on a Friday night and they are drinking, they’re fighting, everything […]. They [my neighbours] won’t come to PACT […] I think all residents feel a fear of reprisals […]. Albeit here on my own but would be good [to have this as a priority] and it would help my neighbours. I can move out in a year they can’t, they’re terrified. They’re lovely. I’d like to help them, (Evergreen 01.09.08)

For Sullivan (2009), PACT reflects a participatory style of democracy based on residents – like Bonny, John, Dana and Mrs Neece – who are not formally accountable or elected representatives. Karn (2007) also talks of local regeneration forums in which residents, and sometimes elected resident representatives, present their ‘living here’ expertise and credentials to legitimate their contributions. Becher (2010) suggests residents need to be accepted as both participants and representatives because you never get 100% participation. There is no question in people’s minds that they qualify to speak for other residents in their area. They can be said to be co-joined within PACT as an appropriate setting to speak as unelected ‘local experts’. Within disadvantaged Evergreen and Redbank, this positioning is also regarded as permission to challenge and not the obverse. For these residents, responsibilisation and challenge seem to go together. Conversely many of the Whitewood attendees represent their Neighbourhood Watch Scheme; five to six schemes are represented by one to three attendees each, and they make up the bulk of the residents present. They are serious about their representational role and this helps to explain why they listen carefully and take notes: ‘we come to learn what is going on from our councillors and police. We then report back to our members’.

Within Evergreen and Redbank, further identification as responsible is highly contested. At all PACTs the police encourage vigilance and repeatedly ask for community intelligence and information about incidents, perpetrators, etc.

PCSO Carl: [Yeah] but you know the only way we know who’s there […] is by description, we want ‘oh yeah he’s got a black hood on, he’s got some mark on his face’ it makes a lot of differences particularly the details of their shoes, you know, shoes can tell us a lot (01.09.08)
How far residents should be responsibilised to obtain and provide all this information for the police is hotly contested. In October 2009 we see a clear rejection and frustration with attempts to responsibilise residents:

PCSO Carl: At Waterloo Stores we have been working on this and had one arrest and four ASBOs submitted and if we could identify more youths we could do more

Shop owner: I’ve given some names but it’s NOT OUR responsibility to get their names and addresses, given you what we know, still see a gang of 6-7 youths outside - and it’s FRUSTRATING it’s not OUR job (Evergreen05.10.09)

This shows contestation and a lack of clarity on where the boundaries and responsibilities lie between local residents and police.

This contestation can be seen after the success of community events organised by the Evergreen Gardeners in what can be seen as local residents taking responsibility to work with their youngsters. The City BCU Deputy Commander pays a one-off visit to their PACT, after which he tells me:

I thought the Evergreen residents were vociferous, and rightly so. I hope they are prepared to set up some youth diversion initiatives, because I believe the opportunity to make a difference lies with the youth […] There is a real opportunity in Evergreen to drive forward Community Engagement – the people are passionate and want something done. However, I did sense a lot of negativity from some residents, who clearly felt there was no way they could make a difference. They need to be reminded that THEY CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE [his capitals] and the PACT process can assist if used properly (01.11.07)

He positions residents as failing to be sufficiently responsibilised either in sufficient support of the police and their willingness to assist (Tyler & Fagan 2008) and potentially failing to provide either type 2 mobilised level of coproduction (where residents provide solutions) (Innes & Roberts 2011). In this way he is suggesting it is inappropriate for residents to express negativity in PACTs.
The example below shows how, within PACT, being an ‘active citizen’ has multiple meanings, including when the boundary between ‘active’ or ‘vigilant’ and vigilantism is crossed (Evans 2009). Vigilante identification either puts residents at risk or tries to responsibilise them to do things it is reasonable to expect the police to fulfil. This is clearly seen when residents discuss the need to fill the gap left by services’ lack of action. One example of the suggestion that they should intervene directly comes from Peter, a local resident who used to be a youth worker, who argues they should reclaim the streets from drug dealers:

[…] so my err, my proposal is to basically if the residents of Wisson Rd aren’t prepared or, it’s too difficult, somebody else should come and reclaim the streets for them. Now we’ve done this in other areas […] you know we’ve got quite a lot of drug dealers, it wasn’t a problem

PCSO Carl: ermm hmm
Peter: Now maybe we have to, maybe the police, local adults like me, other agencies, perhaps with youth workers, not a lot of us, just a few, maybe we just have to stand around. We then make the area uncool by being there [we know] they will move on. […] actually do something about it

PCSO Carl: YEAH BUT I’M not actually saying the residents should go out there, it’s not the residents job to do that IT’S OUR JOB

The PCSO protests saying this is too risky and this is the job of the police. His positioning of the residents seems to be one that is ‘less active’ and differs from that of his Deputy Commander who wanted ‘mobilised’ volunteers on the streets, or active community involvement in diversionary activities. At a later PACT, Peter suggests he will go alone and talk to dealers on behalf of other residents who are too scared. The same PCSO tells him: ‘Please don’t do that. It is far too dangerous for a member of the public and may get you into trouble with the police’. While not promoting vigilantism, both the Casey report (2008) and the guides concerning citizen-led policing (NCPE 2006) seem to position residents more actively in engaging with CDQL issues within their locality beyond solely providing community intelligence. As Clarke et al (2007) suggest, my micro-level findings support the contestation of the role of active citizen, or citizen-consumer, within CDQL governance settings. Confirming this is neither straightforward nor an uncontested single discourse but part
of the resistance and struggle that is evident through the agency and talk between both police officers and residents. Less controversial is the responsibilisation of the community chairpersons as active citizens within PACTs.

6.4.1 The ‘Brokering’ Role of Community Chairs
The police aim to legitimise PACTs as community rather than police meetings through the appointment of community chairs, suggesting a key role and the responsibilisation of these resident attendees. Becher (2010) argues that for collaboration to work there is a need for an intermediary facilitation role as collaboration oscillates between moments of co-operation and conflict. This position of intermediation and representation is one that seems to apply to PACT chairs. When my research began, two of the three PACTs had community chairs; Redbank appointed one later in 2007. Southern Police’s 2008 PACT guide states that ‘community chairs mean the police can be seen as more neutral and the meetings as driven and owned by the community’. In the three PACTs that I followed, the community chairs were not elected by other residents but approached by the police who identified them as ‘suitable and trusted’. They were introduced to the meetings on this basis. All have some history of being actively involved in their neighbourhoods and seem to be accepted in this role by the residents who attended the meetings. However, Evergreen Councillor Jones did not agree with this being a non-elected role (by the meeting’s attendees) or a police appointment.

Evergreen was the first City PACT to appoint a community chair. The police are very proud that their first community chair came from this disadvantaged neighbourhood. The Inspector boasts: ‘Jill was our biggest critic and now she chairs the PACT for us’, and Maureen the FLSO says ‘she’s great, shame not all as good’ (Workshop07.06.07). Jill is a local resident who has a full-time administrative health job in Redbank. She has brought up her children, who are now young adults, in Evergreen. One of them still lives at home and she has lived in this area all her life. She became known to the police prior to PACT because of drug dealing related problems in the bus shelter - now removed – directly outside her house. This had gone on for a number of years until she decided, despite strong reservations, that she needed to talk to the police and enlist their help to tackle these severe problems. She sees herself first and foremost as part of the community - ‘one of you’ - who happens to be chairing this
meeting. She positions herself as a resident who has been through the same things as attendees, and can therefore identify with their situation:

I’m member of the community and I’ve suffered what you have been through so I know what it’s like, all been there so you are not alone, not saying your problem will be resolved today. I always say Rome wasn’t built in a day and neither will your problems [be solved in a day]. It will take some time but what you’ve done by coming here today is made a start and asked us and our partners to help you (03.11.08).

Her multiple identifications include ‘being a member of the community’ who also has suffered and ‘being a partner and ally of the police’ in the way she controls the meetings. Below, we see this involves boundary work to achieve a workable balance between the separations of these identifications, at the same time as maintaining sufficient congruence (Kreiner et al 2007). She sits at the top table, aligned with the police representatives and any partners present, facing the audience of resident attendees. Like the other chairs, she acts as ‘figurehead’ in these meetings and assists in control by helping to quell the anger of residents and by adjudicating during adversarial or tricky moments. For example, on one occasion she exclaims: ‘Quiet, QUIET [bangs on table] now, now, we know the police have limited resources and are trying to do what they can for us’.

Her style of chairing is ‘in your face’, forthright and fairly loud; in this sense it can be said she is typical of residents in Evergreen and identifies with their desperation and need to vent frustrations in meetings:

One of the good things about PACT is its given people somewhere to come and talk to police and tell them what’s happening, of course they’re going to vent and have their say. People come because they’re desperate. You’ve got to be desperate to attend something like PACT, you can’t shut them up. If you tried to they wouldn’t listen to you. You have to let them have their say and let off some steam; only when they’ve done this that you can get them to hear you. People understand that and they benefit from seeing they’re not alone and isolated. (14.04.08)

The chair for Whitewood, Barbara, is in her early 70s; she is petite, bright eyed, with a sprightly, energised demeanour. In meetings she has a firm, friendly, interested air. She is a trusted figure in the local community who has organised many community events and chaired
the Residents’ Association. People speak to her: ‘you could say I’m nosy but I keep my eyes and ears to the ground and I tend to know what goes on… and tell these gentlemen [police]’. The FLSO describes her as ‘quite a power house who sees it as her job to keep us on our toes and ensure all the resources don’t go to troubled areas and leave the village at risk’ (Sept07). She is a highly competent chair who keeps her eye on residents and works collaboratively with PC Ron; as she says, ‘I use a light touch to keep firm control of the meetings’. When the formal PACT finishes people come to talk to her as well as the police or councillors.

At Redbank, Phillip is not an obvious chairperson. He is in his 40s, quiet, and nervous with people. Originally a member of Redbank’s only Neighbourhood Watch, he and the three other members are the original core PACT attendees and their watch was subsumed into these meetings. Their motivation is that the ‘area has got much worse and we need to do something’ and he indicates that he was asked to chair ‘because councillors are not allowed to’. He plays a minimal, almost solely symbolic role. Redbank meetings are substantially run by the councillors and Maureen, the FLSO. His chairing skills and confidence are weak: ‘of course its councillors people want to hear from and I leave it mainly to them’. He concludes: ‘the meetings can be difficult and sometimes people get angry’.

In their own way, each of these PACT chairs make the role their own, and conduct themselves quite differently within these very different meetings. It is their nuanced performances that fit with the nature and local politics of their PACT that most stand out. Southern Police’s Chief Inspector for Partnership and Communities boasts ‘even if we’ve empowered no one else at least we can say we empowered community chairs’ (Workshop07.06.07). These chairs can clearly be identified as co-joined to the police PACT agenda or - as the police identify them - empowered.

However, the chairs within City are not happy with the way the police fail to respond to communities ‘call to action’, particularly those from more disadvantaged areas. During the research period they decided to mobilise (type 2 coproduction) to try and improve the PACT process. For a brief period in 2008/9 they form a citywide PACT chairs meeting but no chairs from advantaged areas attend. It is clear that the few chairs who do attend are from deprived and disadvantaged wards who attempt to communicate strategically with the police and council beyond local PACT priorities. They are hoping to develop a strategic dialogue concerning PACT meetings and the avenues dealing with CDQL issues within City.
Nabalfa Chair: We’ve heard of Area Neighbourhood Meetings but it’s hard to tell if PACT priorities are taken as seriously as we’d like at these. While we all value the good relationships we have with our FLSOs and Inspectors [laughter from others]. No, no, the FLSOs try and my Sergeant is good, he always attends

Spenchurch Chair: Not same in Spenchurch. Our Sergeant is trying to take over the meetings because he doesn’t like me only giving the police a 15 minute slot

Evergreen Chair: We can’t get a bloody policeman at our meetings, excuse my French!

Nabalfa Chair: Yes, well, we feel we need to look at ways of capturing resident wishes so these are considered across City to see if there are commonalities to be dealt with more strategically based on residents’ issues

Evergreen Chair: Yeah we all attend because we want to do something for our areas but they don’t half make it hard for us (March 2009)

We see that the expectation of these chairs to be heard within police-community engagement through PACT does not seem to be met, suggesting that they do not feel they receive the level of procedural justice (Tyler & Fagan 2008) from Police that they expected their responsibilised position to provide. Their talk shows that they feel dismissed in their attempts to gain communication channels to decision-makers beyond the setting of three local priorities within their meetings. This is frustrating for them as they have all stepped-up voluntarily at the request of local police to be involved in running PACTs. They also wish to remain credible in this position and to achieve effective working relationships with police and partners to improve their areas. Having fulfilled their ‘figurehead’ function within meetings, it does not seem that the police make time or discuss relevant area information with them. With nowhere to progress their discussions, and after holding four meetings, this group disintegrates in 2009. This attempt at mobilisation is a brief example of chair-led bottom-up and vertical coproduction. However its short-lived and early demise also suggests it does not

30 The Spenchurch Chair has attempted to limit the police input to his meetings by giving most of the hour to residents. This has met with resistance from the police. By the end of 2009 this community chair - who works within 101 himself and understands the reporting, grading of calls and police response procedures - has resigned. Spenchurch meeting attendances then drop from around 25-30 when he chairs to 4-10 residents. Spenchurch is also a disadvantaged Communities First area in East City.
prove a successful space for empowered chair action outside the police owned PACT structure.

Summarising responsibilisation, we see PACT chairs are cast in a pivotal role as ‘brokers’ in the talk between professionals and residents. In their talk, we see chairs from disadvantaged areas position themselves variously as responsibilised, dismissed and disempowered, suggesting they undertake more boundary work to sustain their roles within and between PACTs. I have also suggested that residents are responsibilised through their attendance, and shown this has higher costs and fears for those from disadvantaged areas. This suggests that these residents may also need to undertake more boundary work to sustain their identification in, and attendance of, PACT.

6.5 Class & Inequality

Clarke et al (2007) reminds us that the theme of inequality derives from the critical political economy thesis that market dynamics tend to ‘produce, reproduce and deepen social inequalities within and between nations’. Researchers have established that some aspects of class and related inequalities (like race, ethnicity and gender) are used as a basis of social policy and moral significance when used to control the lower or dangerous classes (Clarke et al 2007, Gilling 2007, Brent 2004). This is hidden in much of the language policy literature on participation, such as the WIMD, which reshape this with talk of disadvantage and indices of deprivation such as poor housing, income, level of education, employment, health and - latterly - crime and disorder. While not directly referred to, ‘class is one of the considerations in officials’ decision-making in the delivery of neighbourhood services (Ruppert 2006:185, Newman & Clarke 2009). Inequality and class are used as discursive resources (Walkerdine et al 2009) which demonstrate their salience in structuring people’s everyday lives (Bradford 2011). These uses are developed in this section.

Supporting this analysis, class is never raised overtly within PACTs but may be invoked in discourses and in accounts of some areas being ‘better off’ and therefore possibly receiving preferential levels of service, for example:
Lois: [The rubbish on the streets is] a nightmare, it’s from visitors to St.Magans Museum\textsuperscript{31} during the holidays. I’ve had it removed but I’ve been asking them WHY is it we got three takeaways and not ONE bin? And they keep saying they will put bins BUT it’s just not done because it’s out of sight to those driving through isn’t it! YOU GO ROUND THE CORNER […] INTO NIKKLESTON\textsuperscript{32} AND THERE’S NO RUBBISH THERE. THEIR BINS ARE EMPTIED, they’re done properly but it seems if you’re from around Evergreen. THERE’S NOTHING DONE FOR US HERE. WHY’S THAT? (01.09.08)

There is the suspicion that police attend Nikkleston PACT - when only PCSOs attend Evergreen – because it is a better-off area within the police sector ‘Hope not being snubbed because we live in Evergreen and not Nikkleston?’ (Bill03.11.08). Even the councillor raises issues of differences between advantage and disadvantage, in this case within Redbank and compared to Whitewood:

Cllr Welsh: You go to areas like Whitewood and they are clean, well-kept public lanes and streets. Are they getting a better service from cleansing and South Redbank gets less? Do people from these areas get more resource or complain more, what is it? Or do people from there come and dump in South Redbank? Never have the same problem in North Redbank always South […] I expect it’s easier to clean in North Redbank and ‘posher’ areas as they stay clean so understandable if sweepers prefer to clean there and avoid South Redbank where what you do one day will be undone by the next (21.05.08)

There is also the feeling that Evergreen is written-off and stigmatised, for example with their youth blamed: ‘it happens in ST FELLONS\textsuperscript{33} and I’M FED UP OF EVERGREEN and our youth being picked on as the PROBLEM’ (Lois 01.09.08). These are clear identifications of self, others and place by residents and councillors in which some residents and areas seem to be regarded as more or less worthy. This analysis supports the assessment by Jenkins (2008)

\textsuperscript{31} One of the main access routes to one of Wales’s major attractions - St Magans Museum - runs through Evergreen. St Magans and Nikkleston wards border the North and East side of Evergreen and are ‘better off’ advantaged areas.

\textsuperscript{32} The boundary with Nikkleston ward is within yards and there is no refuse left by their shops and takeaways.

\textsuperscript{33} St Fellons is a deprived ward on the far East side of City. Like Evergreen it is renowned for CDQL issues, has a bad reputation and is also an original Communities First area
of the real and practical outcomes of such stereotyping and categorisations in the discretionary and administrative allocation of resources, including within much policing work (Cicourel 1968).

These examples suggest that PACT is not perceived by many residents or councillors as a level playing field, suggesting these are relevant differences. Within these meetings, distinctions are often drawn between ‘us’ and ‘them’, and judgements are made that to some extent operationalise meaningful stereotypes such as ‘better-off’. The differences identified are therefore often related to discourses of class, advantage and disadvantage (Jenkins 2008). Benwell & Stokoe (2006) call this the characterological use of identity descriptions of both locations and people. Jenkins (2008) points out that aspects of group identifications, local context, and the discourses and lived experience of categorisations such as class, inequality, exclusion and marginalisation are implicated, employed and performed as part of the construction of agency and power-relations.

In my first interview with the local Neighbourhood Inspector for Evergreen, he confirms the introduction of universal neighbourhood teams had meant a loss of previously ring-fenced community policing resources for Evergreen that had previously been regarded as the most effective team in Wales.34 As part of a universal COP provision, PACT is premised on paying attention to residents’ priorities and concerns across all localities whether they are advantaged, such as Whitewood, or disadvantaged. Whitewood residents’ understandable concern with cycling on pavements may seem insignificant compared with the level and nature of the persistent issues in Evergreen and Redbank. For example, in Evergreen residents experience persistent serious problems with harassment and antisocial behaviour, while in south Redbank residents battle with rats, cleansing, inability to park in their own streets and other issues with stadia events. These differences in levels of CDQL correspond to the WIMD and partners’ rankings for City wards summarised in Appendices Two and Six.

The frustrations of being ‘let down’ with insufficient services within Evergreen and South Redbank can be considered in relation to Whitewood. It could be interpreted as advantaged Whitewood experiencing a closer match of services received to the area’s needs which

34 Within Wales, the Welsh Assembly Government funded Communities First programme mobilised additional resources for the most deprived Areas in Wales. This included additional community policing. Evergreen and a couple of other Wards in City benefited from this programme.
sustains their higher standard of living environment. While it was not possible to externally substantiate this, it is evidenced in the talk of residents and police, and PC Ron agrees that while Whitewood has problems, they are ‘nothing big or major, not like Evergreen’s youth annoyance or Raytown’s’\textsuperscript{35} prostitution’ (16.04.09). In Whitewood, police and partner resources are mobilised to respond to their lower levels of CDQL issues so that when the PC hears of a single incident of ASB and disturbance he confidently tells residents they will receive services:

PC Ron: […] and I know I keep banging on about this but if they’ve [youths smoking cannabis in parks] kept you up at two or three in the morning ring 999 and get someone out to deal with it (27.10.09)

Whereas in the same month resources are not available within deprived Evergreen:

Daughter: Not an appropriate level of response for the perpetual harassment and intimidation my parents are experiencing on a daily basis and not just one off. I think we have serious differences of opinion on what is criminal and what is acceptable behaviour and the Police and 101 aren’t reacting appropriately to protect my parents’ rights to have some peace and enjoy living in their own home. It’s not good enough to treat this so lightly it’s inappropriate there must be more suitable action to deal with this and stop it happening […]. I was intimidated by them and I used to teach 1700 in high school in Canada so I’m used to youth. Not for residents to have to go out and deal with them, not me nor my 85 year old parents. Police need to deal with this. (06.10.09)

Inequality and the level of problems in different areas are also associated with the frequency of PACTs. Meetings are quarterly in Whitewood, bi-monthly in Redbank and monthly in Evergreen. Residents’ views on the level of resourcing are reinforced by the community chair of Whitewood, who confirms:

We have a very good relationship with the police and whatever their crime figures or hotspots - whatever they call them - we aim to keep a permanent police presence in our village and the Chief Constable and Police Authority know we’ve campaigned before to maintain this.

\textsuperscript{35} Raytown is one of two deprived areas, close to the centre of City, that experience high levels of prostitution
Whitewood residents’ interests in attending PACT are to maintain standards whereas Evergreen and Redbank fight to attain or aspire to what Whitewood experience as normal standards of services within their area. This reinforces the view that these new spaces of governance have the capacity to reproduce existing levels of inequality, influence and access to services. Similar to Herbert’s (2006) findings, it highlights the possibility that residents from advantaged areas are more able to mobilise and influence services. For example, as well as PC attendance at their PACTs, Whitewood residents - through their high propensity to report - are shown to have skewed the City UPSI (2009) study of signal crimes and disorder. They have been labelled the ‘worried well off’ by the Chief Inspector for City responsible for performance reporting and ‘hotspot’ data. He jokes that if public confidence becomes a key driver (Gilling 2010) then satisfying advantaged residents – he specifically mentions those from Whitewood - will have a more positive impact on Southern Police targets than providing services to disadvantaged areas. Part of this influence seems to be due to Whitewood residents’ ease of access and predisposition to report incidents utilising phone, email and websites. In Evergreen, under-reporting of incidents is an issue, as pointed out by Councillor Jones:

Residents don’t always have phone credit to report incidents to 101 this is a deprived area and the barriers to reporting are higher, services need to accept their hotspot statistics will be underrepresented because of this (14.03.08).

Again, similar to Herbert’s (2006) findings, this seems to reinforce the view that the better off or middle-classes will be able to exercise greater influence and choice than the residents in working-class disadvantaged areas within locality based CDQL initiatives. Herbert (2006) also suggests disadvantaged communities are potentially ‘too light’ (lacking the resources and capacity) to be responsibilised within COP public forums. This will be discussed in chapter eight along with the part played by professionals outlined in chapter seven.

The above discussion illustrates both perceived and potential differences in need and service, and how categorisations that draw partially on class and inequalities are visible in the discretionary work performed within PACT and officials positionings. It is also clear that residents draw on these identifications as discursive resources to identify either a better or worse-off ‘other’ and neighbourhood that can be negatively applied to them. This includes the ‘othering’ of areas, who attends within the locality, and the interstices of historical context. This suggests that categorisations such as class, disadvantage or inequality might be
operating with discretion to form partial explanations of power relations and agency enacted within PACT. This seems to be occurring covertly with the consequence that class categorisations are not formally acknowledged (Lawler 2005, Newman & Clarke 2009). This supports the need to consider identities and situated practices in spaces of social democracy like PACT (Mouffe 1999). This section has clearly shown how residents in PACT draw on the discursive resource and experience of locality differences in terms of disadvantage or class in their construction of subject positions within this neighbourhood based governance.

It is important across both advantaged and disadvantaged areas to consider other potential limits to both community engagement and responsibilisation within PACT. Levels of attendance at meetings compared to local population focuses our attention on who may be marginalised or excluded from PACTs. It could be said that non-attendance is the ultimate rejection of responsibilisation and community engagement; there are low levels of attendance across all PACTs, irrespective of class indicators and levels of CDQL issues or resources. The next section focuses on who is marginalised and excluded within the PACT process.

### 6.6 Exclusion & Marginalisation

It became clear during my field work that high numbers of residents are not attending PACT; therefore, it is fruitful to ask who these are and why this may be. This section looks at attendance and at the attempts to address why some residents don’t attend and the identifications of those potentially excluded and marginalised.

I tracked these meetings and attendance over 24 months and the data on attendance are presented in Table 6.1 in two phases, original and later levels. The numbers show that as a percentage of ward population attendance ranges from 0.3% to 0.1% - namely between 9 and 36 people - this is a small percentage of the possible attendees; the only PACT with rising attendance is advantaged Whitewood. As one Redbank PCSO says, ‘I don’t know if people aren’t interested or can’t attend? However much we try we just cannot get people to PACT meetings’ (02.02.08).
Table 6.1: Level of Attendance at PACT Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACT (meetings attended)</th>
<th>Original Number of Attendees as (% pop)</th>
<th>Later Numbers of Attendees as (% pop)</th>
<th>Marginal Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen (15 of 21)</td>
<td>First seven: (0.3%)</td>
<td>Last eight: (0.3%)</td>
<td>Fluctuating attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: 14,754</td>
<td>Average 16-22</td>
<td>Average 18-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range 10-34</td>
<td>Range 14-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbank (9 of 13)</td>
<td>First six: (0.2%)</td>
<td>Last three: (0.1%)</td>
<td>Decreasing attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: 12,009</td>
<td>Average 21-28</td>
<td>9, 13 &amp; 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitewood (6 of 9)</td>
<td>First three: (0.2%)</td>
<td>Last three: (0.3%)</td>
<td>Increasing attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: 11,281</td>
<td>14,16,17</td>
<td>29, 31,36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Mid-year 2006 ONS adjusted

Skogan (2006) suggests it is appropriate to focus research on those who are interested in CDQL. However we do not know if interested residents are not attending because of insufficient publicity, difficulties in getting to meetings or unwillingness to work collaboratively with others in their neighbourhoods or the police (Tyler & Fagan 2008). Recent research suggests that people prefer other mechanisms of engagement on CDQL matters to public meetings, such as online resources or newsletters delivered to their door (Casey 2008 & 2009, Hohle et al 2010). It may also be that some residents have little confidence in participation through PACT, or feel excluded from their local meetings.

The moral majority or ‘majoritarian’ position is often discussed as being the hegemonic voice that is invoked within societal discourses by key actors such as the police (Clark et al 2007, Herbert 2006). I have shown that regular attendees cite a range of warranting factors from being longstanding residents, victims, the ‘faithful’ or knowledgeable, as well as positioning themselves as ‘deserving good residents’. This frequently involves being part of the in-group as differentiated from the less deserving or undeserving ‘other’ (Hughes & Mooney1998), such as problematised youth, bad neighbours or families who cause social problems (ibid).

The ‘other’ is an accepted part of social identity (Jenkins 2008) and suggests that identifying ‘who I am or we are not’ - such as the undeserving or bad citizens - is a critical part of clarifying ‘who I am or we are’ as deserving or good citizens (Holmer-Nadesan 1996, Elsbach & Bhattacharya 2001). It also provides a comparison point for defining oneself either individually or as having a group membership (Kreiner et al 2006), in this case as deserving compared to those who are not.
Below, we see the use of such categories and identifications is clear within these PACTs and highlights a range of potential excluded residents who may never attend, make a brief appearance or are cast as undeserving compared to the deserving. For example, we see Whitewood attendees both position themselves - and are positioned by the police - as ‘good citizens’ or parents compared to those who are not:

PC Ron: You are good parents won’t tolerate kids smoke [cannabis] at home so [they are] out on streets or parks unlike Nabalfa and Bentwin where parents let them […]. You are doing your bit as good citizens if report seeing drugs handed over, that’s enough (27.10.09)

Problem families and youth are identified as coming from more disadvantaged areas to cause problems.

PC Ron: On talking to the youths we found the majority of the youths had come from other areas and we told them they wouldn’t be tolerated here so not to come back. Whitewood parents are prepared to take responsibility for their youngsters

Res: We’re not having them come here and ruin our area (27.10.09)

The common refrain of ‘the youth of today’ is raised in all PACTs, for example:

John: [Closure of this] is a sad occasion, because Evergreen bowling green has always been there, and I’m 77 years old and I’ve lived in Evergreen all my life, and to see that go like that […] A great shame, in other words the youth of today have won again

Mr Williams: Yeah

Mr Acton: and that is wrong, to be honest

Lois: Yeah, it is wrong, but we have to give them somewhere to go or something to do instead

Bad parents and problem families that cause problems for the moral majority are often raised as a critical comment on the state of society and the changes in attitudes, including those to authority.

Mrs Williams: and the kids were still out there and it’s not quarter to 2 in the afternoon its quarter to 2 in the MORNING and they’re shouting and screaming as if its quarter 2 in the afternoon (Evergreen 01.09.08)

36 Two more deprived wards that are infamous in this part of City
Mrs Neece: It’s the parents I blame, attitudes to discipline have changed, no one observes proper boundaries, not taught to respect their neighbours or authority anymore. It’s a society problem (Evergreen, 07.01.08)

Within Redbank it seems some of the established mainly Asian black and minority ethnic (BME) residents and at other times white migrants (for example from Poland) are constructed by a small core of the regular white attendees - who have lived in the area for over fifty years - as ‘bad neighbours’. This seems to be because many are categorised as not caring, understanding, or conforming to the rules. This is overtly expressed in the focus group.

Mrs Hickson: We come because we care sometimes feel some people in community don’t do enough to keep neighbourhood nice… when we first lived here none of them were here it was a white area then and neighbourhood was much tidier and not same problems… Problem now is there is no community spirit (21.05.08)

Pejorative identifications of ‘none of them’ are frequently made as veiled and covert references to ‘their kind’

Mr Hickson: We are considerate and respectable people, we’ve always lived here, and we don’t want people and their kind ruining our lives. We had relatives come to stay and they couldn’t believe what we’re having to put up with, it’s not right (08.10.08.)

There is the additional negative identification of newcomers who come to live in City for a few months or years as not caring because they are part of the transient influx that characterises many inner city neighbourhoods within England and Wales (Foot 2008).

Mrs Rose: You can’t tell them I tried they don’t speak enough English - they’re Polish or something - just throw rubbish out in stairwell its foul. Council won’t collect it because it’s not bagged properly […] perhaps it’s a cultural thing (18.06.08)

It is clear the counter or disidentification of ‘bad neighbours’ is central to the construction of the identification of ‘good neighbours’ (Stokoe & Wallwork 2003). Another resident’s privately made comment to Councillor Welsh, the only white councillor for Redbank, overtly states this negative positioning. Understandably Councillor Welsh responds that this is racist, unfounded, and unacceptable.
Mr White: The reason Riddle Street is so bad […] is they [Asian & Somali residents] don’t treat it properly […]. Well THEY never come to PACT do they. Never see them at any meetings that’s because they’re hiding they don’t want to be seen, to make themselves known, because they shouldn’t be here they’re illegals. There’s so many of them... Don’t look at me like that, I know you’re not going to agree with me it wouldn’t be pc [politically correct], but it’s the truth just no one will say it (regular attendee in his late 60s)

The BME population for the whole of Redbank is 18% overall, however this is much lower in North Redbank because the majority of BME residents live in South Redbank. Within South Redbank, where the PACT meetings are held, the local population is 27-34% Asian - mainly Muslim with some Sikh and Hindu – plus a small percentage of other BME, including Somali, Chinese and Afro-Caribbean residents. However, it is rare for Asian or other ethnicities to attend the PACT. The views expressed above suggest both permanent Asian and other transient or non-English speaking residents may rightly feel some PACT attendees will hold negative or racist attitudes toward them. They might predict that PACT, though ostensibly for everyone, is not for them as they or their communities might be identified as the ‘problem’ rather than included as part of the solution. Other research has also found that, in practice, they are potentially marginalised or excluded from local governance through discrimination or lack of confidence (Rai 2008). Within Redbank, some separate efforts have been made with Asian communities to address accessibility and confidence. This has occurred by holding women’s mini-Asian PACTs run informally by non-uniformed female PCSOs, held after women only English classes with non-English speaking Asian women (age range 20 to 70) using interpreters.

The few Asian people who visit the main Redbank PACT are professional, fluent English speakers who are either highly educated residents or run local businesses. They are all victims of antisocial behaviour or crime – most often to their businesses - and come to speak about these incidents. None become regular attendees and not all are comfortable with the way they are treated. One attendee who runs a local BME charity uses her professional status and ‘accredited expert’ knowledge to comment on how best to deal with the racist-motivated abuse, harassment, break-ins and criminal damage to their premises.
Female Manager: The problem is people understanding their citizenship and how they should behave; need to run these courses for existing British Citizens not just new immigrants. Need these in schools so teenagers understand how to take care of their environment.

Another resident disagrees with her on the best way to deal with the behaviour of these white youths, based on her alternate claim to local ‘experience based expertise’ (Collins & Evans 2002) as a foster-carer:

Foster Carer: That won’t work because respect comes from very small and is taught by parents you cannot teach this at high school. I’ve been a foster carer for 8 years […] It’s a learning process can’t take a teenager in because they won’t learn it’s too late they’ll laugh and ignore you.

Maureen FLSO: Perhaps we could finish this interesting chat later, and move on to prioritising? (20.02.08)

The female manager regards the foster carer’s comments and the dismissive response from Maureen the FLSO as demeaning and suggests that they are directly motivated by identifications based on her race and religious dress. She tells me:

Female Manager: I certainly won’t go again… I have never been treated so badly by the police and the residents […] just because we wear the hijab people assume we are ignorant and uneducated. The reality is PACT is not comfortable places for us and the police need to do a lot more work to make them so.

As well as drawing on aspects of professional status she also draws on locality, race and religion; not one of these is either predictive or explanatory on its own. Certainly no one from the various ethnic (Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Indian, Somali, Afro-Caribbean and Chinese) and religious communities (Sikh, Hindu, Muslim, Christian etc.) who are not fluent English speakers attend. While the two South Redbank councillors are respectively Sikh and Bangladeshi, the high proportion of first, second and third generation migrants in the area is not reflected in PACT attendance. The racist views presented at Redbank are not presented as reflecting the view of all attendees but the meetings are overwhelmingly white and most residents have lived in the area between 20 and 60 years, suggesting they are the in-group of PACTs. In South Redbank they have seen the ethnic composition of the area change in their life time. Across PACT, aspects of the ‘othered’ identity and identification (including visible signifiers of ethnicity and age [teenager], as well as prejudices and discourses of religion and
racism) are used as discursive resources in complex multi-layered matters of inclusion and exclusion (Wetherell et al 2007).

It is relevant to consider the ‘other’ and who is excluded within PACT. Through local contacts, including charities, it was possible to briefly interview some young people, BME, and other residents who live in City, not just these three neighbourhoods. One marginalised or excluded group from PACT that is often problematised is youth. The Central City sector, with a high proportion of young people including transient students, has held a young people and a University PACT. But this is unusual. At one Evergreen PACT, residents are panicked by some youths who have followed an older lady to the meeting. They are genuinely frightened of the consequences for themselves and the PCSO goes out to move them away.

Mrs Bligh: They’ll know where I live and that I came here, it’s no good
John: Close the blinds so they can’t identify whose here
Bill: They’ll vandalise the cars if we can’t see them

Some young people confirm the negative attitude toward them, which means they feel excluded from their local PACT:

Yeah I used to be worried coming home from school [of drunk adults outside particular shops or houses] but I wouldn’t go to PACT myself because they wouldn’t listen to me it’s the sort of thing my Dad would go to
(April 2008, age 18, Evergreen)

One young person’s mother had persuaded her and a friend to go to their PACT to put their view on needing a space to meet within their village. She reports:

They wouldn’t even let us speak. Each time we tried they shut us up there’s no way I’d go again, they have their view and they don’t want to hear ours
(age 17, female, Treigia37April 2008)

The police themselves say that ‘at most PACT young people are demonised and seen as the problem… we do need to find ways to include them’ (Inspector Evergreen). This reflects the negative ‘othering’ of young people in public places (Benwell & Stokoe 2006; Hughes 2003) as well as fears expressed at PACT. Two young women who are members of a BME youth forum express the view:

37 Treigia is like Whitewood an advantaged though more rural area
We wouldn’t be comfortable going to PACT but we’d be happy to have the police come and talk to us at our [BME and young people] events (19 & 20 January 2008)

Given the low number of attendees (0.1 to 0.3% of ward populations) it is pertinent to consider who else, of whatever ethnicity, is not attending PACT. An Afro-Caribbean resident suggests that she and her adult family members would not attend because ‘we wouldn’t feel comfortable’, positioning PACTs as for ‘other’ people:

You know, the self-appointed busy bodies, like older people with time on their hands and serial meeting goers (woman, 50s, Ganton Resident38)

This shows a clear disidentification and negative view of ‘serial meeting goers’ of those who attend as well as a self-identification that reflects an unwillingness to be co-joined, responsibilised or empowered through attending PACT. This directly contrasts with the identifications of attendees who position themselves as representative ‘care takers’ of their neighbourhoods as holding the higher moral ground. They sometimes negatively position non-attendees as ‘letting the side down’ by not attending:

The police are kind enough to hold these meetings for us and if we want to keep them we have to do our bit by attending (Whitewood)

Where are they? I know some have child care or are too elderly, but where are the rest, they should come (Redbank)

If we want are areas to improve, you have to come don’t you? Someone has to (Evergreen)

The view that PACT is identified as not worth attending is expressed by white people from advantaged and disadvantaged areas:

Oh NO, never, never go or speak at a public meeting [laughs] no way… they’re [police] never going to listen to us even if we did. I think those that go are wasting their time nothing will change (Female,40s,SouthRedbank).

This suggests a lack of confidence in participation with the police. Other attendees from the advantaged parts of the ward suggest that they prefer, and can use, other avenues of influence:

No we haven’t heard of them [...] we write or email our MP, councillors and, I suppose police authority if we have things to raise (resident, North Redbank)

38 Ganton Ward borders South Redbank
Taken together, these comments reveal that the value of attending PACTs is not universally accepted by people as a governance space that they need to or would attend. Also, those who do attend may be an in-group that others do not wish to be co-joined with in CDQL public meetings, or cannot be due to their circumstances. In City, PACT has been mapped on to existing Key Informants Network (KINs) which hold specialist quarterly meetings based on ‘communities of interest’ such as BME or LGBT groups through which aspects of CDQL are raised. This shows locality based PACTs do not map easily onto communities of interest, even when large numbers tend to live in particular localities within City. It also highlights that the police need to have direct avenues of contact and community intelligence to minority populations within City, beyond locality-based PACTs. This means that many voices within localities either rely on their ‘care takers’ to speak for them or remain unheard.

This chapter closes by reflecting on how some of the above experiences affect attendees’ levels of trust and satisfaction both with the police and with PACTs. This is important as part of the justification for the introduction of PACTs as the ‘call to action’ is to improve communications and engagement. It is assumed that this will enhance levels of trust and satisfaction with public services (cf Clarke et al 2007).

6.7 Trust & Satisfaction

As discussed in the conceptual chapters, trust has been identified as a precondition of collaborative governance (Yang 2005) resulting in increases in satisfaction and confidence (Gilling 2010). The talk within these PACTs acknowledges this. Trust and satisfaction with PACT can be said to look promising in Whitewood but it is clear from the challenges concerning poor levels of service in relation to need that this is not the case for either disadvantaged South Redbank or Evergreen. Bob from Evergreen asks ‘Does it do what it says on the tin?’ and he concludes ‘no’. He makes these comments having looked at the published claims and rhetoric for the ‘call to action’ and public meetings within the guides on citizen-led policing and Neighbourhood Policing (NCPE 2006).

Bob: Of course this has all come from the government’s partnership agenda and wanting agencies to work more effectively together. That’s how it’s come about it wasn’t a local idea the police had and thought they’d do it. It’s another central initiative, not really sure how well it has been thought through given the amount of resources police and agencies have got. That’s part of what needs addressing. Though I do think they could work better
across agencies to do more with what they’ve got and it would be good if they paid some attention to what is needed, and listened to us [local residents]. Unfortunately there is no evidence at Evergreen that they do listen. The police don’t even attend, they send the PCSOs. (14.03.08)

Bob suggests that the practice in Evergreen is far below what this literature claims. We have seen in earlier sections how this may be related to inequality in practice across areas (for example non-attendance of police officers and beat managers at disadvantaged PACTs) and this directly impacts on residents’ trust and satisfaction with the police. It also highlights the implementation gap between policy statements and practice.

As Bob states, residents in Redbank and Evergreen are dissatisfied with the services they receive. It seems that they try to make sense of their situation by drawing on macro-discourses (Fairclough 2005) relating to lack of resources:

Mr Hickson: Big problem is years of lack of resources council and police. Problems got out of hand area got worse and worse over years and now big issue to bring it back up, attitudes changed old days obey police and respect neighbourhood not same now (Redbank)

This is frequently raised in Evergreen, for example:

John: Who decides? WHO decides how many Policemen we have, WELL? We pay rates for the police and that

Cllr Harris: Well that’s the Police Authority

John: You mean the councillors and [interrupts

Cllr Harris: NO you can’t say that

Cllr Smith: NO it’s a GOVERNMENT problem the law and sufficient police

John: Because all this - really is - because we haven’t got enough policemen and to counteract that they downgraded a lot of crimes so that NOW we don’t know whether the police are hiding behind the government rising crime scheme or whether they’re really telling us the TRUTH because we don’t know

Cllr Jones: NO

[...]
Cllr Harris: The PEOPLE who need to sort out the process is PARLIAMENT because they set the rules they tell the police what their responsibilities are and they tell local authorities what they’re expected to do.

It would also appear that residents are well aware that their area suffers broader problems and draw on macro discourses of decline, lack of respect for authority and neighbours, long-term under resourcing and resource allocation practices that impact on their lived experiences at a local level. These discourses also imply that these issues are beyond PACT or CDQL initiatives to resolve. For example, in relation to unemployment:

Years ago people had prospects, they had self-respect, and could look forward to being employed for life, this has long gone from this area, not just the young ones but some of their parents never known this, we need jobs we need to offer people something better (Bob Evergreen 01.10.07)

While residents want long-term solutions they realise PACT has its limits and cannot tackle wicked issues such as social ills and economic deprivation.

These macro-discourses frame their situation as a governmental or citywide issue and failure to deal with the difficult problems of long-term deprivation and CDQL. In doing so, they deflect some of the blame for this away from the local police to the wider context in which the police are asked to work. It also shows they do not trust what they are told as the truth, and identify themselves as ‘abandoned’ by the government, council, councillors and the police, despite promises for improvements.

Res (new) […] it needs more action from police to deal with this

Mr Acton: It is the government that’s at fault we were promised when Tony Blair first came into office that there would be more resources and action to deal with quality of life and crime and it’s never happened not good enough. Councillors need to get on to the government and get some action for us (Evergreen 06.10.08)

The falling and low levels of attendance at PACT do not suggest that residents feel they will get satisfaction from coming to these meetings. As Mr Acton at Evergreen says:

Most people fear the police in this area, they’re the people who arrest them or raid the area, surprised people prepared to talk to them at all […] never listened, never come and helped us ordinary folk when we needed them.
For years and years we’ve been left to suffer so what’s the point of trying to talk to them, people don’t trust the police and others [agencies like council] to come and help us when we’re so desperate […] Lucky anyone comes […] Need to prove to us they’re actually going to listen and do something for us when we asks them (07.07.08)

Even against this backdrop of dissatisfaction, all three focus groups said they wanted to keep this avenue of communication open with the police

Mrs Dean: Now we’ve got it we wouldn’t want to give it up (Redbank)
Res: It’s been long overdue to have this sort of opportunity (Whitewood)
Bob: We can’t say it’s working well yet, but I hope it will improve (Evergreen)
John: Having started, it will look bad if it’s taken away, never do (Evergreen)
Mrs Neece: It’s important to be able to chat to them in person, lots of people do that at the end of the meetings, they’re able to talk one-to-one, and the police learn a lot that way (Evergreen)

For these residents, the opportunity to ‘have a say and a voice’ seems to have struck a chord, even if their own PACTs do not seem to give them what they need – more services and choice. The small bands of regulars voice their support for PACT and encourage others to attend. Trust, satisfaction and the legitimacy of PACT will be revisited in chapter six in the context of the police and other partners’ participation in the process.

It can be argued that the mere provision of these meetings qualifies as evidence of procedural justice by official agencies, and indicates their willingness to be respectful, listen, and work collaboratively in participation, ‘opening the door’ for these to happen. The residents who regularly attend seem to construct PACT in this way, and it would seem that some of those who do not attend may not. The importance of the quality of interactions with police applies to public meetings and not only to individual interactions (Tyler & Fagan 2008). How police treat people has been found to have a stronger effect on their view of police legitimacy, levels of trust, and people’s willingness to cooperate individually and collectively than the quality of police performance (Sunshine & Tyler 2003). These authors found differences between whites and minorities in the general importance of legitimacy in shaping cooperation, indicating that minorities place more importance on distributive justice (fairness in relation to others). However Tyler & Huo (2002) found whites and minorities both respond
equally to procedural justice. My micro-analyses of participation show that BME attendees are unhappy with procedural, distributive and outcome justice within meetings. This is coupled with an absence of BME attendees, as well as young people, from these meetings; part of this absence can be explained by their expectation that they will not be treated fairly and justly by other residents and – potentially - official agencies.

In terms of demonstrating procedural justice within meetings, the quality of contact within Evergreen and Redbank (based on levels of challenge and rejection of choice through coproduction) seems to indicate that for disadvantaged residents there is little trust and opportunity to achieve procedural justice. The residents are left frustrated and often angry; this would indicate a missed opportunity with possibly no gains in trust, satisfaction and confidence (Bradford 2011). This seems to demonstrate that residents in these neighbourhood public meetings pay great attention to issues of distributive justice. Much of their positioning is in relation to services they see others getting (when they don’t) or, as in Whitewood, to maintain the current distribution of service within their area. As to be expected, residents are focussed on service delivery and outcomes, not just on how they are treated within the interaction. This is hardly surprising as the nature and procedure of the meetings is focused on setting local priorities for service delivery. These micro-level findings would therefore question the conclusions drawn by Tyler & Fagan (2008) and Bradford (2011) who suggest procedural justice (without distributive justice or an emphasis on improved outcomes) is sufficient.

6.8 Conclusion
The focus of this chapter has been on residents’ struggles to be heard and their social identifications within PACT meetings, revealed through a focus on micro-level analysis of meeting interactions and long-term ethnography, rather than survey or snapshot research such as Clarke et al (2007). I begin by summarising the collective identities and experiences of residents and their possibilities of exercising voice, choice and challenge through collaborative work within their different PACTs. Within all three PACTs, attendees are predominantly older, established and long-standing residents. These regular attendees (and other occasional attendees) feel they can speak for themselves and their neighbours based on a sense of belonging and identification as ‘good citizens and neighbours’. The main story that has been presented in this chapter is one of nuanced and complex locality differences that include multiple identifications, positionings, and resources.
Reviewing the three localities, Evergreen is classed as a disadvantaged area, with many CDQL issues. Many attendees have a history of involvement in local matters for example regeneration, Communities First, and the Concerned Gardeners who formed to fight a local planning issue. They congregate and chat before and after meetings; within meetings they establish a collective identity as deserving and can work together collaboratively (and with councillors). Their meetings are characterised by anger and frustration. At Redbank the majority of attendees are from disadvantaged South Redbank; although this neighbourhood has a significant BME population, ethnic minority and transient populations are underrepresented at these meetings. They also position themselves as deserving and frustrated, but do not usually work collectively within meetings. Two key messages are clear. Firstly, residents from disadvantaged Evergreen and South Redbank experience PACT as frustrating; their voice, choices and requests remain unheard by what they categorise as unsupportive public service officials and services that let down residents by not providing minimally sufficient services within their neighbourhoods. Within Evergreen this is overwhelmingly with the police - and sometimes housing - in dealing with severe ongoing ASB as well as a few problem families. Within Redbank this is more often directed at the local authority with their concerns largely focused on parking and ASB related to stadium events; both areas have issues with insufficient street cleansing services. Secondly, within Evergreen and Redbank, there appears to be concerted efforts to challenge and exercise voice within these meetings to improve services.

Within advantaged Whitewood, many attendees represent neighbourhood watch schemes and take their representational and reporting role seriously, enacting an ‘equal status’ identification (often aligned with their own professional status) with the police and officials. Their meetings are characterised by bonhomie and a collective identity that seems to include the councillors and police working together. The residents’ key position is to preserve their quality of life and levels of service they receive (including having their PC / Beat Manager attend). Their requests seem to get a more positive response with assistance to tackle ASB and other incidents, and police refer to them as being able to mobilise other avenues of complaint. Frequent issues are with village parking, speeding cars, cycling on pavements, and the few incidents of ASB (attributed to youths from less well-off areas). Therefore, for residents from disadvantaged Evergreen and South Redbank the lived experience of PACT can be summed up as one of frustration, whereas for advantaged Whitewood it is one of satisfaction with maintaining standards. This highlights the importance of locality.
differences in the types of issues and attendees experience and within the practice of PACT (identifications and enactment of voice, choice and challenge). I will now examine the key locality differences in relation to challenge, collaborative work, responsibilisation, coproduction, trust and satisfaction, and the potential practice of procedural, outcome and deliberative justice. I will close with a brief review of my findings regarding class, inequality and exclusion.

Challenge is exercised differently within Evergreen and Redbank meetings. Evergreen attendees seem to draw on a range of significant resources to support their ability to exercise challenge and choice (for example membership of interest groups and experience of working with officials and police in other forums). The norm in Evergreen is for collective and passionate collaborative working; people are often angry and talk over one another while also building on each other’s points to construct their arguments. There is a collective challenge and speaking out. Within Redbank, residents seem to present individual complaints and challenges, and while they share a collective identity of frustration they rarely work collaboratively to progress this. The one occasion when they do work collaboratively is when some senior local authority staffs visit their meeting. The emotional positionings within the meetings are also different. Evergreen is far angrier while Redbank’s are sometimes quieter as if they are resigned to the situation and the focus on micro-practices reveals a more nuanced picture of the concerted and collaborative efforts of residents. We clearly see within collaborative working how residents draw on significant resources to mount challenges and position themselves as enabled within PACT meetings. This seems to reflect some aspects of the communitarian thesis and the enabling of ‘communities of fate’ (Braithwaite 2000, Hughes 2007:16) within these multiple diverse and disadvantaged communities. In Evergreen particularly, there is a cadre of strength, expectation, collective identification as ‘let down’ and a preparedness to work in collaboration with police within disadvantaged communities that suggest the potential to shake-up existing power-relations. However, it does not seem to result in gains or changes to services or choice. This suggests that while residents draw on resources, positioning themselves as ‘enabled’, the reaction of officials, both police and local authority, limit their capacity to influence service delivery and power-sharing.

With regard to responsibilisation, my micro-analyses reveal how community chairpersons act as intermediaries and are responsibilised as ‘brokers’ in this process, though each of the three chairpersons play this quite differently and enact different claims to power (Becher 2010).
In Evergreen, the chairperson’s discomfort and contestation of existing power-relations is based on an identification that draws on the lack of support and feedback from the police. We saw chairpersons from disadvantaged areas perceiving themselves as unheard, dismissed and disempowered, suggesting that they undertake more identity maintenance boundary work to sustain their roles both within and between PACTs. For other residents, attending can be considered a level of co-option and a potentially ambivalent and responsibilised identification that is potentially more onerous on those from disadvantaged areas who have real fears of retribution and cross a social identification of not talking to the police. The difficulties with further responsibilisation, such as identifying perpetrators and seeming to do the police’s work, were hotly contested within Evergreen, as was identifying fly-tippers for the local authority in South Redbank. Importantly, my findings suggest resident attendees can be seen as accepting varying degrees of responsibilisation as citizen-consumers (also called active citizens) in their attempt to exercise voice, choice and challenge. In this respect my findings seem to go some way to contradict the Clarke et al (2007) finding that the citizen-consumer identity is rejected.

With respect to coproduction, there are some similarities in resident expectations across areas; overwhelmingly all residents want the police and other public officials to provide services, including solutions to problems. However in response to being let down by public servants the emphasis for residents at Evergreen and Redbank seems to be on type 1 coproduction whereas at Whitewood it is more consistent with Innes & Roberts (2011) classification of police protecting the community (type 3). Consistently within Evergreen we see the contestation and struggles around resident mobilisation (and to some extent responsibilisation) in the provision of solutions and over demands to be vigilant or willing to participate and engage in the active provision of intelligence. There were also locality differences concerning procedural, outcome and distributive justice. There is evidence within better-off Whitewood of residents’ polite but persistent expectation that maintaining their privileged voice and service is an opportunity for procedural justice that can lead to increases in trust, satisfaction and confidence in local police. However, in the same way that Whitewood residents compared their better-off position positively with other areas, there were real concerns within both Evergreen and South Redbank that other areas were receiving better levels of service (for example street cleansing and rubbish). This suggests PACT meetings and neighbourhood PACTs are very much concerned with issues of both distributive (what others get compared to us) and outcome justice (obtaining services) and
that procedural justice alone may not be sufficient. This micro-level analysis tentatively contradicts Bradford’s (2011) research suggesting that focusing on procedural justice alone might result in improvements in trust and satisfaction. This highlights issues for residents concerning perceived inequalities in the discretionary delivery of services. Not least is the lack of a level playing field, with middle-class Whitewood receiving a better level of service provision (and match to need), procedural fairness, and responsiveness so that residents do not feel the need to mount collaborative challenges within PACT meetings.

For all meetings there are excluded residents which may be based on choice (not to attend), age (younger people), being newcomers or transient residents, or other reasons; these groups can form a significant proportion of the neighbourhood population. This was discussed in relation to their potential exclusion through feeling unwelcome, excluded or marginalised by, for example, the majority longstanding residents who mobilise a belonging and ‘care-taking’ identity, or perhaps being labelled as the problem. Within Redbank there is underrepresentation of South Redbank’s minority ethnic residents, potentially linked to capacity to speak fluent English, or other aspects of ‘othering’ or racism. This may or may not be linked to the fact that the councillors within South Redbank are members of two of the key BME communities and therefore have the potential to act as gatekeepers. Some non-attendees were also clear that they do not value PACT as offering an enabling space they would wish to be part of. Lastly, we see that residents in disadvantaged areas are more reticent and generally demonstrate less trust and satisfaction with PACT meetings. This interpretation has been aided by drawing on locality factors and the material practices that are emblematic of class and inequalities, as well as trust, satisfaction and procedural justice. Taken together, these findings suggest the need for situated and contextual analyses that goes further than broad categorisations of advantage or disadvantaged and takes a nuanced look at citizen choice, challenge, responsibilisation as well as marginalisation and exclusion.

However, if the impact of PACT meetings is seen as a function of direct attendance then the impact of all meetings is limited as they only engage and are experienced by a small minority of residents. It is therefore pertinent to ask if they are fulfilling a symbolic function rather than a change of governance or of power-relations around citizen-consumer identities and citizen-led neighbourhood delivery of services. For example, their symbolic contribution might be the fact these meetings are known to take place and aim to give credibility to top-
down and centrally driven initiatives (Gilling 2007). This tentative conclusion will be developed further in chapter seven.

Finally, my focus on collaborative working utilising a social identities approach reveals locality differences in their performance and practice that seem to relate to the exercise of power and inequality and can be said to draw in part on differences in class and the experience of advantage and disadvantage. This approach shows agency and power-relations in action within the micro-level interactions within meetings and achieves a more in-depth focus on practice than other research, including Clarke et al (2007). My findings clearly support the argument that power-relations and positionings are contested (Foucault 1980) and show how these are revealed in the micro-practices of actors in this new collaborative space. This micro-level discursive approach supports Barnes (2009) emphasis on local implementation of centralist initiatives. To conclude, my findings present distinct local differences within this top-down and potentially centralising initiative of PACT meetings. However, the community and its residents is only one half of this story. What will be considered in chapter seven are the positions and experiences of the police and their partners within PACT, as well as in their talk about PACT. In doing so, I will explore further local implementation and examine the influence of these professionals in the ways they enact and perform in PACT. Whether this new collaborative space has the potential to become an arena for choice, challenge and engagement is dependent on the identifications, positions and situated influences of the professional officers involved in the process.
Chapter Seven Police & Professionals: Control versus Collaboration

7.1 Introduction
Chapter seven focuses on the heterogeneous group of public service partners and officials involved in PACT, namely the police, councillors, council partners and occasional visitors. In this chapter, I review their lived experiences, identifications and resistances through their talk concerning PACT and New Labour’s adoption of NPM and, later, NPS and citizen-led ‘call to action’. Following the discussion in chapter six of residents’ experiences of choice, challenge and responsibilisation, this chapter aims is to explore the positions of different officials at PACT meetings, including the impact of preconditions such as local history, and practices and technologies of discretionary allocation.

The chapter begins with the local contextual history to the introduction of PACTs into City and the distancing of the local authority and CSP from this new type of democratic governance. It then considers how the police control PACT meetings and priorities, include their employment of different technologies and strategies to side track and deflect resident requests. The discussion will relate these to an investigation of the way that residents are constructed as the ‘usual suspects’ or ‘counter-publics’ described in 3.4.1, and the implications of this identity attribution for the practice of collaboration and engagement. This is discussed in the context of residents’ positions within police-community engagement within the PACT process. This chapter concludes with a focus on councillors who play an important and distinctive role in PACT, focussing on their interactions, multiple relational positions, and their markedly different collaborative work as either partners or ‘special residents’. This reflects the position of councillors as key participants and potential sources of influence within PACTs, in part based on their locally situated and representational role regarding local issues and politics. This is a pivotal role at the intersection of the diversity, dissent and conflict that occurs within and between various public identifications where these identifications meet city and region-wide local authority agendas (Sullivan 2009).

7.2 Professional Partners Involvement in PACT
Section 7.2 introduces professional partners’ construction of PACT and the implications this has for their level of involvement and engagement. Two issues are key PACTs ownership by the police, and local authority and CSP distancing from direct engagement. These form the
history and local context which influence the practice and implementation of PACT within City.

Within Southern Police, PACT is situated as Partnership and Communities Together to promote horizontal and vertical coproduction. Within other police forces, the same types of meetings are portrayed as Police and Communities Together\(^{39}\). Interviews with some of the police officers responsible for implementation suggest this invoking of partnership, rather than the police, was over ambitious and unfeasible because of insufficient consultation to secure the necessary commitment to collaborative working with partners, particularly local authorities. The Chief Inspector of Partnership acknowledges that while partnership working is integral to dealing with Neighbourhood CDQL there was insufficient buy-in from partners to launch PACT as a partnership endeavour.

We had designed it to be launched as Police & Communities Together but at the last minute the Chief Constable changed it. Wrong decision, we hadn’t done enough behind the scenes work to build partnerships with the seven local authorities and doing this alienated them even further (Chief Inspector Partnership, Workshop June 2007)

Southern Police are tasked under Neighbourhood Policing and the Policing Act of 2002 to hold these public meetings and to allow the community to set priorities for police action. With its ‘call to action’ PACT is seen as an anathema by the Senior CSP Manager and key stakeholder within City Council. He is responsible for both the CSP and the development of Neighbourhood Management with its new public management agenda of citizen-led partnership working.

Both CSP and local authority already have well established public consultation channels. Our priority is to progress Neighbourhood Management, not PACT, and co-ordinate locality based delivery of council and partner services. We are initially trialling Neighbourhood Management on the CDQL agenda so this involves a focus on working with the police. This is all part of LSB\(^{40}\) [and City’s Neighbourhood Management] […] We

---

\(^{39}\) For example, gold star rated Lancashire Police, whose model Southern Police based their PACT process. This was a last minute decision made by the then Chief Constable of Southern Police.

\(^{40}\) LSB: Local Service Boards is part of the Beecham initiative for joined-up and partnership delivery of services that are citizen-led and locality focussed across the range of all local partners. Its timescale is to be fully in place by 2011. Neighbourhood Management is City’s term for the partnership decision-making, reporting and operational structure that is being put in place below the strategic level of LSB’s to achieve this agenda. In 2008
need to ensure how we consult and gain citizen views across all these services has a holistic approach that satisfies providers and the public.

He then explains how City CSP did an initial review of City PACT meetings from September 2006 – March 2007 (Smith 2007) and confirms their view that PACT is not an approach they wish to adopt:

What our study found is PACT is attracting very low numbers and has not engaged across localities in any meaningful way [...] it seems to be an invitation for a minority to come on the basis of ‘who shouts loudest’. It does not reflect needs across neighbourhoods or sectors and because of this it has no validity as a source of intelligence on actual priorities [...] It totally cuts across SARA41 which is the touch stone for us in community policing and safety. In its current form it’s not a consultation technology we see as the way forward in creating citizen-led services.

This illustrates two key identifications. First, the professional preference for forms of intelligence implied by use of SARA and problem-solving policing which contradicts the plebiscitary of fora like PACT, including difficulties with resident and councillor contributions (this will be discussed later in this chapter). Secondly, the positioning of the CSP and local authority as ‘distanced partner’ and their collective disidentification and associated boundary work in relation to PACT which continues to be prevalent and persistent. For example, in October 2006, City local authority decided that paid council officers would not formally attend PACTs but would instead focus on their separate Neighbourhood Management agenda. It gave councillors permission to attend and represent their Wards. This enshrines councillor attendance and - as we shall see in section 7.6 - the multiplicity of interpretations of councillors’ roles. The local authority response is partly based on their initial assessment that some service areas (such as cleansing, highways, and rubbish) could be overwhelmed by resident requests; difficulties posed by police-set PACT meeting schedules, and possible conflicts in organisational approaches and operational timescales (City 2006). This clash of approaches and timescales is reflected within the introduction of PACT in 2006 by what was seen as the railroading of Councils by the police. It resulted in an apology by the Chief Constable of Southern Police:

City’s Police Commander is the first lead officer for this body, with the Local Authority Leader, and an Assistant Director as his colleagues.

41 See chapter three section 3.5
Police unilaterally rushed ahead without bringing partners, particularly Local
Authorities, with them. Our Police Chief has met with the Chief Executive of
City Council and apologised. This is a very big thing and an almost unheard of
occurrence (Retired Deputy Chief, Workshop June 2007)

This fits Bourdieu’s (2000) definition of sense making that draws on significant key events as part of habitus (narratives of ‘the way things are’ that sustain a sense of coherence and often include significant and defining dramatic events). What he calls apocryphal stories. As part of a bridge building exercise, a partnership workshop is planned for June 2007. This fails because neither senior City local authority nor senior City BCU police attend. This is followed by a hastily convened September workshop which leads to the establishment of City’s Neighbourhood Management Network of six separate sector Neighbourhood Management Area meetings, without achieving any change or commitment for council officials to become regular partners in PACTs. This suggests what Edwards et al (2008) refer to as the clash between community safety modes of governance structures and this alternate PACT co-governance process within Neighbourhood Policing. The implementation of PACT within City highlights the importance of situated locality factors, preconditions and experiences. This review of locality factors and constructions begins by focusing on the importance and nature of police role within PACT.

7.3 The Police Construction & Control of PACT

Section 7.3 looks at the police construction of PACT and the desire for good news and achievements that can result in manufactured success stories; it draws on the invocation of hero identifications and a significant amount of identity work, including the contestation and rejection of these identity positions. It then focuses on the control of priority setting within what is essentially a target and performance-driven culture.

7.3.1 The Importance & Manufacture of ‘Successes & Heroes’

The police construction of PACT as a place to gain community intelligence and to impart good news and successes to residents was introduced in chapter six. The creation of this ‘good news message’ is embedded in PACT within Southern Police. According to police officers, their own PACT Guide (2008) focuses on good news messages and the control of meetings on this premise. The ‘ideal’ City PACT is meant to last one hour, present a balance of good news - without letting meetings become a place where residents moan and groan –
and lead quickly to the setting of three local priorities. As one Neighbourhood Sergeant explains:

- Our aim is to make sure meetings last no more than an hour […] we want them snappy, upbeat, and to keep up the positive energy. We do not want to allow them to become moan and groan or bash the police sessions, oh no (Interview, Sergeant Prusher, Redbank)

The PACT Guide focuses on careful planning, conduct and recording of priorities (ibid). Police actions are seen as providing the ‘good news’ for the next meeting: ‘we did what you asked by patrolling Cherry Blossom Way and we are pleased to say there have been significantly less incidents reported, one resident even thanked us’ (PCSO Mat, Evergreen).

While the police presentation of successes at PACT needs to be treated with scepticism, communities, police and local authorities all seem engaged at some level in the search for positive outcomes. Even Lois, one of the most outspoken and challenging residents, comments that ‘news of success’ is good because it shows how their disadvantaged area with its bad reputation is not all bad:

- It’s not on. Our area is always seen as bad. We need some of the good news to be told (Evergreen07.01.08)

There are a number of ways that success stories are manufactured for PACT. Firstly, the appropriation of success stories from other professional partnership settings. An example of this is the TidyTowns decision to allocate funds to gate alleys in South Redbank that was taken within the Area Neighbourhood Management (ANM) and Network Meetings. It was based on professionally collected data and statistics not PACT priorities; coincidentally it fits with resident raised PACT priorities. The reliance on good news indicates the importance of ‘small-wins’ as a basis for creating a virtuous cycle of trust, commitment and shared

42 The researcher also tracked relevant inter-agency Area Neighbourhood Management (ANM) meetings. By the end of 2008, regular South-West Sector ANM meetings are convened and report twice yearly to a citywide Neighbourhood Management Network. PACT priorities are rarely reported to ANM and if they are it is a brief summary that is selected by the police and not a complete review from all PACT meetings. There seems to be the imperative for police to show they are effectively dealing with CDQL issues so those reported to be minutted in the ANM meetings are based on ones the police have ‘successfully’ dealt with or support and are prepared to allocate resources. The ANM agenda is thus professional police not resident or PACT driven. The ANM meetings make horizontally produced partnership bids to available funding streams via Local Authorities / CSP structure (for example one-off TidyTowns funding in 2008/9) or government and Home Office funds.

Obtaining TidyTowns money to alley-gate lanes in Redbank is a successful professional partnership outcome. While issues with lanes are raised at Redbank PACTs residents requests and priorities are never cited or considered in the bid.
understanding (Ansell & Gash 2007:543) as if they were achieved as part of PACT co-governance. We see this recast and presented to PACT attendees as if their requests are being taken seriously by the police and their partners.

Cllr Musin: Pleased to be able to tell you that as a result of you coming to these meetings and telling us about this that we have been able to get the council and police to work together and allocate monies to getting these lanes gated.

This creates the impression that PACT had been a site where residents have been able to exercise influence, voice and choice ‘as if’ it is an example of successful vertical coproduction rather than horizontal coproduction (Innes & Roberts 2011) from Neighbourhood Management. This is a rare occurrence of type 1 coproduction (ibid:14-5) with agreement between resident identified problems and police or local authority solution; it only happens once in Evergreen (Mall Rd play scheme) and this singular occurrence in South Redbank.

Secondly, there is an attempt to manufacture success through positioning ‘grateful’ residents responding to officers ‘heroic’ actions. This is contested. Typically within Redbank and Evergreen, residents disagree with the police that their operations or actions to meet PACT priorities are a success, frequently accusing them of failing to deal with issues.

PCSO: With regard to Hoyden Mews criminal damage and youth annoyance we had an operation and it was very successful, I see Mrs Egypt is here from the Support Women Charity
Female Manager Mrs Egypt: Yes we’re here, and I can say it’s really not working well, so don’t think you can say it’s been successful. Instead of getting on with our work we’ve had to deal with this and are still suffering (Redbank20.02.08)

Evergreen residents differentiate the actions of ‘other’ police from their particularised relationships with their local PCSOs. The PCSO are often positioned with a separate identification as ‘good lads doing their best’ who are in touch with resident needs and who try to do their best for the area, whereas ‘the police’ are collectively identified with seriously ‘letting them down’.

Bob: People have built relationships with PCSOs but the rest of the service continues to let them down. Things won’t change (Interview Evergreen23.04.08)
The police are placed as ‘out of touch’. This is pivotal to the conduct and outcome of PACTs in disadvantaged Evergreen or result in their being viewed as a ‘distanced’ hierarchy apart from residents’ lived experiences and suffering:

Chair Jill: Sometimes I don’t think the ‘high ups’ [decision-makers in the police] appreciate how bad it is and how much people in Evergreen have had to tolerate, they’re so divorced from it see, they don’t go round walking the area and see what the real needs are and yes they’re [residents] angry that they’re still having to put up with it, shouldn’t have to (Interview14.04.08)

Within Evergreen, positive positioning of the PCSOs is not always maintained, sometimes being aligned with dissatisfaction with the police; they are negatively positioned and criticised for the ‘real police’s lack of action’:

Chair Jill: Now, now don’t have a go at these boys they’re doing all they can for us
Mr Williams: It’s the real police that are letting us down, they’re the ones who never come out when we need them not you, you do your best for us we know that
John: Give you your due, good lads, you always come to these meetings and people do see you out and about, that’s what they want, more of that reassurance

This is frustrating and difficult for the police and PCSOs who strive to construct an organisational and occupational identity as law enforcement ‘heroes’ who rescue the day (Westmarland & Clarke 2009) and keep ‘good residents safe’. At Whitewood PACT, PC Ron and his predecessor (PC Joe) get closer to this identification and are viewed as experienced, confident ‘sure hands’ who aim to reassure residents that they can be relied upon. PC Ron constructs himself and the residents he serves in this vein:

The community want to know they can trust us Neighbourhood Police and PCSOs. They want to hear good news stories at PACT […] to be reassured Whitewood is still safe, they are safe in their beds, the police are out there. Elderly and families are frightened by media idea of gangs of hoodies in reality kids out in park playing football. Doesn’t matter that there are 40 to 50 of them – no knives no problems - but people see them and worry immediately. Its fear when look out window, or when live by schools or route home, kids rude, noisy, trash hedges, scratch cars (16.04.09)
In this contestation and struggle to be identified as ‘successful hero’ we see both residents and the professionals moving between identifications and positions as they align or re-align themselves within the meetings. The PCSOs work hard to maintain their hero identification. For example, in Evergreen PCSO Carl offers to extend his own working hours and indicates how his colleagues can also be relied on in this way:

PCSO Carl: I will come to your shop even if it’s midnight

[…]If I’m not available […] I’m sure every officer in the Evergreen Neighbourhood Team will

Within the same meeting, PCSO Mat presents himself as ‘coming to the rescue’ for the community by working in partnership with the council:

PCSO Mat: Yes, as I say I was the officer for that area and it seems like ASBO referrals and [threats to your] tenancy letters and everything was issued in operation with myself and the council and fingers crossed, it, it’s.. I won’t say it’s gone, but it’s not as bad as it was.

This relational identity of ‘hero PC’ is predominantly what Goffman (1969, Van Maanen (1988:34) calls a front stage presentation of self (backstage in this context would be with colleagues) and is invoked on frequent occasions at PACT, and often in the priority setting phase.

At Evergreen - when their hero positioning is contested by residents as insufficient to resolve their problems - the PCSO and FLSO often align themselves with residents as ‘one of you’ and distance themselves from their organisation and their colleagues, ‘the police’. This role distancing and disidentification both disassociates them from their official organisation identity and is used to gain credibility with residents, as someone who understands and is ‘one of them’. On separate occasions, Maureen the FLSO, and Wayne both identify this way:

FLSO Maureen: Off road bikers started coming around back of my house lived in Evergreen 5 years and never had this before so I know how it feels

[…]

PCSO Wayne: I live in the Vale [have persistent off-road issues] but they can’t hold us over a barrel I will keep on this (11.05.09)

This performance is aimed at calming the situation down by more closely aligning with the communities or localities and their core community officer identity as public servants who are ‘servants of the community’ (Herbert 2006). This boundary work and identification with
residents can be understood as a hybrid position that is meant to convey both empathy and action, suggesting that ‘we understand and work for you,’ thereby establishing their legitimacy. Their alignment to this alternative position seems to be invoked to reduce tensions within the meeting and to de-escalate residents’ challenges and frustrations. It also seems to provide acknowledgement of the importance of police action or lack of action (outcome or distributive justice) as well as a possible attempt at procedural justice (Tyler & Fagan 2008).

One key aspect of fulfilling the role of ‘successful hero’ is ‘deserves to be thanked’. This relational reciprocation is most likely at advantaged Whitewood where the envisaged police ritual is enacted: meetings are often one hour, the police are represented by a PC, PCSO input is limited to good news or giving information (warning to residents about bogus window cleaners) and the good residents ‘tut tut’ about villains trying to come into their area. This is a collectively achieved by the PCSO and residents through an overwhelmingly well behaved and polite performance:

PCSO Paul: To let you know what’s been going on in Whitewood […] so you and your neighbours are forewarned, can keep an eye and let us know of any incidents (Whitewood)

This seems to point to the importance of managing interactions and expectations.

7.3.1.1 Managing Expectations

Whitewood meetings are kept ‘light and bright’ with the use of humour (Mirivel & Tracey 2005) and the feeling that residents and their police can be satisfied and reassured concerning police actions in their area. Again and again, PC Ron demonstrates that he - and the police generally - should be identified as public servant heroes: ‘I am the police and I will deal with it’. He refers to himself as ‘safe hands’ and he co-opts residents to support his actions and receives affirmation and thanks:

Chair Barbara: want to say thank you to these two gentlemen, I’ve seen them out on the streets, leafleting and working hard for us (11.08.09)

Polite conversation and its maintenance is a powerful normative driver within the talk and identifications within this meeting, with the use of humour to smooth and achieve this positive interaction (ibid). It represents ‘the way things are done’ and in a backstage interview the previous Whitewood PC, Joe, jokes:
Moaners don’t come, won’t let them [laughs] lots of people moan and do nothing […] people who come [to Whitewood] are the gooduns trying to do something, like Barbara

He emphasises and acknowledges the importance of procedural performance at Whitewood, telling me:

PC Joe: These are tricky meetings that need careful handling, you know, most of them are, you know, influential or professionals so you have to be on the ball to deal with it (Interview15.05.08)

As reviewed in sections 6.2 and 6.3, this style of interaction gives ample opportunity to use procedural justice which is characteristic in dealing with residents’ concerns at Whitewood.

For example:

 Resident: A lot of elderly in Upper Whitewood we don’t see the police, ignore us
  PC Ron: That’s a shame. I’d like to come and see you [smiles to everyone] seriously now, unfortunately or fortunately that’s because there’s no crime in your area [brief nod and smile to audience to ensure they absorb this good news]. What we can do is make sure we hold a surgery [mini-PACT] in your area soon [general nods from audience and Barbara the Chair] (26.03.09)

This is a consummate performance of procedural justice to connect with and reassure residents (Sluss & Ashforth 2007, Bradford 2011). Though relatively challenge free, this suggests police achieve this by careful, conscious and reflexive use of procedural justice rather than these merely being easy meetings. Whitewood PACT meetings aspire to the police conception of their ‘ideal’ PACT, and the officers who control their meetings engage in a front-stage construction and presentation (and acceptance by residents) of themselves in Herbert’s (2006) public servant mode.

These attempts to manage expectations and manufacture success can result in failure and rejection. However hard the police try to enact their ‘ideal’ PACT, the meaning and operation of PACT is more diverse; in disadvantaged communities they are thwarted by the contested reality of engagement with a dissatisfied and seemingly ‘ungrateful publics’. Thanks and appreciation of the police/partners’ efforts is rare in Evergreen and Redbank meetings. This means that in many PACTs – such as in these deprived areas – the police are frustrated because the practice of PACT does not conform to their ‘ideal’ construction and vision. PCSO Mat mutters at the end of a particularly challenging Evergreen PACT: ‘we do
our best. We don’t deserve to be treated like that’. This is a rare revelation of backstage doubts concerning the difficulties of this role when no PCs attend.

The Neighbourhood Inspector for Evergreen and Redbank indicates that the dominant police discourse on PACT is one of ‘managing residents’ expectations’:

Need to have realistic expectations, and that’s all down to explaining what we can deal with and how we work so people understand (Interview 27.07.07)

At an official partners ANM meeting, he relates co-joining residents to professional solutions, in this instance approval for the trial closure of Badgers Lane in line with police resources:

We can’t resource it. We were called out nearly every night to something at Badgers Lane, also the kids causing trouble. Alright, it is mainly, but not always, on Bluewater side, then they escape through the Lane and we lose them. It’s unpolicible. It has to be closed (South-WestANM, April 2009)

Chapter six discussed how residents in disadvantaged areas frequently resist being co-joined and reject seemingly neutral explanations such as resource issues. They use this to critique professionals’ discretionary allocation and complain that they do not get the services they ‘should’ and ‘deserve’. This included responses in relation to Badgers Lane:

Lois: We don’t want it closed we want it policed and something done for the kids AND how come you found police NOW [to implement the trial] when you couldn’t find it to police it all these years? (01.09.08)

It is in the light of these struggles and contestations within disadvantaged South Redbank and Evergreen, and the different more acquiescent experience in advantaged Whitewood, that the police move toward setting priorities. Below we explore residents’ ambivalence to the police control and conduct of this phase of PACT meetings.

7.3.2 Control of Priority Setting

In order to maintain a position of ‘being in charge’, the police operate tight control over the final priority setting phase of the meeting. Interestingly, this phase of the meeting is frequently completed in fewer than five - and up to a maximum of eight - minutes, whereas the full meeting may have lasted up to two hours. As outlined in the Policing Pledge43, the setting of priorities is central to the purpose of PACT, though this seems a central

43 See section 4.2
preoccupation for the police rather than the residents. The regulars in the audience even start getting ready to leave at this stage; they begin to talk to each other and hold informal discussions, indicating that for them the main event is over. Within all three localities it is the police who drive the priorities setting phase. For example, at Evergreen, PCSO Carl’s statement ‘we ought to think of setting some priorities’ is ignored. This meeting has already lasted nearly two hours, and he fails two or three times in the last 20 minutes of this meeting to shut down ongoing discussions of issues to get to priorities:

PCSO Carl: Can we get on and set some priorities other than Cherry Close update

Cllr Harris: Yes, well can we have an update on St Dustan Close and Welsh Close? (01.09.08)

At all the three PACTs residents are far less engaged in this phase of the meeting than the police. Particularly at Evergreen and Redbank, it seems the energy of residents is by then ‘spent’. Their interest, emotion and anger have been used on ‘having their say’ and voicing their issues. Eventually there is laughter as the PCSO attempts to set priorities. As this begins, the residents seem to dis-engage from the formal meeting. They move back into their extensive premeeting and informal talk characterised by humour and chattiness (Boden 1994; Mirivel & Tracey 2005). For residents it’s as if the PACT meeting is already over:

PCSO Carl: Right, I am going to get to the PACT priorities this time [laughter] right PACT PRIORITIES

He has to shout above residents conversations to do this. Below, we see two conversations (conversation 1 and conversation 2) between some residents during the priority setting:

Mr Acton: So is there football most Sundays now [conversation 1]

PCSO Carl: NEED TO BRING MEETING TOGETHER and set priorities

Lois: Yeah when we’re not run over by bikes [conversation1]

John: Is ball playing in the street illegal? [conversation2]

Dana: that’s dreadful, are you still doing slimming club on Thursdays I might see you there [conversation1]

Bob: I think it is [conversation2]

FLSO Maureen: SO IT seems we have four possible - ALL ASB - because they are causing noise, alarm or distress and harassment. So can we take a vote by show of hands to see which will be our three priorities for this month?

1. Ibson Rd (football)
2. Rear View Road (youth)
3. Asian Families Shop on Heol Mustard
4. Acton Rec with off-road motor bikes [women conversation 1 raise hands
vote for this as they carry on their conversation]
Lois: Yeah, yeah, most weeks [conversation1] (11.05.09)

Within Evergreen and Redbank, the experience of priority setting and its impact on curtailing choice and adding to resident frustrations seems to lack procedural, distributive and outcome justice (Tyler & Fagan 2008). Interestingly, while Whitewood residents seem to obtain procedural justice at PACT meetings -and arguably distributive and outcome justice- they are also quieter and seem equally dis-engaged in priority setting. It is the formal panel at the top table of PC, community chair, and councillors who discuss potential priorities and then present these to be approved by residents who are positioned as ‘audience’ to ‘rubber-stamp’ rather than being involved as power-sharing participants. It is clear that PC Ron dominates this process in Whitewood. He uses his charm, position power and authority to convince the meeting of the ‘right’ priorities. He explains this when I interview him:

At the March 26th meeting I knew I had the horse watch [operation] ready to run the next day and it is what we [the police] wanted to achieve as the priority for this area so I asked PACT to agree to this

Within the March meeting he inserts a police desired priority, while continuing to influence and set the final two priorities:

I appreciate it’s not affecting anyone here but it is important and we want it as a priority for this area as it’s an important crime […]I suggest we also continue with the two we’ve already got, parking in Button Road and Youth Annoyance in Pristine Close

This visible control and managing of priorities is clearly driven by his police target to produce fitting and manageable priorities within the constraints of police resources and demands. It also ensures that an existing police operation- horse watch - can be counted as a PACT priority, as he says:

Yes we do need to set priorities and I think the community want to see some set, it’s like an affirmation of their attendance at the meeting […]up to me to make sure they’re achievable given all the demands on us [laughs] (16.04.09).
After the formal end, a few residents speak individually to the police, chair, or councillors. The majority often leave quickly, smiling, happy and well served. There is a joint sense between police and residents of having ‘done their job’ for another couple of months.

Like other PACTs, priority setting is a brief affair and seems a formality or ‘tick-box exercise’ to meet a police target that needs to be ‘rubber stamped’ at PACT. It does not feel like power-sharing and the exercise of a call to action at any of the PACTs. This seems to reflect both Skogan’s notion of ‘laundry meetings’ (Somerville 2009:266) and the déjà vu voiced by Hughes (1994) in relation to the Scarman recommended community meetings. At Evergreen, the clear task of the police is to limit priorities:

FLSO Maureen: I’m not having that as a priority. It’s a huge area for ASB, it will have to be split into two separate priorities
Chair Jill: What about the issue with the motor bikes?
FLSO Maureen: No, NO way. I’m not having such a large area North Evergreen for motorbikes it’s too much for officers to cover its too big for mounting operations […] if we keep that one of the ASB will have to come off come there’s too much here for the boys to cover. It will have to be either Heol Mustard, or Water End Stores can’t do so much…. Chair Jill: [tells the meeting] Okay we’ll leave it with the FLSO to sort out what can be done (Evergreen06.04.09)

This illustrates a lack of procedural justice, as well as contestation concerning residents wish for outcome justice. At Redbank, councillors negotiate with the police to discuss the options. The chair and residents listen and wait while the FLSO dictates what is possible. The residents then have a notional show of hands to endorse the outcome:

Cllr Welsh: Two issues parking issues in Redbank and criminal damage in Hoyden Mews
FLSO Maureen: NO CAN’T have parking all over Redbank
Cllr Welsh: [said very quietly looking at FLSO] say Norton Street then? [FLSO nods and Cllr Welsh says louder so everyone can hear] OKAY councillors will take away issues of drains […]

In all the PACTs that I attended, this imperative to limit the geographical coverage of priorities to small areas that are part of a street or a particular junction is repeated time and time again. This circumscription is viewed as problematic for residents or areas that have
ongoing severe ASB or CDQL issues – be it parking, fly-tipping, harassment or noise nuisance - at multiple locations throughout their areas.

Bob: This limiting of priorities to parts of streets is not really getting us anywhere; ASB is happening across the Ward and needs to be dealt with more strategically to have an impact (Evergreen11.05.09)

The police view reflects that this containment of priorities is a deliberate strategy and they have to work out what they can cope with. Their points are reflected in the following quotes:

Police had a steep learning curve [since beginning PACT in 2006] learnt to say ‘no’ to medium term and long term issues, priorities taken on are short term (Chief Inspector Partnership, WorkshopJune2007)

For neighbourhood priorities the Police are looking for quick hits and easy successes, not necessarily causes but symptoms (Neighbourhood Inspector, WorkshopJune2007)

In light of this level of containment and control by police it is hardly surprising that residents dis-engage from this process. At Redbank they often leave during it. This part of the meeting does not seem to be for residents. Priority setting and the ‘call to action’ seems to have been repositioned and subverted (Prior 2009), recast as a police activity to meet their own target of having met with communities and allowed them some input in setting local priorities. Edwards et al (2008:45-6) confirm this in their finding that policing and community safety is overwhelmingly target driven. These targets result in the reduction of priorities to those that are bite-sized and short-term, focused on what police can achieve by mainly using PCSO resources. As noted by Karn (2007:105, this seems to make them almost meaningless to residents who live-in the area and suffer the issues).

Lois: can we have a request for money for diversionary activities for the young people in the summer holidays

FLSO Maureen: No I can’t put that because it’s not something the police can achieve between now and the next meeting so it doesn’t fit as a priority unfortunately, sorry, nothing I can do, that’s the way it is, my Inspector would kill me (07.07.08)

It is these longer-term and broader-based solutions that most residents focus on within disadvantaged areas; not just a temporary quick-fix of targeting symptoms such as catching or dealing with the perpetrators in a one-off instance. This is an example of residents looking
for services to provide what Innes & Roberts (20011) call protecting the community or type 1 coproduction and, importantly, through residents’ vertical coproduction within PACT. However, the micro-interactions within these meetings show that residents are to a large extent powerless to change or negotiate significant influence on outcomes to meet their expectations.

As already seen, there are disappointments, contestations and a clash of expectations between residents and the ‘distanced’ police and local authority staff who do not formally attend PACT meetings. This is most visible within disadvantaged areas where residents have limited influence on police and partner action as well as limited impact and influence over the allocation of existing resources or access to additional resources. It seems that this expectation of PACT is beyond how the more dominant and powerful professionals construct the PACT meetings. This is a key criticism of PACT and a source of frustration for residents, causing much of the tensions and contestation that occur within the meetings. This can be seen as a result of the lead agencies (police) ownership of PACT through a process of dismissal, rejection of resident solutions, constraining priorities and limiting the possibility of residents holding services to account. This is an example of what Prior (2009) calls staffs’ ability within implementation to subvert outcomes, and their use of agency to achieve their preferences.

Far more important than residents’ ‘rubber-stamping’ of the formal priorities is the final informal phase where they review and discuss the meeting. This seems to be a critical event for resident attendees and is an example of post-meeting talk that occurs separately to the front stage of these meetings. This is backstage, between residents themselves, or quietly with partners:

Mr Williams: Well I wasn’t happy about that but I suppose we’ll have to see
Mrs Nice: Yes they should do something it’s been going on for a long time, no good leaving us living with this up to 20 there most nights
Bob: I do hope they do. This needs sorting out there should be a co-ordinated way of dealing with this not leaving it to chance, the Police need to act on this
Mrs Williams: I was going to speak to Councillor Harris but he shot off pretty quick, okay for some (01.09.08)

This backstage exchange of views reinforces their dissatisfactions and wish for police and councillor action. It seems to be an important part of sustaining their collective identity
with meetings. This informal phase – lasting up to twenty minutes - is also important to the police for gaining community intelligence and talking individually to residents. For some attendees, and to some extent the police, this post meeting seems to represent a second main event or critical transition phase in its own right.

Finally, this phase of the meeting reflects the critical role of FLSO Maureen within PACT meetings. For example, when she suggests she cannot allow priorities that won’t be achieved by the next meeting, based on her Inspector’s instruction (No I can’t…. my Inspector would kill me), and in earlier exchanges where she dictates what is or is not acceptable as priorities (e.g. Heol Mustard or Water End Stores). She tells residents their attendance at PACT is to set three local priorities (that’s why you are here Sir). In doing so, she identifies herself as ‘gatekeeper and enforcer’ and is responsibilised to the achievement of the police agenda.

7.3.3 Operating in a Performance-led Culture
I referred earlier to the managerial and performance-led aspects of NPM and NPS. Redbank Sergeant Prusher provides an insight into ‘insider’ positions and culture in relation to PACT and the need to meet other police performance targets when he confirms:

> It’s a balance of influencing and managing the expectations of attendees with all our duties, NICHE, COMPSTATS\(^44\), not just PACT you know […]. The Inspector’s decision is to focus manpower on these so police don’t attend [South West Sector PACTs including Evergreen and Redbank] but our comp stats are 93% for Ganton and 87% for Evergreen. Bluewater [West Sector] police attend PACT and their comp stats were the next nearest to those for the other six sectors in City at 54% big difference […]. NO, no, not allowed to give those figures out to public these are an internal performance measure (Interview 30.10.08)

This tells us the nature of the performance environment and demands that the Neighbourhood Inspector for Evergreen and Redbank is working with. He sums up his ‘juggling’ with limited resources and agendas as follows:

---
\(^{44}\) NICHE is the police system that applies call grading to allocate tasks based on the level of response they require (for example immediate attendance down to a phone call within the next 48 hours to talk to victims). Comp Stats are internal targets and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) measure that all Inspectors are held to account to report on fortnightly. These are the critical and highest priority performance BCU targets they have to meet.
If I said to residents to do all you want means you paying loads more through your police precept in council tax to fund it they won’t say ‘yes great’. I have limited resources and I do the best I can with them (27.07.07)

This position is one he and many others hold as ‘experts who know best’ and claims decision-making power within the police hierarchy and CSP:

We’re the professionals; we’re recruited and paid to do the job so let us get on with it. The public can’t interpret the data or make sound decisions. We are the experts; they don’t know what will be the most efficient way to tackle issues or how our systems and resource works. It’s totally unworkable (CSP Co-ordinator WorkshopJune2007)

This adds another barrier to inhibit and marginalise resident choice over the use of limited resources. The Inspector’s resources are spread thinly in a sector that comprises four Wards that all have high levels of CDQL issues, and three deprived Communities First areas (Evergreen, Coolgreen and South Redbank). He is directly accountable to the BCU Commander; his head is on-the-line in these fortnightly performance COMPSTAT reviews.

To conclude, there is a confusing and seemingly endless range of key performance indicators (KPIs) and targets tracked under Community Safety (Violent Crime, Burglary, Car Theft etc.) and related HMIC inspection regimes for Neighbourhood Policing, including holding PACTs, setting priorities, and measures of public confidence (Gilling 2010). Hughes (2004:14) goes further, suggesting that success in crime and disorder reduction partnerships has been ‘largely synonymous with what can be counted, audited and easily targeted’, leaving little room for ‘more ambitious social programmes of prevention and safety’ that may have greater relevance to communities and the public. This is also the finding of the 2008 review of CSP in Wales conducted by Edwards et al (2008) which suggests that the police seem to give ‘lip-service’ to community engagement, or at least take a ‘tick-box’ approach to setting PACT priorities within the dominant credo that ‘what gets done is what gets measured’.

From this perspective, the wish to control PACT and PACT priorities to ensure they are something achievable and manageable within limited available resources is both sensible and the practical exigency for these police managers and their organisation to attempt. We see them positioned as ‘accountable managers’ who allocate and juggle limited resources in the face of these externally and internally driven regimes. Within the Welsh context, Edwards et al (2008) conclude there is a prevalence of an instrumental ‘tick-box’ approach to PACT
related to meeting police targets and performance measures. This culture also permeates the police commitment to CSP activities that are themed to different CDQL and policing issues (e.g. domestic violence). These are hampered by a mainly centrally-specific agenda and separate, rather than combined, agency budgets (ibid).

While the key focus of this research was contestations and identifications within PACT, an attempt was made to trace action to fulfil PACT priorities by police & partners. OM Mike reported that no formal record of PACT priorities or follow-up actions was kept by the local authority; it was not possible to differentiate councillors’ questions generated by PACT or other avenues. The one-off visit of senior staffs to report their positive actions to Redbank PACT occurred as a result of councillor-led follow-up. With respect to police there were rare occasions where formal operations were mounted, for example utilising the off-road motor bike team and vehicles supported by planned PCSO/PC attendance. Otherwise activity was at the discretion of Sergeants to slot priorities into available PCSO time once other duties were completed (such as response to NICHE allocations, victim support/feedback, planned beat routes etc.). The operational ethos was to adjust PC and PCSO beat routes to ensure they incorporated PACT priority locations. Therefore, actions on priorities become absorbed and combined with normal working, without additional formal record. At Whitewood, the PC would report on police actions to meet PACT priorities (e.g. speaking to resident/cyclists, issuing parking tickets); at Evergreen the PCSOs often failed to give reports and feedback to residents other than ad hoc recounting where they had personally been involved. As discussed in chapter five, residents often disagreed with police and other officials whether priorities had been successfully dealt with, and most priorities recurred at future meetings (e.g. ASB in a particular location, speeding, parking, cleansing). What seems evident is that recording separate and traceable actions arising from PACT priorities is not a critical performance measure. This leaves a complex picture with little possibility of tracing clear actions and outcomes, further complicated because the definition of successful outcomes is itself contested and ill-defined.

The impact of centralist regimes and discourses (such as measurement and ticking boxes) can be seen as reflecting the contested space or field of policing, measurement of performance and operational demands with its use of its own narrative norms and habitus (Bourdieu 2000). Together these seem to limit the extent of reform and operation of new governance within community engagement at PACT. Section 7.4 further considers how resident choice is
limited through the enactment and practices by the police of a range of technologies (tactics and approaches) to dismiss residents’ voice or to side-line their capacity for choice and challenge. These strategies give us a further insight into how the police organisation and individual officers’ actions and identity work constrain residents’ power and choice within PACTs.

7.4 Technologies of Dismissal
Within meetings, the police rejection of choice and challenge is partly achieved through a lack of response. This is achieved by using a range of strategies and technologies to dismiss or deflect requests. The police representatives (PCSO, PC, and FLSO) at PACT meetings position themselves as ‘experts who know best’. This seems to build on their identification with managing expectations to manage the process and outcomes of PACT. This is most noticeable in the way they dismiss choice and challenge within meetings, which in effect silences residents. This adds to their control of priorities, compounding the effective curtailment of choice and challenge. They display what can be called technologies of dismissal (Dean 1999:73), used to disempower, deflect and fob off residents’ concerns (Newman et al 2004). I categorise the full range and use of these strategies as:

- Direct dismissal
- Active deflection
- Indirect deflection

These act as ‘counter challenges’ to residents’ attempts to exercise challenge and choice within meetings and effectively shut these down. The dynamics of these power-relations are particularly visible in the Evergreen meetings where residents attempt to subvert meetings to achieve their desired outcomes (Prior 2009). These technologies seem embedded within the police organisational culture - the taken-for-granted social constructions and discourses of police - in a way that hides these actions and the work they perform as part of the normal and every day (Hardy et al 2005). They are performed and utilised to create and sustain policing collective identities: what Bourdieu (2000) would categorise as resources within their habitus. We see how this performance is unquestioned as naturalised to such an extent that it is unacknowledged by officers in their construction of police-community engagement within PACT. Throughout 7.4 (as with priority setting) we see the central position of Maureen, the FLSO, as the key person positioned as ‘broker, gatekeeper and enforcer’ on behalf of the police. I will illustrate the use of these dismissal technologies in turn, beginning with direct dismissal.
7.4.1 Direct Dismissal

This is used in Evergreen. Direct dismissal visibly transgresses the norms of talk and what Hardy et al (2005) refer to as the assertive discourse required in effective collaboration. This counter challenge to residents by the most powerful actors within PACT is the most shocking to this researcher; to me, its use seems to transgress the stated nature of community-engagement through PACTs.

It needs to be understood within the history and context of the relationships and issues within the locality, and the distress and anger concerning the timed closure of Badgers Lane. To recap, the feeling of the Evergreen meeting is that this is a police-led agenda. Also, while Bluewater PACTs views have been sought and listened to, those at Evergreen have not. Bob and the FLSO have an established, respectful relationship which may also partly explain the lack of reaction by him, and other members of the audience, to being told very firmly by her to ‘shut up’. Both give context to the exasperation of Maureen (the FLSO) and Wayne (the PCSO) to the continuing questioning of this issue, and the police insistence that opposition to closure does not become a PACT priority. Wayne quickly moves the meeting on from Maureen’s personal statement to invoke the authoritative ‘we’ the police are ‘experts in charge’ and are dealing with this.

Bob: There will be deaths don’t know trouble closure will cause collateral damage [he gives examples] youths jumping main railway line or using other [even more] unsuitable crossings like Weenybridge to cross from Bluewater & Evergreen

FLSO Maureen: Shut up Bob

PCSO Wayne: We don’t know how they will react too early to say that will happen

Bob: Closure will make life more difficult for the shop on Heol Mustard need to consider how vulnerable the Asian shop keepers are, you don’t appreciate how much they will suffer with Badgers Lane closed

FLSO Maureen: We do realise closure may have an effect and already had a number of meetings with them (11.05.09)

And on another occasion:

---

45 See section 6.2.1
Bill: It’s not good enough they’re elderly and vulnerable they shouldn’t have to cope with that sort of neighbour. Something needs to be done about him, he’s a problem

FLSO Maureen: The Inspector’s said it’s a social problem and we can no longer discuss it at PACT as it’s not something the police can deal with alone

Lois: That’s not good enough [FLSO looks at Chair for support]

Jill Chair: Much as we may be unhappy about this, I have been told it’s a council matter now and not a suitable PACT priority, hopefully our councillors will report back to us on progress (07.01.08)

This rare use of ‘obvious control’ is grudgingly accepted. These occur solely within Evergreen PACTs and it is suggested they may be related to the sustained and consistent collaborative challenges mounted within their meetings. The norm in other PACTs, and Evergreen meetings, is for less obvious strategies of control to silence or dismiss challenges that the police do not wish to deal with. They range from active deflection to changing the topic of conversation or the FLSO / PCSO state that they cannot answer the question.

Indirect deflection is less obvious again. The issue or question is not picked up, nor overtly addressed nor acknowledged in any way. Alternatively, one small aspect within the original request is answered leaving the main and substantive issues unaddressed. This happens frequently to deflect big issues and concerns that the police do not wish to discuss within the meeting. In many ways it seems to be the most tried and tested tool used by professionals, whether used consciously or unconsciously. These discursive strategies often occur together.

7.4.2 Active Deflection

Firstly, I present an example of active deflection to change the topic of conversation; the FLSO/PCSO either directly avoid giving an answer or state they cannot answer the question. We see how having no information on a topic is used as a strategy to ‘close it down’, resulting in both a lack of feedback and the silencing of councillor and residents objections.

Cllr Jones: Before we leap into priorities can we have some feedback on the situation with travellers and Cherry Blossom Way raised at the last meeting?

PCSO Carl: We’ve had no figures [statistics] through on that so I can’t give you those

Cllr Jones: Well how many calls have been made to 101?

PCSO Carl: Ummmmmm…
The community are let down by this lack of information on a previous PACT issue and my observations of these meetings reveal that this happens regularly. The extract below is taken from the one meeting where, due to an emergency Labour Party meeting, no councillors are present at Evergreen. The position taken by Bob reflects the views within this deprived area that PACT may not be fit for purpose. It focuses on the lack of communication of residents’ issues to any systematic decision-making or formal reporting body that might look at both short-term or long-term CDQL issues and potential solutions raised by residents. We also see that this type of reporting through a police or partnership structure is something residents expect but can see no evidence.\(^{46}\) For these residents, this lack is a major inhibitor to allowing them to effectively exercise choices in PACT meetings.

Bob: This is a concern. No one at PACT, neither councillors nor police. If the police regard PACT as a useful meeting they should arrange a channel of communication to have these addressed. Otherwise police not taking this seriously

PCSO Wayne: Not Partnership and Communities tonight but Police and Communities because no partners are here

FLSO Maureen: Bob I wish I could answer your questions we can’t comment on

trial [closure of Badgers Lane] you know that. Have to move on to set priorities (11.05.09)

Over a year later, in May 2009, residents are still trying to get answers regarding Badgers Lane. Maureen invokes the personal subject position ‘I wish I could answer’ combined with ‘we can’t comment’ on this. This seems to draw on ‘our hands are tied’ as a discursive resource to avoid and depersonalise responsibility for being unable to respond by identifying with the constraint of organisational hierarchies and direction. From my longitudinal involvement in these meetings and my attendance at the relevant ANM meetings, I can unpick the multi-faceted elements as follows. The first strategy of the FLSO is to defer to

\(^{46}\) The researcher’s separate tracking of Neighbourhood Management and interviews within the police showed that the police have no formal body to review police oriented or general CDQL PACT issues within or across sectors. The police report sparingly on PACT to ANM meetings, highlighting selective priorities and messages. Upward communications, particularly from PCSOs and FLSO at the bottom of the hierarchy, are limited and edited through senior officers.
formal decision-making outside PACT. This is the line she has been instructed to take by her Inspector.47

The second active deflection strategy shown in this example is one of opportunism. The FLSO capitalises ‘opportunistically’ on the unusual fact that no councillors are present and refuses to answer the question, stating it’s a council issue. This devious tactic is to some extent related to the local history of antagonism between police and councillors at Evergreen due to the decision of these councillors to sit in the audience with residents and not as partners on the top table with the PCSOs. Their absence often provides an additional opportunity for the PCSOs to talk of their ongoing frustration with having no formal partners at the Evergreen top table. This is an uncomfortable and unresolved issue for the police. They position themselves as ‘beleaguered and alone’ within these meetings as ‘Police and Communities’. They try to deflect this and re-direct residents’ frustrations to a lack of partners. The joint effect of these two police interventions is a double jeopardy. The serious complaints of Bob and other residents at the way PACT operates to deny them a real voice or choice are silenced and shut down by focusing attention on another issue. This negates their choice to hold this position, to have it heard and be given a response. This is not giving them the either procedural or what seems to also include outcome justice they are looking for (Tyler & Fagan 2008, Bradford 2011). In conversation with Maureen, the FLSO, she explains how her Neighbourhood Inspector is particularly authoritarian ‘his word is law’ and how they operate through layers of hierarchical reporting: she and the PCSOs brief the PC or Sergeant who then briefs the Inspector on PACT priorities. She also states how limited reporting is: ‘oh no, we just tell him the final priorities. He only wants a brief summary and he told us to say Badgers Lane is a council matter’. Complaints about how PACT works do not get reported or dealt with; getting a response to such concerns is therefore unlikely within Evergreen or City.

A third related position, often taken by police and CSP representatives who attend ANM, is that they do not need to provide such information to PACTs.

---

47 City local authority through the South West Sector ANM approved the timed closure based on police petitioning combined with Bluewater councillor and resident support. The police are monitoring the trial and reporting through the ANM, this is not revealed within PACT.
No, NO, NO [bangs table] it’s not what PACT is for. It’s not our job to feed PACT meetings information on what we’re doing in their area. Never hear the end of it, not got the resource to do it, PACT is just for communities to TELL US what’s bothering them that month

(CSP Co-ordinator, SouthWestANMmeetingJune2009)

These both suggest a construction of PACT that involves minimal vertical coproduction, sharing of information and decision-making with residents. For Yang (2005:276) it is a construction that does not meet the requirement of participatory governance based on trust and willingness to share power. PACT seems to be subverted to minimal levels of consultation (Arnstein 1969) and intelligence gathering. This is reinforced by police suspicion of the PACT chairpersons’ meetings. These seem to be threatening because they attempt to disrupt existing power-relations by re-positioning PACT chairpersons and moving them beyond their police-appointed community broker role. Citywide meetings contest the enforcement of single ward PACT co-governing relationships that are controlled within the sectorial boundaries of individual Neighbourhood Inspectors.

Hmmm not sure, my first reaction is I’m not comfortable with the chairs getting together without us. What would be the point, should I worry about this? (Interview11.11.08)

The City BCU Commander’s comments reflect their concerns with an independent bottom-up generated and unmonitored group holding a citywide strategic focus.

7.4.3 Indirect Deflection

Indirect deflection is a more subtle and less visible way of ignoring challenges. Issues or questions are not picked up, overtly addressed or acknowledged but are redirected; the most acceptable aspect of the original answer leaves the key substantive issues unaddressed. The example below shows how the lack of police decision-makers and attendance at Evergreen are successfully ignored by the PCSO and FLSO. They stay silent initially, letting the conversation continue between residents. When the FLSO does speak, she refers to being unable to answer questions on Badgers Lane but does not address the broader and more important issues of the absence of ‘real decision-makers’ or the lack of invites to the training. This is the most frequent technique used in meetings. It is a consistently used technology to avoid the discussion of contentious issues, whether used consciously or not. Indirect and

48 See 6.4.1
direct deflections are techniques applied to calm meetings and to avoid discussion of issues that will escalate tensions within the PACT process. This is reminiscent of the assertiveness training technique called broken-record; to achieve your preferred outcome you do not enter into wider-ranging discussions but repeatedly remain focused. This seems to be a tactic used by police (Smith 1975).

Gordon: The stats say we have more Police now than we ever had before… main problem not getting resources where want them. In this meeting no big wigs [Senior Police nor council] so we can only ask you where are they [police] when we need them on Friday nights and Sundays

John: It’s all the administration and taking paper work for court, so that is where police are 2-3 days of their time used up […] Quite a few people here like to find out what can do to help […] NO ONE from Evergreen was recommended. Lots of people coming here [to PACT meetings] and they weren’t given opportunity to go. If had training, I’d have more understanding what could do to help Police. We turn up week after week and NOTHING. I’ve done a lot during the years [for the Police] and not even been thought of

New Attendee (Heol Mustard): YOU allowed one and a half hours to talk about motor bikes but only 20 minutes Badgers Lane closure I don’t think that’s enough

FLSO Maureen: I’m sorry need to have councillors here to answer your questions on closure of Badgers Lane

PCSO Wayne: We can’t answer questions (11.05.09)

Taken together, these deflection practices effectively silence and contain contestation and struggles in ways that work to disempower citizen-consumers.

In my interviews with police staff, the range of dismissal and deflection technologies suggested above is also used to deflect aspects that they do not wish to discuss with me. A frequent discursive strategy is to draw on the subject position of ‘the expert who knows best’. For example, the BCU Commander indirectly deflects my questions concerning the ‘big issues’ relating to taking PACT seriously; when pressed, he gives me what seems to be the ‘good news message’ on PACT. Although I have status and acceptance as researcher, I am an ‘outsider’ (Davies & Thomas 2008, Jupp 2007, Van Maanen 20003:58) and my challenge is effectively deflected to a general response on the importance of hearing residents’ views.
Researcher: Sometimes it seems like residents try to raise what could be called ‘big issues’. What they see as the lack of sufficient action to come to ASB call outs, or clarify what are police responsibilities or strategies. This comes up frequently in Evergreen for example. Do you think police should or can respond within PACT to these concerns?

BCU Commander: Yes, yes I can understand that hmm… mmm obviously we want to do our best for communities and we take what they raise at PACT seriously.

Researcher: Are you saying then that it might be good if you responded to these types of questions and discuss this at PACT?

BCU Commander: We need to ensure PACT priorities are achievable. PACT is a valuable asset for us and communities to discuss neighbourhood issues. Mmm…..as an organisation you can say what I’d choose as a priority would be different and come from what I know as a professional [pause] and it makes perfect sense that these views will be internally driven by targets, our experiences and what we see on the street. So we will have our own perspective. I think we need to hear from residents themselves and be responsive to seeing their perspective, that’s why I pushed for us to spend a large amount of our budget on the City UPSI study to hear what residents in their very different neighbourhoods and situations want (11.11.08)

The UPSI (2009) study is constructed as a sounder, more rational and less challenging and controllable way for professionals to access resident priorities rather than via PACT meetings. His position appears to be carefully crafted, and one that is appropriate for public consumption. It represents what Silverman (2006) calls moral story telling by presenting himself, the police and his BCU in a good light. He avoids imparting information or topics that may show police in a bad light (Goffman 1969, Alvesson & Karreman 2000). He avoids my substantive question, namely whether PACT can adapt to handle the types of issues raised in Evergreen meetings. I never hear his position on his staff’s or organisation’s lack of response to the big questions and policing within PACT. Professional need for corroboration and other data beyond PACT may also in some way explain dismissal and deflection of residents’ views within meetings. It reinforces Yang’s (2005) view of professionals’ preference for procedural bureaucracy that privileges their own sources of data, expertise and
working that acts to decrease their trust of citizens. This would act to limit vertical coproduction (Innes & Roberts 2011).

One potential explanation of the use of dismissal strategies is the historical and hegemonic control of public law and order held by the police as an arm of the state (Newburn & Reiner 2007). Police - used to being listened to and obeyed - try to maintain this positioning, particularly through the continued use of their well-honed technologies of control, developed within traditional law and order settings (Gordon et al 2008). This seems to limit their ability to hear and accept choice or challenge within PACT. However, we can also construct the police as a service that is itself constrained by, and operating within, the new public management agenda (Newman et al 2004). They are being asked to set three priorities and to hold PACT meetings in the context of real operational constraints. As the Evergreen Inspector says:

Obviously I don’t say specifically only 9 police officers based in Evergreen and 9 based in Redbank because I do not want to scare them [the public]. But we are not a police state so it’s not surprising there are not hundreds of us. [I think] we’ve got to point now they understand we don’t have new or limitless resources[…]In truth with current NICHE tasking we’re lucky if PCSO are able to spend 20% of time on PACT priorities. So I’d really like to space PACT further apart because people are bringing longer-term problems to solve (27.07.07)

The limits of police resources, including PCSO time to deal with PACT priorities, are clearly spelt out. We see the Inspector undertake boundary work to balance the role demands and different identification domains, such as not lowering residents’ confidence or not alarming them by spelling out resource constraints, balancing tasking constraints, and the need to demonstrate quick fixes between PACT meetings. His comments on limits to resources for PACT allude to a key NPM reform agenda to achieve more with limited resources. This competes with the NPS agenda to be citizen-led and meet monthly with citizens; he resists this by wanting to hold less frequent PACTs. This seems to support the Clarke et al (2007) finding that the newer NPS agenda collides with traditional policing. We gain an insight into how the police make sense and interpret operating in a performance and target-driven environment in which they are expected to do more with less, gain joined-up performance synergies in the face of reducing budgets and increased paper work, and undertake an
increasing and diverse range of duties (Flanagan 2008). The struggles with coping with these new duties and responsibilities are revealed in his acknowledgement that residents are bringing longer-term problems to PACT that may need different types of solutions and resources that a ‘quick fix’ between monthly meetings can provide. It seems that the challenges of PACT are pulling police officers toward an identity position in which they are asked to act beyond their competence and capacity as if ‘community leaders’. This is acknowledged as a contested identity, and one at odds with their ‘real policing’ identities (Davies & Thomas 2008, Somerville 2009). The Inspector’s reaction might be interpreted as a reluctance to change the boundaries and give more credence or higher priority to this conflicted identification. An identification that entails greater power-sharing and collaboration seems to be interpreted as reducing and complicating the alternative domain of professional control and decision-making. Their struggles within Evergreen and Redbank PACTs to respond and meet the needs of residents show this to be an identification they are potentially unable to perform (ibid; Brogden & Nijhar 2005, Gilling 2007). These are real world conundrums which are disputed and debated within the service (Gilling 2007, Morgan 2011).

We have seen that residents are also aware of, and draw on, wider macro-discourses when building their arguments within PACT (e.g. resource allocation, wider environment). Newman et al (2004:215) refer to how many citizens are ‘well aware of the constraints that public agencies work under – of funding, of capacity and of having to meet central government targets’ and often made excuses for public service officers for their lack of action. As the newly promoted City Chief Inspector for Landerby observes, the police are expected to be all things to all men:

This is the political environment we are operating in. Under the present regime no Chief is going to say we cannot do that, or refuse resources like PCSOs that come with this agenda [Neighbourhood Policing & PACT]. However not everyone sees it as the police job to meet these sort of community demands […] see it as taking us away from our core duties […] it is a hot debate best summed up in the Flanagan Report. […] Also we have the elections that will be held in early 2010 at the latest, so many officers are biding their time and giving minimal ‘lip-service’ to initiatives like PACT because they see a change in our political masters and agenda coming. […] With increasingly limited resources I see partnerships and talking to residents
about their needs and wishes which means engaging with increasingly diverse communities is the only way forward and a change in orientation that we WILL need to make (July 2008)

This reflects the debates surrounding the diverse agendas set for police (for example ranging from traditional enforcement, anti-terrorism, motorway policing, domestic violence and community policing etc.) coupled with the increasing constraints of less resource (doing more with less in joined up NPM and NPS citizen-led governance) and the priority of working in multi-agency partnerships. It is possible to see this not only as a driver for change in orientation but as part of the explanation for the police adoption of deflection strategies within PACT meetings and their resistance to power-sharing through collaboration with citizens.

Also important in the enactment of PACT is how the police and partners construct publics within these settings. In the next section I shall consider my findings on professionals’ constructions of residents and the impact this has on PACT.

7.5 Constructions of Residents as ‘Usual Suspects’ within Police-Community Engagement

What becomes clear, and as other authors suggest, is while the principle of community co-governance is supported by many professionals, its messiness and competing concerns makes it a far more difficult task to enact (Rai 2008, Ray et al 2008, Guarneros-Meza et al 2009). This reflects professionals’ real issues with lack of trust and confidence of residents (Yang 2005, Barnes et al 2008) which seem to impact on their ability to engage through PACT. I will explore their preference to construct residents in ways that support their own constructions of police-community engagement and the ‘call to action’, specifically how the police position resident attendees and how this adds weight to their identification of themselves as separate (Herbert 2006) distanced, and therefore able to dismiss resident views. This section begins with examples of how residents are constructed within PACT then reinforce how this is problematic for partners (not just the police); finally, I examine the implications for the practice of police-community engagement at PACT meetings.
7.5.1 Constructions of Residents

In our interview, the Evergreen Inspector constructs a positive and publically acceptable position on PACT meetings:

We have learnt the lesson that we need to listen to public and within reason deliver what they want. What eight police officers want is totally different to what two hundred or two thousand community members want. We need the community to tell us, and tell us what’s going on in their neighbourhood. As the lead agency [for PACT] it’s been a realisation check likely be like this for all [the partners]. Of course the major benefit has been getting community intelligence and as public have learnt to trust us we are getting a lot of detailed information [including some leading to drug arrests] that we weren’t getting before and just wouldn’t get any other way (27.07.07)

However his (and other Neighbourhood Inspectors) ‘insider’ talk at their June 2007 workshop suggests their problematisation of residents at PACT. This suggests that the Neighbourhood Inspectors do not see residents as the ‘faithful’ or representative providers of intelligence but as unreliable and political – similar to councillors. This indicates that within the police hierarchy PACT police-community engagement is viewed as less reliable, valid or important to obtain a citizen-led focus for CDQL priorities. Supporting other research, they suggest that these attendees cannot speak for their areas, present their own agenda are unrepresentative of the public, and dominate meetings:

Inspector Evergreen: you can’t even say they represent because you’ve got a handful of people out of a much bigger area and it’s always the same old faces with axes to grind
Ex-Inspector49: As far as I can see the main criteria seems to be who shouts loudest [laughter] it’s a nightmare
Inspector South Sector: yeah usual suspects
Inspector Evergreen: we’ve got a few of those […] and two of them are councillors who seem to think they can tell me how to run my area [all laugh many nods]
Ex-Community Inspector: PACT setting priorities is laughable, totally unworkable. It’s difficult enough for us as professionals with years of

49 He is a recently retired Community Inspector, now lead on co-ordination and partnership within City CSP.
experience, who are knowledgeable about the whole area, know what types of
solutions will or will not work. They [residents] have no idea, no idea, it will
be those who shouts loudest trying to set priorities for our limited resources
[shakes head]
Inspector Evergreen: We need a more strategic approach. The main thing is to
manage the publics’ expectations of PACT. While we get [formal] partners on
board so it’s not seen as just the police and ensure our resources can be
targeted at what really needs doing identified through proper analyses with
people like yourself and our other local authority and health partners

In the above exchange we see the dominant internal organisational and occupational
discursive positions that reflect the police wish to be left in charge as ‘experts who know
best’. It clearly casts resident attendees as illegitimate, unrepresentative and attending to
fulfil their own agendas. What Barnes et al (2003, 2004) differentiates as ‘usual suspects’ -
habitual meeting attendees, and ‘counter-publics’ who attend to pursue their own agendas -
are referred to by Inspectors and other senior staff from other partner agencies as ‘usual
suspects’. It provides evidence to support Barnes et al (ibid) suggestion that in PACT, as a
new space of governance, residents’ (new actors) contributions and (as we saw in chapter six)
the way they draw on emotional and personal discourses within meetings are problematised
by professionals. This seems to prove an anathema for professionals who prefer traditional
deliberative governance (Barnes 2008). Likewise, we see that the backstage talk of these
Inspectors is more revealing than their more guarded public talk which upholds the official
organisation line that is pro-PACT and police-community engagement. Their identity work
in this ‘safe and private’ space reveals the tensions, conflicts and struggles they experience
when working with publics at PACT. They are struggling with the attempts to change and
reform power-relations that give community the ‘call to action’ and engage in PACTs. It
exposes a key positioning for Neighbourhood Inspectors, local authority officers and some
safety partnership staff in their identification of the ‘lack of representativeness’ and the lack
of requisite ‘professionally held knowledge’ of resident and councillor attendees. Taken
together, these devalue the ‘experience based’ (Elliott et al 2010) or ‘lay knowledge’ of
residents and add weight to the justification of dismissing the relevance of their inputs,
suggestions and solutions. For Barnes (2009) this rejection of residents as unrepresentative
and illegitimate is a common subversive practice within such processes that still persists
today. It also emphasises professionals’ requests for clarity within new sites of vertical co-governance on resident accountability (Barnes et al 2008).

The Evergreen Inspector’s position shows a nuanced identification when he talks to me, perhaps because I am ‘outsider’ in this coproduction:

The numbers attending PACT have picked up but I would say they plateau on the whole around 30 people. Yes, hard core of attendees, what we call ‘usual suspects’ who come out to meetings, so we do get same old stories. Though usually one or two fresh faces because of word of mouth from neighbours or because had a problem and come to a meeting. This makes perfect sense because most people don’t go to something unless its relevant to them and their experiences so naturally come when feel have a need to do so. (27.07.07)

This underlying positioning of residents as ‘usual suspects’ becomes most visible when the Neighbourhood Inspector reports in late 2009 on the outcome of the Badgers Lane trial closure to an ANM consultation meeting:

Neighbourhood Inspector: I went to Evergreen PACT to tell residents how successful the trial closure has been. Having heard the evidence they confirmed they are happy for the closure to continue

Councillor Jones, who attended this PACT, tells me this is not what occurred. The residents did not agree with the Inspector that it should remain closed. Through his action he dismisses Evergreen residents’ views as irrelevant; they are devalued as ‘usual suspects’ with their same old stories or axes to grind. The Inspector is clearly more powerful and occupies the dominant position on reporting the outcome of the PACT. What he reports is that his organisation’s preferred professional solution is given resident approval for the continued closure. This is a prime example of a distanced and separate (Herbert 2006) police position. It exposes the contradictions within police-community engagement and the police role to ‘serve communities’ (ibid).

The PCSOs and FLSO who attend the Evergreen meetings seem to position attendees differently; in section 7.3.1 we saw them identifying as more closely aligned to residents. They show more respect for resident views as legitimate- if un-meet-able - and in some ways bona-fide. They both have greater contact as the ‘public face of the police’ in their day-to-day street level work and attendance at PACTs. They reflect a more proactive acceptance of resident demands for police responsibility and action rather than responsibilisation of the
community (Evans 2009) within this disadvantaged area. These examples illustrate the level of contestation and lack of closure and shifting nature of professional (as well as resident) identifications (Bauman 2009:10) in the pulls toward, and pushes from, being ‘servants of the community’ as a mode of interaction (Herbert 2006). In this section we have seen the different collective and individual positionings of residents within PACT by the police. For example, the Neighbourhood Inspector for Evergreen and Redbank has moved between viewing PACT as an invaluable opportunity to gain community intelligence and discussing residents as ‘usual suspects’; also, the different positioning of them by the PCSOs. This shows that the construction of active citizens, citizen-consumers and communities within PACT is political and contested, and this has important implications (Gilling 2007:206). The positioning of residents as ‘usual suspects’, ‘serial meeting goers’ or those with their own ‘axe to grind’ allows the justification of the position to dismiss residents choice and challenge. By positioning residents as unrepresentative, it allows them to elevate professional and expert positions, emphasising their own expertise, control and decision-making (Herbert 2006). In effect to justify the way they enact PACT and choose whom and what they listen to, and for the police (with support of other professional partners) to continue as the dominant partner.

7.5.2 Partners Interactions with Residents

Negative views of publics are common to many officials who see residents as unpredictable. This is summed up by one of City’s local authority corporate directors:

You will never get all the community to agree on what they want – ever- it’s an impossible and hopeless task

(NeighbourhoodManagementNetworkMeeting30.09.08)

His final comment on this ‘impossible hopeless task’ confirms the difficulties and competing concerns, and reflects professionals’ real issues with lack of trust and confidence of residents (Yang 2005).

While mainly absent from PACT meetings, some council and partner staff do make rare one-off visits to PACT to talk on specific topics, usually to do with a current departmental priority. The FLSOs - and at Redbank, the councillors - work hard to get such invitees to attend. When the Senior Director for Waste & Cleansing and some of his OM’s attend Redbank, they come as ‘good servants of the community’ and ‘heroes’ to tell residents ‘what we are doing for you’. This position is challenged; the residents leave them in no doubt that
they do not perceive them this way and do not feel that services are sufficient for their disadvantaged areas.

Corporate Director: I think we solved the problems and I’ve brought photos […] want to launch same scheme in Redbank […]. I know there are problems either side of Lower Church Road and in other parts of Redbank. We need the community’s help […] please report these to C2C50

Res: That’s an excuse. For years we’ve passed on information. It’s action at your end that’s needed (20.02.08)

This blaming of residents as failing to do their bit is promptly challenged. The Director continues to ‘blame others’, initially elected members then the existing organisational arrangements for parking offences. His positioning is rejected by residents.

Corporate Director: Yes I can tell you that the council did take a vote on this and made the democratic decision not to implement this, and it would have helped because there are more and more cars in Redbank.

Mr Silver: Don’t pull that one. The council did that. You blocked off St Marys Street and that’s when it got worse

[…] Corporate Director: The problem is enforcement is non-existent […] there are less than 40 traffic wardens and the new approach would have brought these under control of council not police which would have assisted us tackling this.

Mr Freed: Yes always a problem isn’t there […] we know you don’t do anything to tackle this

Corporate Director: Parking is an issue in Redbank and other inner city wards and the reality is the police are spending their resources on more serious crimes than illegal parking

Mr Hickson: You can’t employ a police force and do nothing

PCSO Wayne: Can I just say we PCSOs do issue a lot of parking tickets within Redbank

[…]  

50 C2C is a City local authority information and reporting line for council matters
Corporate Director: These issues need resolving one way or the other and I’m not going to fudge this but I think we will have to wait until after the council elections to resolve this.

This senior officer’s positioning provides an insight into some of the political identifications and power-relations between elected members and council officers. After they leave, regular attendees express distrust and expectation that things will not improve. Neither do the majority of residents expect to get updates or see them again:

Chair Phillip: Let’s say thank you to the council and let’s go back to last meeting’s priorities

[A few thanks are said. Council officers leave and the meeting erupts]

Mr Freed: We’ll never see them again

Mr Hickson: They won’t do anything. It’s all empty promises and hot air

Mrs Rose: Well let’s give them a chance and see if they do something

Mrs Hickson: Are we going to get any feedback? Will they do anything, are they going to come back and tell us what they’ve done on all these issues of ours. If I was you I wouldn’t expect to see them again […] it will all come to nothing that’s the last we’ll hear of it (20.02.08)

At Whitewood such visitors, for example Trading Standards, are often thanked for attending. The only visitors thanked for their work for their area at Evergreen are the Arson Reduction Team which gets lots of applause. These visits are rare.

7.5.3 Implications for Police-Community Engagement

Viewing residents as unrepresentative and usual suspects has implications for police-community engagement. In chapter six, I reviewed the ample evidence of the police struggling to interact with residents, particularly within disadvantaged areas, and finding this a confrontational, differentiated, messier and difficult experience. For example, in disadvantaged Evergreen, police are positioned as ‘failing heroes’ and failing to truly engage with communities. The PCSOs seem to boast about the results they have achieved in catching and warning offenders; they invoke a macho ‘action man’ and traditional policing identity. PCSO Wayne and Carl invoke this as a collective identity based on the success of a partnership off-road motor bike operation:

PCSO Wayne: We all arrived in 4 by 4 with the truck; had success 4 bikes confiscated and 5 riders under warning; 1 bike and 3 riders today which makes a total of 5 bikes confiscated and 8 riders warned
PCSO Carl: The kids are petrified of the (crusher) truck

Lois: I spoke to them youths on the bikes and isn’t there somewhere else they can go or need other activities for them. I spoke to Outreach Youth Worker for Evergreen and he is prepared to work with them he said if we can set something up?

Some of the residents pick them up on this, saying that diversionary activities are needed as solutions, not punishment; they are not impressed by this macho-policing identity. We see the dominance of professional preferences and identifications overriding residents’ localised identifications:

Lois: […] children are bored we want a local solution something for them to do

Bob: If you can’t get it under control you will have to accommodate them. They want to identify with Evergreen. They are not going to go to other parts of City

PCSO Wayne: Warned them have to use track at Radial Way, told them that’s where have to go to Landerby\textsuperscript{51} (11.05.09)

Evergreen residents clearly show how locality factors (such as police non-attendance at PACT) affect identifications and the practice of PACT. Privately, Councillor Jones tells me how important the one-off visit from senior police is positioned because it is seen as bringing the attention of ‘real police’ to residents’ frustrations and issues:

It’s a balance isn’t it? People don’t want to see six officers at PACT meeting rather than out on the streets catching criminals but you also need to see they take it seriously… I was glad when the Deputy Commander came to that meeting. He was horrified to see the dangerous weapons [including old garden tools and bolt cutters] chucked in the gardens at Acton Path and to hear the level of harassment going on so perhaps something will be done now (Interview 14.03.08)

PACT and police-community engagement is designed with increased police visibility to improve reassurance, trust and the legitimacy of the police (NCPE 2006, Tuffin et al 2006, Gilling 2010). The positions and manoeuvres within PACTs seem to show limited gains in

\textsuperscript{51} Landerby is the other side of City and not accessible without special bussing arrangements.
trust of the police or criminal justice agencies, particularly within disadvantaged areas contrasted to advantaged, as Whitewood residents attest:

- Nothing is ignored. Everything we raise gets a response and is treated seriously […]
- It’s useful, it’s an opportunity to vent frustrations and gain reassurance [murmurs of agreement] […] it’s good to get direct access to councillors and police […]
- People come because they have problems so lack of people might mean that they haven’t an issue which means PACT is a victim of its own success [smiles](focus group 27.10.09)

In Evergreen the Chair comments:

- Can’t ask people to do more or put themselves on the line until all the partners get their act together at PACT[…] though reality in real world unlikely ever get the council there […]. Police and partners like the Crown Prosecution Service need to do a better job […]. As far as partnership goes I think the police are doing their bit but the others haven’t stepped up, it’s not joined up is it, it’s the other partners (14.04.08)

This is an indictment of how the partners within criminal justice as well as the council who supposedly work on behalf of residents to resolve CDQL issues. The Chair relates numerous failures to bring charges, achieve convictions and deal with perpetrators of crime and ASB. She will not ask residents to trust or do more to assist these agencies until failings in partnership working to protect victims improve. The contestation of ‘separate’ and ‘service’ identifications is further complicated by what is seen as poor co-ordination and joined-up working relations within the Crown Prosecution Services (CPS), courts and police; this further undermines trust and legitimacy in the eyes of residents. Residents are left vulnerable, without faith in professionals to provide high quality services. From this perspective we can position police-community engagement as a space where residents can either opt out -perhaps because of these difficulties - or attend and try to bring such failures to the attention of public service officials.

It can be said that some small gains and dealing with symptoms are visible. As Jill the Evergreen Chair comments:
Coming to PACT is not an easy thing to do, it’s frightening, you never know whose related to whom and if what you say is going to get back to the wrong people […] and of course they’re angry. A key part of the meetings is too let off steam; you couldn’t stop them if you tried. You remember when the Deputy Commander came to last October’s meeting? He was shocked by what he heard, its good they know what we have to put up with every day (14.04.08)

This is an issue of mutual trust: residents’ trust in police and professionals trust in residents. Again, this visit by a senior decision-maker is interpreted as a willingness to listen to residents. Within this disadvantaged area, two of the ‘faithful’ regulars comment that the residents are also making an act of faith in the police. They want to see their trust repaid not just within a couple of PACT meetings but to see if, through the PACT process, the police and their partners are committing to citizen-led and police-community engagement for the long run, and in a way that can make a difference:

Mr Acton: Yeah and we have got to trust them [police] to do something otherwise why bother coming? It’s a two way street you know
Bob: It’s a beginning but these things take time. People need to see police and partners are really in it for the long term and actually serious about changing thing, see results. Otherwise put your neck out within the community for nothing

This indicates the importance of the police demonstrating to residents in disadvantaged areas that they can be trusted. This seems to be a key locality difference and part of establishing the legitimacy of PACT with these residents. Trust and legitimacy do not seem to be an issue within advantaged Whitewood. Within Whitewood it seems the ‘worried well off’ are never aware of being ‘usual suspects’, or are never treated as such. However, across all these PACTs only a small number of ‘faithful’ residents continue to attend, and there is no evidence of the process attracting greater numbers. It could be surmised that the small numbers attending, including the construction of residents as ‘usual suspects’, seems to indicate little gain in the trust and legitimacy of police from this implementation of PACT (Yang 2005).

We have seen that partners also have issues trusting publics. At the June 2007 workshop, the City CSP manager sums up letting residents set priorities within PACT and the community ‘call to action’ in the Police and Justice Act as ‘a nutters charter’. Later, in 2008, he
identifies with the difficulties that PACT creates for partners, given the police-driven short-
term focus for PACT priorities (compared to the longer timescales of partners). These are
coupled with the issue of resident representativeness:

PACT doesn’t work at present, it needs to be re-oriented to longer term
solutions […] we need to find a way to inject intelligence-led prioritising not
just the whims of who happens to attend

Taken together these confirm a construction of PACT and publics as problematic

Problem is who attends PACT and who doesn’t. Is it just who shouts loudest?
(Manager 101, Workshop June 2007)

In section 7.6 we see the potential for residents and councillors to act as ‘counter-publics’ and
to pursue their own special interests which sets the scene for those who shout loudest (Gilling
2007:206) to dominate PACT, or indeed for those who attend to dominate in comparison with
large numbers of silenced non-attendees. Many authors suggest that this is an issue that
participatory governance needs to engage with; it is a complex, contested and resisted process
that causes concern and anxieties for professionals (cf Foot 2008, Newman & Clarke 2009;
Yang 2005; Gilling 2007). Lowndes & Sullivan’s (2008) ideal types suggest this is a key
dilemma for forum-based institutional forms of coproduction within their Neighbourhood
empowerment type. This is clearly expressed above. It highlights how the benefits of New
Labour’s aim of giving accessibility and increasing responsiveness and accountability - as
part of strengthening participatory over representative democracy - opens the unresolved and
contested discourse of the accountability of citizens in these informal participatory settings
(ibid:57). At a local level this is a key issue for the police, local officials and, to some
extent, residents themselves. The chair of Evergreen, Jill, says to me at one point ‘what we
need is more ordinary residents to attend’, meaning victims and those who are not regular or
serial meeting goers.

The position of councillor attendees shows a number of locality differences and presents a
nuanced and differentiated performance. Sullivan (2009) amongst others suggests the
overlaying of participatory governance on elected modes of governance will be complicated
and contested for all the actors involved. Others have emphasised that the confusions and
lack of clarity for all participants on the role each party plays is one of the key difficulties of
implementation (Rai 2008, Ray et al 2008). It is important to consider in depth how
professionals or partners are co-joined within PACTs, and how this works within each PACT
and locality. I am particularly interested in the positions of the elected representatives, the local councillors who are key figures at all three PACTs. This will allow us to consider their situated performance and micro-practices within PACT meetings and examine how these relate to the concepts of choice, challenge and responsibilisation. Section 7.6 considers who they are, the understandings they bring, the particular challenges that this represents for professionals and how their relational identities are enacted within the PACT process.

7.6 The Final Challenge: Working with Councillors

Councillors are a challenge within the PACT process. My findings show locality differences and reveal how these operate to produce a spectrum of councillor positionings that affect how they identify and perform their role. It is not possible to position councillors as a homogeneous group as this fails to take into account their interpretations and performance within PACT, with their electorate, specialist committees and political party alliances. This is problematic because their elected representative role means they occupy a pivotal role within locality-based participatory democratic governance; yet they are often referred to as if they are, or should be, a predictable and homogeneous collective within these new governance processes (Sullivan 2009). Critically, this fails to differentiate the range of roles and identifications they may adopt and credentialises them in a uniform way (cf Barnes et al 2008, Ray et al 2008). Utilising a relational identities approach, I found a far more diverse and differentiated picture of identifications and positionings among the councillors who attended the PACT meetings. These are central to understanding how each of the three PACTs works as their positionings at each are quite different. This section will begin by exploring the range of councillor positions, from partners in what can be called Councillor & Communities Together meetings (CACT) to identifications as if residents. It will then explore the struggle of police and officials to work with councillors within PACT and neighbourhood management in City.

7.6.1 Locality Differences in Councillor Positions

Councillor positions varied between PACT localities, reflecting a breadth of locality-based heterogeneity within their identifications and roles. These ranged from a position as ‘special residents’ to aligning with official partner positions. Each locality will be introduced in turn. The councillors at Whitewood stood as independents. They identify as ‘partners’ and members of the PACT panel sitting at the top table. As Councillor Julie Plum says, ‘it’s our role to represent the council and represent our residents’ concerns to the council. We’re all
trying to work together’ (Interview March 2009). They present themselves as professional, working closely with residents and police, and frequently co-opt PACT and resident support for the issues they want to progress for the area with the council: ‘So if we can have your support with this issue?’ (27.10.09) and ‘we are working with police on this to try and get a new layout for safe parking approved’ (11.08.09). This attitude reinforces their collective identity of working together with their police partners on behalf of residents and neighbourhood, exactly what the police wish for. They also draw on a ‘resident’ identity by talking about ‘our area’ but do this from the position of working ‘on your behalf’. They most closely fulfil City police’s wish to have councillors on-side and responsibilised as partners. They adopt a strong identification that all councillors ‘should’ accept responsibilisation as the council’s representatives. It is a source of frustration to the police that not all councillors or council staff identify or interpret the councillors’ role this way.

The councillors at Redbank are all Plaid Cymru members. They have a more multi-faceted positioning. Firstly, they do not claim to represent the council. As Councillor Welsh says, ‘how can they?’

I don’t have superpowers, all I can do is lobby people in the council and try and get things done for you […]. We do try our best (15.10.07)

Both the police and residents struggle with the distinction between council and councillors, and she reinforces this again

It doesn’t work that way. I’m not a council officer and cannot comment on this. They will say what their programme is. Let me or councillor Musin contact them and see what we can find out (20.02.08)

Secondly, the Redbank councillors are highly regarded by the police and are identified as the key people who ensure that Redbank meetings run so well. In fact, they wish that all their councillors were like them, particularly Councillor Musin:

He’s fantastic, all are […] they don’t get political they’re really doing what is best for their communities […] they always sit at the top and most of the issues are council ones, it’s the easiest PACT I’ve got (FLSO Maureen, August 2007)

Not being identified as political is a key factor for police and some residents; the spirit of PACT lies in locality, not a party political space to progress councillors’ own agendas. As Jill, the Evergreen chair, sums up:
Councillor Musin is excellent. He listens, he encourages people to raise things and then he takes them away as action points [...] That really is working for the neighbourhood and community [...] just what we need, after all councillors are currently the only direct link to councils at PACT. Like being council’s ‘eyes and ears’ so need them all to work in that way until either council officers attend, or, if they aren’t [going to] other councillors need to step-up to be this link (14.04.08)

This style of behaving is seen as critical to the conduct of effective PACTs; it is missing at many because some councillors’ identification are quite different. Interestingly, in both Redbank and Whitewood where the councillors play an active partnership role in meetings they invoke positions of ‘heroes who are working for the community’. For example in Redbank:

Councillor Musin: We’ll take it up as councillors and liaise with council [...] I want to thank residents who have helped me last few weeks by passing on registration numbers of people dumping black bags. Because of this prosecutions are now taking place [...] (21.05.09)

As one might expect, councillors also want to be seen as doing their best for the areas and residents they represent. This is important in relation to being positioned as a ‘good councillor’ and ‘being re-elected’.

It is not clear if most of the CDQL issues raised at Redbank are council or partnership because the councillors are so good at taking on priorities to follow-up with the council. What we do know is that they come fully prepared and give detailed reports to residents at the beginning of meetings, often lasting 20-30 minutes. They also take on up to fifteen additional council related issues that go beyond the police maximum of three priorities. They work in concert to be positive and calm the meeting with reassurances that they will be staying ‘on the case’ to ensure appropriate action; their actions are designed to de-escalate tensions. They are authoritative, reasonable and business-like, invoking a resident-inclusive identification of ‘our task’. By the next meeting they have always attempted to progress these issues.

Apart from the last 2009 meeting when a PC attends and speaks to ASB issues, the police and PCSOs play a minor role in Redbank PACT. The PCSOs rarely speak at meetings,
sometimes only nodding, though they symbolically sit at the top table. Like the PCSO in Whitewood, these PCSOs position themselves as in favour of police-community engagement but do not want to play an active role in running PACTs. As PCSO Carl says:

Yeah we do work hard to build relationships with the community but you can’t do that at PACTs […]. We’ve got the main PACT tonight, personally I find these meetings overwhelming, there is so much emotion and anger coming from people, and it sort of hits you, it’s shocking, so confrontational aren’t they? (08.10.08)

They identify and are identified by councillors and residents as ‘minor players’ who (apart from controlling formal PACT priorities) would not want a bigger role.

Redbank PACTs can be seen as councillor meetings, and the police rely on these councillors to play an active role in running them:

Cllr Welsh: They [council officers that have just left] have been kind enough to come so let’s see what happens. Shall we move on to the other priorities?

Cllr Musin: Ok we’ll see we can only keep the pressure on them let’s hope we get something from it and it was good to see them come to a PACT meeting, something some of us thought we’d never see[…]Let’s get the meeting back on track now, quieten down, and discuss the rest of our business. Let’s go through the priorities from December’s meeting […] (20.02.08)

The Inspector confirms this saying:

When councillors attend PACT it is mainly council issues. This takes the pressure off us

Councillor Musin even refers to PACTs as ‘my’ meetings and as:

Councillor Surgeries we run, ermm, of course they are owned by the police, they introduced them

However this is also frustrating for the councillors who are critical of the lack of attendance by the police. As Councillor Welsh comments:

Where are the Police? They just don’t come to PACT. Police are absent. May as well call it CACT!52 Is it like that at other PACT? It’s not right. If they want more commitment from council and other partners they need to attend

52 Councillors and Communities Together (CACT) is a play on PACT and reflects the pivotal responsibilisation of councillors in Redbank.
themselves. Using us as councillors to run their meetings and deal with communities and do their job for them. If we weren’t there doing this, PACT would collapse and be unworkable. PCSO couldn’t run them. Community would soon get fed up attending to find out no one was there from any of the services to deal with their problems (21.05.08)

This view is expressed to me backstage; Redbank councillors do not challenge this directly within PACT meetings. The majority of meetings do seem like CACT. While these councillors argue that the absence of police seriously undermines both their involvement and work they also signal to council officers that they need not attend until the police show more commitment themselves. As one operational manager (OM) tells me: ‘until Inspectors attend PACT you will never get council managers there […] and I don’t see any sign that’s going to happen’. This highlights the local politics and political nature of co-governance inherent in City PACTs.

Councillor Welsh and her fellow councillors, while co-opted to the extent that they are almost solely responsible for running Redbank PACTs, still feel disempowered by the police who are identified as the dominant power player and who ‘own’ the PACT process. The councillors represent themselves as tied to running an ‘adversarial’ style PACT format because this is the police designated design. Despite efforts to discuss this format with the police hierarchy, the councillors have not been able to negotiate any changes, especially in the rigid setting of three formal priorities.

It’s so testing and exhausting. Did you notice how adversarial it was even with less people? What can we do? They are the police’s meetings we don’t have power to change them. Tried, won’t listen to us. This is how they want them. A top table and getting three priorities. Need to try and turn them around to get longer-term solutions and different type of discussion of issues, more like Communities First work with the community. Trouble is police they don’t want to change them they need this setting priorities (Councillor Welsh, 21.05.08)

This illustrates the difficulty and discomfort of sitting at the top table. It also demonstrates how challenging this can be despite being an ‘invaluable partner’. We see them identified and identifying as simultaneously central and disempowered within the PACT process by the dominant lead player.
Finally, we can look at the different positionings of the Evergreen Labour councillors. They are adamant that they represent the community not the council, and they do not sit as partners on the top-table in PACT. They sit in the audience and we see how they move through a range of positions from that of ‘knowledgeable experts’ to what I call ‘special residents’ (who potentially hold more sway and power and access to decision-makers) and that of ‘ordinary resident’ (cf Clarke et al 2007:45,58) who have no more access and are equally at the mercies of council and police professionals who let ‘us’ - residents and councillors – down in this area. Their positioning is frequently in opposition to that of the PCSO and on many occasions seems to escalate tensions, and is rarely part of their de-escalation. It could be suggested that this is a sensible positioning given the high levels of police related CDQL issues in Evergreen, particularly given what seems to be the limits to police resources for Evergreen, and the police’s dismissive and controlling positionings within PACTs.

Evergreen councillors work collaboratively with residents, such as when the PCSO, acting on instructions from his Inspector, tackles councillors on their failure to be co-opted as partners at these meetings. Councillor Jones forthrightly responds that she does not represent the council but represents the community. Throughout she positions herself as ‘special resident’. The residents rally to support her, immediately pointing out that the actual police don’t attend either and they re-direct the talk to provide a counter-challenge:

PCSO Carl: These PACT meetings have become police oriented don’t think it runs well at moment. Want to address this at this meeting and next meeting want to sort councillors on panel out
Cllr Jones: No, no because I represent the community NOT council. I’ve always sat in the audience with the community and I always will. I’m here for them
PCSO Carl: You’re saying no but this is supposed to be a partnership so would like you on panel
[...] Bob: Yes, why don’t we get police here, I’ve been to Bluewater and they had Inspector and seven people on the panel, including police and councillors
Mr Acton: Truth is police should come as well but don’t and we have to put up with you [PCSOs] trying to run these for them
Cllr Jones: I know you have asked again and again and it does seem unfair though because we know other PACTs Inspectors and police officers attend
The residents are never given a clear explanation or answer to their request for police presence and decision-makers. Residents remain confounded but it is clear that this collaborative work puts pressure on the police while residents are left feeling ‘abandoned and un-served’ by both the council and police.

This is not an isolated occurrence and these councillors are often more direct in their own criticism of the police or in supporting residents’ challenges. Working collaboratively, councillors and residents repeatedly challenge the police on their failure to fulfil their responsibilities. In the following extract, Councillors Harris and Smith move between ‘knowledgeable expert’, ‘ordinary resident’ and ‘special resident’. This is angry talk in which the emotion of councillors matches that of residents, escalating tension and the attack on the police position.

Cllr Smith: The issue that I have with this reporting business when you ring up 101 and they say there is a process to go through[…] I know there is an ASB nuisance process now, even if it’s not the tenant […] the tenants responsible. BUT it’s left to YOU to identify who they are. WHAT GETS ME is the police very often are not prepared to get out of the car and ask these kids who they are nor establish where they live. BUT WE ARE ASKED TO GO OUT of our houses and ask these kids what they’re names are so we can identify who they are and put them on a list. WE CAN’T encourage at two o’clock and three o’clock in the morning ORDINARY CITIZENS to go out into a Lane in the middle of Big Avenue when we know there are kids who are drug taking […] because the next morning the needles are still in the gulley. WE CAN’T expect citizens to go out and take people’s names. SO HOW ARE YOU meant to identify who these people are? SURELY IT’S THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE POLICE TO IDENTIFY THEM find out where they live, and write to the tenants and say this person on Saturday night was causing a nuisance […] and if it carries on your tenancy is at risk

Mrs Williams: YEAH and if not get rid of [name of tenant] and YOU KNOW [PCSOs] who the two tenants are […], what I mean, and we could be rid of be rid of [name] and him whose encouraging them. I mean driving past the house

---

53 101 is the local non-emergency reporting number for the police and other CDQL services
at 3am on a Saturday nights not on, when 20 or 30 youths a night can be outside that man’s house and YOU KNOW they do that, you can’t tell me there’s not a policeman in Evergreen who doesn’t know they do that

PCSO Carl: What we do [the PCSO is shouted down by councillors and community]

In another example, the councillors work together and with residents to pressure the police to take more pro-active action to deal with the serious and ongoing ASB issues. Their collective work seems to escalate tensions:

Cllr Harris: We know, and the Police know you have the powers, after all 18 months ago used them in Spenchurch. What we want to know is why when people in Acton Terrace and Welsh Close and other areas of Evergreen are suffering so much on a daily and nightly basis is why not used here when it should be

Cllr Smith: The only way to do this and get what you want is having senior officers here. You need to make it a PACT priority for a Sergeant or someone above him comes to the next meeting

Gordon: We’ve got two councillors here they should be able to get them [police] to come they must have some influence

Cllr Harris: [laughs] I’m a councillor but if I write to Chief Constable I never get an answer it just keeps getting passed down to the lowest level (06.10.08)

They identify as ‘knowledgeable experts’ who share knowledge with the police on their powers to deal with this, and ends with Councillor Harris protesting that he has no more powers to influence than an ‘ordinary resident’, denying any special resident or elected representative status. Both are difficult for the PCSO to deal with; it leaves them isolated and ‘attacked’ rather than supported by potential partners.

The council, as well as the councillors, also come in for criticism within Evergreen meetings for their perceived lack of services for this deprived area:

Chair Jill: Any rubbish including needles ring 101 and report it they can arrange collection [turns to ask FLSO] I think this is one for Councillor Jones, a council issue, can you add it to the list to discuss with her. Also can you talk to her about raising the paper work to get a gulley alley-gated (07.01.08)

54 Spenchurch is another deprived ward within a different sector of City
However, there are always some residents who speak up for Councillor Jones as ‘working hard and doing a lot for the area’. She has loyal support having worked for many years to gain improvements for residents, including being the instigator of the Evergreen Festival which has run annually as a partner activity between professionals and community for over 17 years. She and the Coolgreen councillor are also full partners and active members of the ward quarterly consultation meetings (which now feed into the South-West Sector ANM meetings). Police rarely attend these consultation meetings as they do not form part of their performance requirements; they usually rely on OM Mike to report on these to the sector ANM meeting. By the end of 2008, these councillors use the consultation meetings to work collaboratively with professionals (police and others) to progress local CDQL issues for their wards. It is through these consultation meetings that councillors gain access to OM Mike, the senior council manager tasked with neighbourhood management and chair of their sector ANM.

It is at these consultative meetings that councillors work collaboratively as ‘partners’ with police and council officers. In the Evergreen PACTs, Councillor Jones never refers to her partner identity status in this separate performance arena that is backstage to PACT. At these consultation meetings she reports the PACT priorities sometimes in conjunction with the FLSO. The FLSO has built a good long-term relationship with Councillor Jones through being the police representative who works on the Evergreen Carnival. Behind the scenes, they will discuss who and how best to progress requests. The councillor is always more specific and detailed about issues raised at PACTs, certainly more than the FLSO is allowed to be. As Maureen tells me ‘my Inspector wouldn’t let me report that, it’s better if Councillor Jones or you speak on issues’. These examples reinforce the influence of relationship dynamics, including shared histories and influencing practices within implementation (Westmarland & Clarke 2009, Yang 2005).

Below, we see her backstage performance and collaborative working drawing on both co-operative and assertive talk (Hardy et al 2005).

Councillor Jones: One of our concerns is the flood arrangements that affect two or three streets near the river. Who will co-ordinate and issue sandbags or whatever will be put in place?
OM Mike: Yes I’ve spoken to Highways and WAG\textsuperscript{55} about this and it seems responsibility lies with the Flood Agency […]

Councillor Jones: Specifically from PACT there is Coronation Cottages which the police now refuse to have as a priority because they categorise this as a social problem that needs council and housing intervention. They’re saying they can’t do any more

OM Mike: Ah ha […] it does seem to be a problem family. I have spoken to the Inspector to ask housing and the police do a joint visit and explain to this family that their tenancy is under threat and the consequences for them. I believe they are due to do this in the next week and I’ll chase that up to ensure it’s happened (November2008)

Her identification as ‘collaborative partner’ fulfils the Westmarland & Clarke (2009) definition of someone that has access to influence service providers.

Particularly problematic are the discursive resources those councillors in Evergreen draw on to position themselves as bona-fide elected representatives for their neighbourhood when they speak from the audience as special residents, experts and ordinary residents. When the councillors act as ‘reliable partners’ (Redbank & Whitewood) they operate within the range of acceptable identifications that are overwhelmingly in agreement with police, and when they do disagree with either council or police this is often presented as requests for clarification or help (such as inviting senior council officers to visit Redbank PACT).

Councillor Jones from Evergreen explains the context to this confusion and lack of clarity in councillors’ positions:

As councillors we didn’t know what to expect. Suddenly we were told they [PACT] were happening, I know different councillors treat it differently but I always try and attend and I do go to most meetings.

She continues:

I think the police were totally naïve. They thought if we get councillors there they will represent the council, nothing of the sort, I can’t tell council officers what to do I’m dependent on them to respond to my requests on behalf of the community […] some of them do some of them don’t […] that’s why I won’t

\textsuperscript{55} WAG is shorthand for the devolved governmental functions and civil service who form the Welsh Assembly Government
sit at the top table because they’d present it as if I was the council's representative (14.03.08)

This also highlights her disidentification and ‘distanced’ construction of the police as having their own and an alternate agenda playing out within PACT; this goes some way to explain her contestation of their attempts to co-opt and co-join her as partner.

To conclude, Councillor Jones identifies the potential and practice of PACT as limited by being misconceived at its inception, particularly in relation to council involvement and the role of councillors. She positions PACT as a centralist top-down initiative that local partners and police have been ‘left’ to implement as best they can:

PACTs an idea thought up by someone in the Home Office who thought it was a brilliant idea and didn’t think it through [...]. To make it work requires so much resource, resource the police haven’t got let alone the council [...]. Council will never tell officers [staff] to attend, we can’t afford the overtime, and there is no budget (14.03.08)

This suggests that police (and other professionals) will need to work with councillors at City PACTs; the next section looks at professionals’ struggles and contestations with this.

7.6.2 Professionals’ Struggles & Contestations with Councillors

The struggle of professionals with the myriad of councillor identifications can be understood within the context of their situated history and mainly negative experiences of working with councillors. PACT is a new arena for the contestation and practice of professional-councillor experiences. The example below illustrates the difficulties many (but not all) experience working with councillors, as well as power-relations and struggles occurring within meetings.

Following one meeting when there had been a long exchange involving councillors at Evergreen PACT, PCSO Matt lets down his guard and complains:

PCSO Mat: It couldn’t be shittier having to put up with THEM [councillors] having a go at us. It’s not on. They should be up at top table
Chair Jill: I quite agree but that’s not going to happen just like the police coming here they’ve said it’s the PCSOs and that’s it, whatever happens elsewhere (03.11.08)

In doing this, he reflects a police construction of their contribution as inappropriate and illegitimate, and the chairperson responds by situating this within the local context and history of PACT.
In 7.6.1 we have seen councillors variously position themselves as ‘invaluable partners’, panel member ‘partners’, and as ‘knowledgeable experts’, ‘ordinary’ or ‘special residents’. Within these positions they have identified and disidentified with being ‘council’ and moved between supporting residents, supporting the police and working with residents in challenging police positions. It would seem to be the unpredictability of their identifications and their complex, shifting, multi-faceted use of agency that leads professionals to categorise them as unreliable, responding with defensive boundary work to protect themselves from expected criticisms. The examples below show many council, police and CSP staffs think professionals should not meet with councillors who they identify as difficult to work with, motivated by their own political rather than neighbourhood agendas. The police construct most councillors, particularly those who refuse to be ‘partners’ within PACT, as overly ‘partisan or dominant’ and political unacceptable (they could be said to be an extreme case of ‘counter-publics’).

No, NO PACT isn’t meant to be political. Not the purpose at all. Some councillors are very good but we have err what can I say, problems with some of them, not so much party politics in our Sector […] We have one councillor who thinks they run the police in this Sector not me, always trying to tell me what we should be doing […] (Inspector Evergreen, ANM Meeting, June 2009)

Councillors like Councillor Smith cause the police problems because they challenge their professional construction of PACT. Councillor Smith sees PACT as a new avenue that will enable residents, including ‘communities of fate’ like Ganton, Redbank and Evergreen to influence the police:

Cllr Smith: Yes residents need to learn to use PACT to get the police to do what they should and don’t do […]

He also moves between criticising police performance and lack of action to acknowledging the PCSOs work at street level with communities.

Cllr Smith: PCSOs are the eyes of the police. They are the ones collecting the intelligence. They take the names and call Police in when they need some back up or someone with powers. It’s PCSOs who do this. PCSO Wayne and other PCSOs work extremely hard to get results. Not easy to do need to build this evidence & paper trail of identifying individuals to get them to court (Evergreen 06.10.08)
He identifies with residents’ views of PCSOs and a too-distant hierarchy of decision-makers within the police that does not respond to legitimate requests. His identification reflects his hopes for PACT to change power-relations and have a future. As with resident identifications, this also reflects the qualitatively different and particularised relationships that are both mediated and held with local PCSOs.

In the face of these types of challenges it is not surprising that most professionals are unwilling to work with councillors. For example:

OM Housing: Never get council officers to attend sector ANM meetings if councillors attend. Too political (July 2008)

CSP Co-ordinator: you’ll never get councillors and us [paid officers] round the same table working on issues because they’re all trying to get commitments out of us to do things for their wards not what SARA and the statistics[hot spot crime and ASB data] tell us should be the priorities and where resources should be spent. They’ll have us spending all our time doing useless feasibility studies instead of getting the real job done. No, no same room, it’s all game playing to them, we have enough problems with councillors’ questions and we’ve all suffered with those [some nods around the room]. Soon as we say anything we’ll be held to it as a promise […]. Let’s face it. Some Sectors have as many as 29 councillors in them, never be able to meet them at the same time, and when you do they’ll be fighting amongst themselves…. never going to work, policing and community safety has got to be politics free (retired Community Inspector Neighbourhood Management Network Meeting 30.09.08)

We see how councillors are regarded by professionals as complex, challenging and outspoken, with an envisaged lack of agreement between different local or party agendas. These are interpreted as negative positions. The failure of some councillors to act as police think they should - allowing themselves to be co-opted within PACT - makes them uncontrollable and threatening. This causes confusion because in 6.6.1 we have

---

56 The statistics he is referring to are the ‘hot spot’ crime and ASB geo-data maps and tables compiled using mainly police figures and used by professional partners to decide on prioritisation of resources. There are data analysts working on this within the police, CSP, and council ASB partnership unit. These are utilised within sector and City wide Neighbourhood Management decision-making.
demonstrated councillors can be categorised as mounting legitimate challenges from their power base as elected representatives for their wards and residents.

The activities of some councillors (for example Coolgreen and Ganton), are frequently cited as apocryphal stories that professionals tell each other - and me - to explain the problem. We see a range of identifications, including the wish for professionals as experts to decide the ‘real priorities’ and ‘solutions’, coupled with the fear that new actors (in this instance directed toward councillors) casts sector ANM as well as PACT meetings as politically fraught and encompassing contested identifications. This reinforces the influence of the police positioning within both separate and generative modes of interaction (Herbert 2006).

City’s most senior police officer and BCU Commander confirms the police and council professionals’ difficulties in working with those that they cannot co-opt or predict as supportive within PACT. He also invokes resident outrage to further justify this positioning:

Well it’s become quickly apparent that councillors either serve the community or themselves. We see this in a variety of ways. I have one PACT at one extreme where the councillor is part of the problem and not part of the solution. This councillor says they don’t represent the council! It’s amazing that they can take this stance. How can they get away with it with community? When community come to a meeting they have every right to expect that councillors should be accountable and sit at the top table (11.11.08)

His outrage, and police frustration that this state of affairs continues, are palpable.

OM Mike is the most proactively positioned – and only enthusiastic - local authority senior manager who advocates working with councillors within the consultative groups that report to ANM meetings. He runs the South-West Sector ANM and is one of the most ‘can do’ and positive about Neighbourhood delivery based on horizontal and vertical coproduction, including working with residents and councillors. He is one of the few council managers who are positive about PACT:

Over 15 years ago when I first got involved in regeneration of run down areas and building stock in various parts of City it was a big shock to me to hear that for residents these were icing on the cake and what they really wanted was the youths off the streets and something for them to do. So I went to the first PACT myself, unofficially in the audience, and I know it was angry and
heated but this was the first time people could actually have the police in front of them and have their say after years of putting up with whatever services were offered […] I think PACT could become a positive opportunity (29.08.07)

Over a number of years, Mike has been responsible for implementing a range of regeneration projects within this locality (including parts of Evergreen and South Redbank). Consequently, he has the most experience of working with communities, councillors and the police. He can ask other council staff to co-operate and answer queries through him, or attend these meetings to directly discuss issues with councillors. Councillors are not invited to ANM meetings as these are solely professional staff partnership meetings. Mike frequently tells councillors:

This is why partnership works, it makes connections to the people you need to access to get things done in your area and breaks down silo-working, it’s great.

Its successes like this we need to report to the ANM (Consultation Meeting, May2008)

OM Mike’s identification demonstrates that joined-up partnership working and co-governance with residents and councillors is a position he is comfortable fulfilling whereas most are not. This can be partly explained by a career history of many years that includes working within co-governance of local regeneration projects (within Evergreen & South Redbank) involving both councillors and residents (Yang 2005). As discussed in chapter three, this reinforces the need for the active endorsement of senior management to build effective collaborative power-sharing (Yang 2005, Ansell & Gash 2007, Ray et al 2008). We see distinct locality and ANM sector differences in willingness to do this.

Those police and local authority staffs that adopt a ‘distanced’ and negative positioning of co-governance with councillors illustrate Herbert’s (2006) separation and generative mode of interaction within PACT and Neighbourhood Management: separation based on the pull to remain aloof and independent of the politics which characterises the seemingly ‘objective’ expert and professional bureaucratic views of the police and other public services; generative, because we can see that the construction of difficult and problematic councillors allows professionals to dismiss and distance themselves rather than become responsive to their voice and requests. In these practices we can see the potentially oppositional pulls
toward maintaining existing power-relations, attempting to co-join councillors as partners, and the potential to enable and empower.

This section has demonstrated councillor and professional struggles, both in working together and within PACT. As well as the myriad of locality differentiated positions councillors play, some - like Councillor Smith above - are particularly challenging to the police and other professionals as they are seen as attempts to re-write power-relations. This, and findings from earlier sections, will be summarised in a final conclusion.

7.7 Conclusion
Chapter seven has revealed some key issues within PACT and co-governance. Firstly the extent of locality differences in how PACT is enacted has been confirmed. For example, disadvantaged Evergreen PACTs rejection of managed expectations and explanations, and working collectively and collaboratively (including with their councillors) to repeatedly challenge officials’ identifications and construction of PACT. In doing so, this necessitates police representatives undertaking frequent boundary and defensive identification work involving direct and indirect dismissal of resident (and in Evergreen councillor) requests. Professionals’ control of PACT and priority setting are repeated at Redbank, although these meetings are mainly the province of councillors who seem to be responsibilised to run it as CACT while at the same time struggling to break away from the police conception of these meetings with their formal setting of three priorities when they take on additional follow-up actions. The position of the FLSO is pivotal in Redbank and Evergreen in the brokering of community-police relations. She plays a central role as gatekeeper and ‘doing’ the police work for them, ensuring police expectations that PACT priorities are small and manageable. In doing this, she reflects the taken-for-granted use of technologies of dismissal (direct, indirect) and deflection both within PACT and by the police. It is their normal identification and its impact on power-relations mitigates against allowing residents choice and challenge, and seems to support the Foucauldian notion of the power of discursive constructions within everyday discourses in disguising the operation of power. These strategies are particularly evident within Evergreen and Redbank meetings.

Within disadvantaged area PACTs, professionals (in Evergreen the police and in Redbank council officials) struggle with presenting PACT as ‘success stories’ in the face of residents’ lack of satisfaction with services and challenges within PACT. They often dispute and
contest professional perceptions and reject the dominant and preferred police explanations of their choices and actions and their positioning as ‘heroes and experts in charge’. This reinforces Brogden & Nijhar’s (2005) findings that we need to be sceptical about claims of community-policing successes. Whitewood displays an alternative identification of ‘the way things are done’ that involves a polite and almost ‘ideal ritual’ of PACT. It is within Whitewood that we see the least contestation and the most acceptances of ‘hero’ identifications (beyond those sometimes attributed to PCSOs in Evergreen) based on particularised ties and relationships. The Police Officer in Whitewood performs consummately in his role of managing expectations, utilising procedural justice through politeness and humour; there seems to be no evidence within their discretionary allocations of procedural, outcome (except with the coincidence of South Redbank’s alley gating) or distributive justice in the disadvantaged PACTs. These findings reinforce the importance of locality and situated understandings and consideration of locality, local history, knowledge and relationships. Relevant to this study are advantage and disadvantage, existing distribution of CDQL resources and its match to level of need, histories of receiving or feeling let down by services, and with managing resident expectations.

Section 7.3.3 discusses PACT as a local implementation of a centralist top-down initiative that needs to be contextualised within the demands (and preference) of police to align themselves with meeting internal and upward focused performance measures. This takes place within a command and control policing culture with its pervasive view of police as authoritative law enforcers. We see how police and other professionals talk and how identifications are dominated by the importance of central measures and targets (such as setting local priorities) and the construction of a managerialist and professional performance culture (such as SARA, hotspot data & NICHE etc.). This drives police and other partners’ constructions of PACT and shows their preferred mode of interaction is as independent and expert professionals who set priorities because they have the relevant knowledge and expertise. This position is frequently aligned with the ‘heroes’ public servant identity and the wish for grateful residents to accept what is provided by them. This links to the view that residents’ ‘call to action’ can function as a ‘nutters’ charter. This can be seen as the context and driver for their use of technologies of practice to control, such as tight control and limiting of PACT priorities, direct dismissal, indirect dismissal and deflection. These are evident to a different extent across all PACTs. This illustrates the importance of power and control to understand co-governance in PACT. These factors seem to motivate police
positionings and identifications within PACT. This is an understandable mechanism for managing resource constraints, and results in attempts to maintain existing power-relations and restrict rather than share power through vertical co-governance and collaboration. This is sustained by – and sustains - views of ‘usual suspects’ and ‘counter-publics’ within meetings and provides an additional rational and legitimisation that enables the dismissal of lay knowledge and experience in the face of privileged professional expertise. Taken together with evidence presented in chapter six it seems to indicate that the police are strongly driven by a strong managerialist and professional identification (Webb 2008). Also that power and control is a key theme and issue.

The need for predictability and maintaining power and control also provides an explanation of professionals’ approaches to choice, challenge and responsibilisation of co-opted partners, and issues with councillors. This chapter finished with a review of the pivotal and locality diverse identifications and roles of councillors, culminating with a review of the contextually situated issues that professionals and councillors experience in working with each other that affect co-governance within PACT and neighbourhood management. Section 7.6 has looked at the various and often problematic positions of councillors as ‘special residents’ and ‘critics’ (disadvantaged Evergreen) which upset and defy control and predictability as well as more controllable ‘partner’ identifications that are played out differently within mixed/disadvantaged Redbank as CACT, and advantaged Whitewood as panel members. It has considered the range of multiple identifications and the difficulties experienced in any collaboration between councillors and professional staff, as well as the difficulties and struggles experienced by paid council partners’ occasional attendance at PACTs in disadvantaged areas. A key theme is the resistance and contestation that can be escalated through councillors working together, and together with residents within PACT. The locality differences reinforce the need to avoid referring to councillors and professionals (police and council officials) as if they are homogeneous organisational or occupational identities because this faces as many problems as constructing communities as if homogeneous (Young 1999:164). It also shows that actors’ identity work and positionings need to be understood in-situ as relational identifications within their contextual history, and how these identifications (including councillors) are politically enacted rather than predictably fixed or static.
What is clear is that officials’ approach to collaboration is based on the comfort of control and resistance to changes in power-relations and power-sharing with councillors who do or do not conform to their view of partners. This extends to contestation over the expectation that through these new forums of collaboration - including both PACT and Neighbourhood Management - councillors and residents might expect to have an avenue for further involvement in local delivery and allocation decisions that are defended as the province of official actors. We see the enactment of PACT is testing for the police; they either draw on their skills and prowess to deliver a balanced and respectful level of polite procedural fairness (which they manage in Whitewood) or fail in most instances to position themselves as ‘community leaders’ in Evergreen and, mainly by their absence, in Redbank. This reinforces debates that these new settings of co-governance and collaboration through NPM and NPS are contested and potentially too difficult to undertake in relation to core duties of policing and law enforcement.

We have also seen the impact of the parallel development and infancy of horizontal coproduction as the police and other local officials work to make sense of the introduction of multi-agency ANM partnership to deliver neighbourhood based services within City57. This includes the range of professional positions and power-relations. This contestation directly impacts on other officials (lack of) engagement within the PACT process. It can be concluded that establishing ANM has been the priority activity and concern. It is feasible that the introduction of PACT and the involvement of official partners might have developed differently had the ANM been at a more advanced stage within City.

Eight, the final chapter, brings together the findings from chapter six and seven with the key themes from the literature review in chapters two and three to draw some final conclusions. From chapter seven, this includes the critical locality differences, the potential of police to exercise different types of justice within PACT, centralist orientations, culture, ANM, the performance-driven positionings of professionals, and finally the emphasis on control and dismissal of resident and councillor voices. From chapter six, this includes the impact of locality differences in the enactment of residents’ struggles with exercising voice, choice and challenge. It also examines the myriad identifications and locality differences in the experience of PACT - such as ease of being heard or not – and, for disadvantaged areas, the

57 See sections 7.3.1, 7.6.1 & 2
frustrations with discretionary allocation of services, ambivalence and withdrawal from priority setting, coupled with concerns about the exclusion and marginalisation of some residents relating to ethnicity, youth and degree of willingness to engage through public meetings on CDQL. Chapter eight will also draw some conclusions for future research.
Chapter Eight Discussion & Conclusions

8.1 Introduction
The aim of this chapter is to provide a discussion of my approach and findings and to examine the contributions that this thesis makes to theory and practice. It can be summarised as addressing the gap in the literature and our knowledge of the micro-level practice of co-governance, particularly the nuanced enactment of interactive identities and power dynamics within the collaborative interactions. It also acknowledges the complexities and difficulties created by the inter-disciplinary nature of my research which required the drawing together of a number of different literatures and approaches. This resulted in an examination of a range of macro and micro approaches to the study of policy, literatures relating to governance, and criminological, policing, community and organisation studies of collaboration and identities.

My thesis began with a review of public service modernisation and reform agendas based on NPM, as well as the later emphasis on NPS partnerships and co-governance involving communities. This review highlighted the variety of horizontal and vertical partnerships that exist and examined the gap between the aims and promises of such partnerships and their implementation and practice. I built on the need, identified in the literature, for more detailed studies of the situated and community practice of vertical co-governance which encompasses situated identity work (cf Hartley 2005) and the extent and nature of agency in local implementations (Barnes & Prior 2009, Yang 2005, Andrews & Entwistle 2010). I make the case for locality-based research of the practice of partnership between communities, police and other partners directed at CDQL issues. Specifically, this involved the selection and longitudinal tracking of Neighbourhood Policing PACT meetings within City in Wales. I developed the Clarke et al (2007) model and approach to the study of citizen-consumer co-governance to encompass the lived experience of PACT. The rationale for the selection of different socio-economic localities was to examine the practice and potential differences – or similarities - in empowerment and power-relations that could affect the ability of citizens to gain voice, choice and challenge, or be responsibilised or excluded.

I developed the following three research questions to focus my research:

- How professionals perform their roles in collaboration
• The extent that the community – or variety of publics – feel able to exercise voice, choice and challenge
• How community collaboration is experienced in different socio-economic contexts

My approach draws on a social constructionist and anti-essential ontology that enables a focus on socially constructed and nuanced lived experience. It is aided by the use of Fairclough’s (1994) critical discourse model which identifies three levels of analysis, namely micro-textual elements, discursive practice and social practice, for understanding the situated embodied discourses of actors. The benefit of this approach is that it enables a micro-level analysis of interactions, identities and power dynamics, as well as a study of similarities and differences in the lived experience of collaboration and vertical co-governance between professionals, councillors and residents in different locations. My research involved the detailed study of interactions within PACT meetings as well as the tracing of different actors’ talk about PACT. It also included an exploration of the relationship between this micro-level talk and the macro-discourses of NPM collaborations, police-community engagement and policing culture and identifications. I was also interested in the relationship between these PACT meetings and horizontal partnership in City

Chapter eight begins with a thematic discussion that relates my findings to the key debates introduced in chapters two, three and four. This is followed by an account of my main conclusions and a review of theoretical, methodological and policy and practice contributions. The more practical contributions focus on the aim of neighbourhood vertical coproduction and co-governance, as part of New Labour’s social policy reforms, to tackle wicked social issues including CDQL. I conclude with some final reflections on my position as researcher and on the conduct and writing of this inter-disciplinary longitudinal ethnography.

8.2 Discussion of Key Themes
I have identified four main themes that inform discussion of my research findings and prove useful for understanding how practice reflects the claims for, and benefits of, partnership. These are: the tensions between centralist pressures and local implementation; the problems of inequalities and exclusion in deliberative democracy; the potential (or not) to empower communities; the power and control of professionals (especially the police) in the
construction of vertical coproduction. These four themes are discussed in the light of low community engagement within PACT public meetings and the recognition that this will limit their identification as both important and worthwhile.

8.2.1 Centralism, Localism & the Role of Subversion within Implementation

The first theme considers centralist pressures, the implications of the top-down nature of this initiative and the scope for local discretion. It addresses whether power can be shared within NPM and NPS governance initiatives or whether they result in an increase in State and central government influence over local action. According to Gilling (2007:230), the emphasis within these reforms is of a centralist project wrapped in a restrictive straightjacket of central government powers that draws on a narrow definition of the moral regulation of dangerous classes. Newburn and Jones (2002) also question the purpose of consulting below when most of the agenda is centrally ‘steered’ from above. Previous research has shown this to be a problem in CDRPs (Crawford, 2007). However, other authors argue that there is some limited space for important differences in the local meanings and construction of governance despite the overarching centralist context of aspects of neo-liberal philosophy and the variety of NPM discourses and levers (Bevir & Trentmann 2007, Edwards & Hughes 2008, Newman & Clarke 2009). My research identifies the tensions between the centralist context and local implementation but also reveals important local differences in the performance and understandings of co-governance.

Neighbourhood Policing public meetings were part of the previous government’s agenda to reform public services and introduce a citizen-led and locality delivery focus (Making New Connections 2004, Beecham 2006). The talk about PACT in my research clearly indicates they are part of a top-down centralist initiative and subject to centralist pressures and a top-down target culture, including the specification to hold these meetings and to set three neighbourhood priorities (NCPE 2006). PACT meetings can be seen as enacted by the police to achieve these centralist demands, and part of the ‘tick-box’ culture and raison d’être. This demonstrates how these public meetings are not a bottom-up community initiative and, while locally implemented, were not initiated or developed by the local police or other partners. My ethnographic study of meeting interactions - rather than the use of surveys or research often conducted with senior officers and gatekeepers - provides a detailed analysis of the conflict and contestation around the centralist PACT agenda. I have shown how some pockets of local active communities are striving for more far-reaching local translations within a
wider and more progressive politics (Edwards & Hughes 2008). These experiences illustrate the constraints of top-down implementations and reveal the scope for local discretion within the PACT process.

My research therefore establishes a more nuanced picture of contestation, struggle and resistance within PACT and shows how the top-down specification of policies is subverted by the agency of front-line staffs and residents. Subversion by the police, for example, can be seen through the way they manage policy implementation by limiting local priorities to bite-size initiatives that are achievable within the centrally specified public meeting timescales. The police are also careful to find ways of controlling PACT feedback to enhance their capacity to report success.

It has been argued that centralist co-governance policies were meant to empower paid officials to take on the qualities of ‘transformational leaders’ (Newman 2005, Prior 2009:204). My research shows limited willingness to revise entrenched models of practice and professional values and identities that reinforce and maintain existing practice and power-relations. It reveals that the construction of practitioners within co-governance as if they are transformational leaders may be too challenging in the face of established professional identities and practices. For example, it creates ambivalence and conflict at a personal level, involving emotional engagement and perhaps subverting the professional’s sense of self. This can be seen through the way PCSOs manoeuvre between their alignments with residents and with the ‘real police’ within Evergreen PACT. This highlights the contradictions and difficulties within the local practice of co-governance for public officials when being asked to take on a range of different and conflicting identities such as servants of the community, community leaders, separate law enforcers and authority figures.

8.2.2 Inequalities & Exclusion in Deliberative Democracy
The second theme, inequalities and exclusion, refers to the evidence of differences between the PACT meetings observed and to my extension of the Clarke et al (2007) model, showing how some groups feel excluded from the PACT process. My study was designed to examine the lived experience of PACT and the potential differences and similarities between different socio-economic areas of advantage, disadvantage, mixed advantage and ethnicity. It also highlights inconsistencies and inequalities in the conduct of PACT and how they do not seem to start from a level playing field. In advantaged Whitewood, the residents seem to have their
needs met, whereas disadvantaged Evergreen and Redbank begin with higher levels of unmet need and continue to receive less. Residents’ requests at these PACT meetings put pressure on the police or local authority partners to deliver solutions, a positioning that seems to reinforce existing power-relations based on professionals’ provision of services. Another indication of locality differences is the dismissal within disadvantaged Evergreen and Redbank of resident-generated solutions, and their requests for citizen coproduction and identification of issues and solutions rather than those that privilege police or other officials. This is prima-facie evidence of inequalities and exclusion within deliberative democracy linked to locality factors.

My research endorses the position that some residents are considered ‘lesser citizens’ (Utting 2009), often referred to as ‘bad neighbours’ or less worthy of services; these are underrepresented and absent attendees of PACT. Those who attend overwhelmingly represent the moral majority and can be considered ‘good neighbours’ or ‘good citizens’ (Stokoe & Wallwork 2003, Amin 2005). My findings provide micro-level support of earlier research that suggests problems with the legitimacy of inclusive co-governance due to the absence of these ‘other’ residents (cf Foot 2009). It seems that in addition to residents that are unable to attend, other residents dis-identify with being able or interested in attending. These residents do not attend and are also excluded, feel unwelcome, unappreciated, and do not expect to be listened to or to gain voice, choice and challenge. A small number of non-attendees – including young people, white and BME residents - were interviewed, and they talked of a range of expected inequalities. These included positioning PACT attendance as divisive, based on an expectation – and for some young people the actual experience – of their views being unacceptable and dismissed by the core of regular attendees.

An additional complaint of these non-attendees was that attending would not change anything, as the police – and their official partners – would not act on residents’ concerns and wishes. Both absent white and BME residents positioned PACT as a ‘talking-shop’ to endorse police actions, with no possibility of gains in voice, choice or challenge. In better-off areas, some non-attendees felt no need to attend as they used other avenues of contact - such as MPs - and experienced low levels of CDQL issues in their neighbourhood. My findings reinforce the arguments that highlight the way that minorities as well as many of the majority are excluded at these public meetings; this compromises them as a mechanism of co-governance (Chaney & Fevre 2001b, Skidmore et al 2006).
8.2.3 The Empowered Community

The third theme focuses on the ‘ideal’ and claim of empowerment for citizen-consumers in gaining voice, choice and challenge. This is discussed in relation to a number of key debates. Firstly, I will examine the potential of, and limits to, vertical coproduction as sites of deliberative democracy and empowerment in relationships with professional partners, particularly the police. Secondly, there will be a focus on the benefits (or not) experienced by both ‘communities of fate’ and advantaged middle-classes, and the relevance of socio-economic profiles to the different lived experience of communities. Finally, I will examine the evidence of procedural, distributive and outcome justice and the challenge and contestation mounted by some individuals and groups.

A key debate within the literature is residents’ capacity and willingness – or not - to become involved and to take on the identity of an active citizen or consumer who attempts to exercise voice, choice and challenge. While Clarke et al (2007) concluded that there is limited evidence of empowerment through the acceptance of the citizen-consumer identity, Newman & Clarke (2009) suggest the potential for positive and differential outcomes in the exercise of situated co-governance. My research shows that despite limited attendance across all the different socio-economic contexts, there are residents who are willing to engage as rights claiming citizen-consumers. These engaged residents form the core PACT meeting attendees. Their identifications include being representative, ‘faithful’ and legitimate ‘care-takers’ within their neighbourhoods. This is endorsed in better-off Whitewood by attendees who formally represent and feedback to their Neighbourhood Watch Schemes.

One key locality difference is the contestation over the nature and limits of active-citizenship and whether this should be directed at providing community intelligence for official services to act or whether it should involve direct action by residents. For example, resident intervention with drug dealers is dissuaded as too risky and regarded as vigilantism rather than ‘being vigilant’. I have shown how positions are nuanced and varied within these meetings. Some Evergreen residents are fearful that their attendance at PACT meetings and talking to the police will become known; Whitewood residents position themselves with confidence and equality with professionals. Other residents can be identified as active in other neighbourhood matters such as tenant associations or single interest groups and these seem to provide some of their strength and discursive resources within PACT. For example, in Evergreen one of the residents, Bob, uses his knowledge of council regulations and his
partnership experience with the Arson Unit as a discursive resource to gain legitimacy and respect within PACT meetings.

There are distinct locality differences in how voice, choice and challenge are performed. Whitewood is polite and humorous, Evergreen frequently results in an angry collective performance and Redbank often has an individual focus apart from their collective mobilisation and challenge in response to local authority visitors. Individually and collectively, South Redbank and Evergreen residents’ identifications are focused on struggling to be heard, with this struggle often resulting in frustrations, anger and overwhelming feelings of being ‘let down’. In Whitewood meetings, there is evidence that the police use procedural justice in their polite attentive interactions. In Redbank and Evergreen, the emotional and fraught interactions suggest that residents do not receive procedural justice and often challenge the professionals within PACT meetings. These challenges frequently draw on fears of differential treatment and services compared to better-off areas (Gilling 2007, Somerville 2009) which signal the importance of both distributive and outcome justice, in contrast to Tyler and Fagan’s (2008) emphasis only on procedural justice.

Much of the talk within PACT concerns ‘them and us’ comparisons, focusing on what ‘others get’ and what residents feel they ‘should and do not’ receive. For example, there is talk of differentiated levels of service for rubbish and street cleansing between disadvantaged South Redbank compared to advantaged North Redbank. In Evergreen and Redbank most issues persist and solutions and outcomes do not seem to be available via PACT. Advantaged Whitewood residents attend these meetings to ensure that they maintain their ‘good’ area and existing levels of policing and council services. It is possible that outcome and distributive justice are easier to deliver in Whitewood because they have less CDQL problems, coupled with levels of service that are matched to meeting their needs. This closer match, along with the use of procedural justice within this locality, suggests that these residents do not need to mount challenges. My findings show that procedural, distributive and outcome justice are matters of interest in these neighbourhood-based meetings. The neighbourhood design of PACT meetings, focussing on the local delivery of services, would seem to encourage neighbourhood comparisons based on distributive and outcome justice, not just procedural justice. While theorists suggest that a focus on the use of procedural justice within episodes of community-engagement is key to improving confidence and reassurance (ibid, Bradford
2011), my findings indicate that, within the PACT context, resident identifications may also involve distributive and outcome justice.

My findings support earlier survey research that shows how advantaged communities may have a greater cache and potential to influence (Clarke et al 2007, Somerville 2009). However, it is not possible within my research to separate out the extent of such influence as the superior or better-matched baseline level of services and lower levels of CDQL issues within advantaged Whitewood may also make it easier for services to respond to their requests. However, my focus on the practice and identifications within PACT meetings provides partial support for the different experiences of ‘communities of fate’, revealing their frustration and sense of being ‘let down’. It also reveals how these communities are being empowered, as suggested by radical communitarianism (Weeks 1996, Braithwaite 2000, Hughes 2007). Residents have been shown to be actively vocal in both challenging and collaborating with professionals. It seems that attendees are prepared to take on the role of active citizens and act as ‘care-takers’ in PACT meetings. For Clarke et al (2007:142) this doesn’t necessarily endorse the discourse and acceptance of the citizen-consumer identity but relates to an alternative account of ‘what we want’ as a ‘matter of right’.

My detailed analyses of naturally occurring discourse and identity positions suggests that residents – either as ‘care-takers’ for their area or as victims - are trying to claim their rights. Differences in socio-economic profiles and categorisation seem to affect decision-making and allocation of resources by both senior and junior public service officials (Jenkins 2009, Somerville 2009). However hard the ‘less worthy or deserving’ try they will not achieve a redistribution of services. This suggests that co-governance initiatives will not address distributive and outcome justice (Bradford 2011) or provide an effective form of vertical coproduction offering new solutions and power-sharing.

Some of the PACT chairs from disadvantaged ‘communities of fate’ attempted to exercise choice and challenge over the implementation and operation of PACT meetings by the police in City. They hoped to establish a power base to begin discussions with the City BCU police to consider city-wide responsiveness and action from PACT meetings. This included issues of distributive justice and the appropriate allocation of resources to areas of greatest need, which they most frequently identified as disadvantaged areas. This suggests that we cannot dismiss PACT as a totally disempowering centralist initiative, or adopt an essentialist
position that identifies residents from disadvantaged areas as always ‘doubly disadvantaged’ and unable or ‘too light’ to mobilise within co-governance (Herbert 2006, Foot 2009).

8.2.4 Power & Control in Vertical Coproduction
The final theme, in a discussion of my research findings, focuses on power and control in vertical coproduction and considers how an identities approach reveals the dynamics of power and the way control is exercised within PACT meetings. It is important to understand police identities and their styles of interaction within the practice of co-governance. This section will explore these identities and interactions, focusing on the critical themes of how residents are responsibilised within PACT and the implications of this for how meetings are controlled. I also outline a hierarchy of knowledge that exists within these partnerships, identifying ‘whose knowledge counts’ as well as the important power dynamics involving elected representatives. It concludes with my argument that the implementation and construction of PACT in City is best conceptualised as ‘therapeutic laundry meetings’.

There is a wealth of literature on power and control in partnerships, suggesting differentials in power and revealing how dominant, powerful partners are able to control partnerships to the detriment of ideals of equality in the practice of collaboration (Powell & Glendinning 2002). Within vertical co-governance, it is suggested that this is the advantaged position of official partners compared to community actors (Fairclough 2005a, Foot 2009). Within police-community engagement - such as local forums and PCCs - the police are often seen as the dominant and powerful player (Hughes 1994, Somerville 2009).

8.2.4.1 Control & Responsibilisation
My findings suggest that these meetings are dominated and controlled by the police; this is shown through the interactions within these meetings, and in the talk about their introduction in City. This seems to echo the Clarke et al (2007) finding that the police are the least able (compared to health, social and care services) to engage with a collective citizen-consumer, their target audience for PACT meetings. The police seem to struggle with, and distance themselves from, resident consumer identities, and resist or resent collaborative action by residents. At times, the PCSOs and PCs present themselves as having their hands tied and unable to progress the most challenging demands for change and for more meaningful citizen-led coproduction. Professional positionings within, and in talk about, PACT are complex and multi-levelled. We see the preference for police officers to identify as ‘heroes’
and for being thanked and appreciated for their actions on CDQL issues. This is easiest to enact in Whitewood but often fails in Evergreen and Redbank where professionals are challenged as ‘failing heroes’. Within Evergreen and Redbank, the PCSOs and FLSO dis-identify with the ‘real police’ and align with residents in attempts to defuse challenges and tensions within PACT meetings. This reveals the tensions and struggles they experience within PACT as the responsibilised representatives of the police and the differences in the identifications between those officers who do attend these meetings and those who do not.

Residents also seem to be responsibilised through their attendance at PACT meetings. There is little evidence of power-sharing and many residents struggle with and resist responsibilisation through the exercise of agency and counter agency. As the literature on governmentality suggests, it seems that vertical coproduction will be implemented in ways that attempt to maintain existing power-relations (Clarke et al. 2007). Most visibly, residents at all three PACTs seem to opt out of the priority-setting phase. They do so by holding other conversations, by leaving the meeting and by paying minimal attention as the police and panel struggle to get their attention or ‘tell’ them their priorities. At one Redbank PACT, FLSO Maureen tells a new attendee that the setting of priorities is the reason for PACT meetings – ‘that’s why you are here Sir’. The dis-identification and opting-out that occurs within these meetings provides practical evidence of what Clarke et al (2007:154) describe as the potential for passive dissent within vertical co-governance. Passive dissent can be extended to understand non-attendance and refusal of responsibilisation and co-option as active PACT participants.

An attempt to legitimise these as citizen-led meetings that are not owned or controlled by the police is evidenced by the police selection and responsibilisation of community chairs to act as ‘brokers’. This is coupled with the presentation of police and partners’ achievements - in relation to either the PACT priorities or in relation to other issues - as success stories. However, we can also see how discourses of control are drawn on by the police in the ways they interact with residents, and at times councillors, and in their undermining of the ability of these groups to exercise choice and challenge. These techniques include direct dismissal or active and inactive deflection of their views. There is clear enactment of Herbert’s (2006) separation, subservient and generative interaction styles in the positions and identifications of the police. Separation acts as a pull to maintain their expert and independent authority and is legitimised by their categorisation of residents as unrepresentative ‘usual suspects’ with their
own illegitimate agendas. Subservience – the willingness to serve - pushes them to engage and resource these meetings, particularly in Evergreen where the PCSOs and FLSO Maureen position themselves as ‘one of you’, thus distancing and dis-identifying themselves from their policing colleagues and formal police positions. Generative interaction – the construction of the community as an available resource to endorse actions - is visible in all three socio-economic settings, as the police, and at times the councillors, call on the responsibilised, moral and upstanding attendees present at these meetings to be ‘good residents’ who will endorse or ‘rubber-stamp’ the actions and priorities that the police deem to be important.

The police are not always able to co-opt and responsibilise councillors, or other formal partners, in the ways they wish. For example, elected representatives adopted different positions and identifications across these three PACTs and - most baffling and frustrating for the police - often refuse to be identified as representatives of the council. In Evergreen, councillors manoeuvre between alignments as ‘special residents’ to challenge officials, to contributing as ‘experts’, and rare support of the police. At the other extreme, we saw that Redbank meetings are run almost as Councillor and Communities Together (CACT) with the police a mainly absent partner; in Whitewood they take a middle-of-the-road positioning as partners at the top table. In other areas they are often the thorn-in-the-side of the police, taking what the police describe as political positions. The police seem to position councillors as potential ‘counter-publics’ who might drag them into partisan matters (Barnes et al 2003). However, while distrust of residents and their elected representatives is a dominant identification it is not uniform or common across all the PACTs studied. My research supports the need to focus on elected representatives and their contested and complex identifications within these new deliberative spaces (Sullivan 2009, Foot 2009).

8.2.4.2 Expertise & Knowledge Hierarchy

The maintenance of existing power-relations is also achieved through the superior positioning of the police and other paid officials as ‘experts who know best’. They draw on their ‘expert knowledge’ and position themselves in this way to substantiate their arguments and fend-off choice and challenge. This suggests a ‘hierarchy of knowledge’ within which it is possible to identify ‘whose knowledge counts’ within the PACT process. It would seem from my research that police, and other official data sources that build hotspot information are the most highly privileged. This draws directly on discourse that privileges the police’s internal hierarchical, authoritarian and target driven culture. This highest level expert knowledge is
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produced by professional services from technologies such as NICHE and COMPSTATS, as well as from official reports and documented texts. Police officers referred to the importance of this data in their assessment of issues and production of solutions. The second level is officially sponsored data sources such as the UPSI (2009) report for City; this reflects knowledge collection by a contracted and highly regarded provider. For example, the UPSI (2009) report mapped their results directly in the format and terminology used by the police and community safety. When it supported ‘expert’ views this was highly prized as a sanitised source of statistical community intelligence and used to substantiate the drawing-down of resources. When the UPSI findings contradicted City police and CSP assessments it was derided and used as a discursive resource to dismiss these views. This shows how such knowledge can be drawn on in pragmatic and different ways to support particular positions.

Resident and councillor testimonies seem to be the third and lowest level in the knowledge hierarchy. The police have always needed to collect community intelligence to inform their decision-making but it is an uneasy process in which they reserve the right to accept or deny these contributions. We see this in PACT meetings when residents’ personal, invested testimonies, and sometimes highly emotional inputs, are dismissed, disputed and on occasions ignored in subsequent resourcing decisions. These would seem to form the lowest level of knowledge within the process and its dismissal by professionals is linked to the way that in some PACT locations those who attend these meetings are viewed as ‘usual suspects’ and unrepresentative of the community and their concerns.

We see the contestation and inevitable tensions between the power and dominance of professional practice and knowledge and local social identities and ways of knowing. Vertical coproduction is complicated for officials due to the inevitable differences between their opinions and solutions and those of residents and/or councillors. This contestation around different truth claims concerning public service provision reveals how facts are (re)constructed and how micro as well as macro-discourses are drawn on within specific contexts to support particular interests (Benwell & Stokoe 2006, Newman & Clarke 2009). Within co-governance, the lack of a unified homogeneous resident identification seems to contribute to lay participant and resident-contributed knowledge being dismissed. Previous research has suggested citizen contributions are too messy and difficult for public service officials (Somerville 2009); this reinforces the identification of residents as ‘awkward customers’ (Westmarland & Clarke 2009) and ‘usual suspects’.
This brings into question the potential of vertical coproduction to share power with residents and be directed at dealing with issues and solutions that are resident generated. While Innes & Roberts (2011) argue that the police are capable of resident-led coproduction their conclusions were drawn within a context where additional resources had been mobilised to address the Prevent agenda. My results provide partial support for Somerville’s (2009) view that coproduction which involves public service officials who are willing to share power is limited.

8.2.4.3 PACT as ‘Therapeutic Laundry Meetings’

My research has shown contested expectations surrounding PACT, with many community expectations remaining unmet. For disadvantaged communities it confirms what Fairclough (2005a) describes as the gap between the promise and delivery of co-governance and deliberative democracy. I conclude that the practice of PACT could be referred to as ‘therapeutic laundry meetings’, established for the purpose of allowing residents to sound-off, providing a safety valve or outlet rather than an opportunity to influence discretionary street-level bureaucratic processes. This builds on the notion of citizen-led co-governance as an example of the ‘therapeutic State’ that functions as a space for single issue communal identification through the expression of emotions (Chandler 2000:11 citing Nolan 1998). It also reflects the importance of collective identities and empowered ‘communities of interest’ within co-governance (Emejulu 2011:117). It can be said that for the duration of PACT meetings, all attendees are co-joined as a ‘community of interest’ around CDQL issues. However, the low numbers attending PACT does not suggest that these meetings will become a focus through which communities within or across Wards may be built.

City professionals – particularly the police who dominate PACT – do seem to construct PACT as a limited power-sharing and consultative exercise with diminished representational and accountable capacity. This provides some support for the practice of police-community engagement as consultative. It supports the suggestion by Gilling (2007) that police-community engagement is near the base of Arnstein’s Ladder of Participation, reflecting consultation rather than a power-sharing or decision-making participatory process. My research shows that professional constructions of PACT as consultation are nuanced and ambiguous, reflecting four main constructions. PACT as the symbolic provision of access,
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albeit in a limited way, to public service officials; as a route to obtaining individual and collective community intelligence; as an opportunity to provide feedback on actions, messages and success stories; and as ‘therapeutic laundry meetings’, which could encompasses all the above and best tolerates resident and elected representatives’ contributions and identifications. Residents and professionals are intimately involved in constructing PACT and these constructions are contested, resisted and challenged.

The performance of PACT as ‘therapeutic laundry meetings’ is evidenced by a number of factors: the lack of enthusiasm or interest by frontline staff from the police, local authority and City CSPs to give prominence to residents’ views; the lack of clear monitoring systems to track PACT priorities beyond PACT meeting agendas within either the police or the local authority; the patchy monitoring and reporting of PACT priorities within Neighbourhood Management; and the emphasis placed by public service officials on horizontal coproduction, professional partnership and expertise within Neighbourhood Management.

To conclude, these four themes reflect a picture of differential and nuanced lived experiences of PACT, bringing to the forefront the importance of power-relations within PACT, and highlighting the influence of top-down pressures, organisational cultures and power over the PACT process. My study of the lived experience and practice of co-governance in public meetings develops and supports the need to look specifically at situated and local constructions of the meanings of partnership (Bevir 2007). As expected, my research also indicates that PACT is not capable - nor meant to deliver - solutions that deal with social inequality. However, I have shown how they reinforce the gap between the promise and delivery of co-governance (Fairclough 2005a) and the way PACT meetings are enacted serve to reproduce existing patterns of inequality and control (Gilling 2007). This limits the potential of co-governance to tackle wicked social issues. It endorses the view that any redistribution will require broader and more far-reaching societal and political level actions (Somerville 2009:71) than reforms, focused on co-governance within crime and disorder reduction and quality of life, can deliver.

8.3 Theoretical & Methodological Contributions
My research makes a number of substantial theoretical and methodological contributions to the literature on community co-governance. Methodologically, it builds on previous survey based research and, through conducting a locality based ethnography, provides a more
nuanced understanding of the construction and meanings of community level partnerships. Theoretically, it enables a more critical understanding of the claims for partnerships within public services and contributes to our understanding of the contestations and power struggles within practices of co-governance. In addition, while there are separate literatures that focus on the practice of horizontal and vertical coproduction and partnerships, my research contributes by examining the relationship between these levels and the implications for the outcomes that emerge. The following sections will consider these contributions in more detail.

8.3.1 Micro-level Enactment & Contestation

My research makes a significant contribution to the literature through micro-level analyses of locality experiences. Drawing on critical discursive analysis and an embodied identities approach, I reveal differences in the practice of partnerships and provide a more nuanced account of the ways co-governance is constructed by the different stakeholders in the process. Much of the existing literature adopts a more macro-level approach - utilising questionnaire surveys, focus groups or interviews - and is directed at the talk about partnership rather than at tracing its lived experience (cf Yang 2005, Clarke et al 2007, Bradford 2011). A critical contribution of my research is its focus on these lived experiences and in revealing the tensions and difficulties of co-governance within different local contexts. Drawing on the CDA approach of Fairclough (1994) my research contributes to important debates in the study of collaboration and partnership, examining the importance of power relations, the impact of collective and individual identities within power struggles and the way control is exercised both within and over collaborative spaces. The three-level model of Fairclough’s approach also provided a mechanism for revealing how broader macro-discourses and influences are involved in local enactment and how they may be drawn on as both contextual and discursive resources.

The research therefore reinforces the importance, and contribution, of longitudinal ethnography to provide an in-depth exploration of the situated, bottom-up practice of co-governance. A key strength is the ability to study changes through time rather than adopting a snap-shot or cross-sectional approach (Hammersley & Atkinson 2007). It has demonstrated the value of a close examination of the performances of the police, other officials, councillors and residents in understanding discursive struggle in the creation and control of shared social meanings. This contributes to a growing body of research that suggests that structural
typologies are insufficient on their own to explain partnership, advocating a focus on local situated practice and the agency of those involved alongside acuity to the broader tendencies of national processes (Bevir 2007, Barnes & Prior 2009).

8.3.2 A Critique of the Claims for Partnership & Co-governance

My research makes a key theoretical contribution to understanding the complexities and dialogic construction of co-governance and partnerships, informing debates on the construction of the citizen-consumer, the potential for vertical coproduction and the importance of procedural justice. I have shown how local implementations of co-governance are dialogically constructed, how practice cannot be directly implied by structural constraints (Whitehead 2007, Newman & Clarke 2009), and how power and agency do not simply or straightforwardly align with policy or central specifications, or with a singular construction of the citizen-consumer, public service officials, or elected representatives. It contributes evidence of the messiness and complexities of the practice of partnerships.

8.3.2.1 The Practice of Governance & the Citizen-consumer Identity

My research confirms the validity and need for a developed conceptualisation of citizen-consumers and how this might best be understood. By providing ethnographic evidence of the interactive practice and relational identifications, it goes beyond the contributions of previous studies based on the talk about the practice of governance, policy subversion and agency in local implementations (Newman 2007, Clarke et al 2007, Prior & Barnes 2009). In so doing it advances the body of knowledge concerning the new relationships engendered by the citizen-consumer within citizen-led co-governance. I show how these are not neatly packaged but are emergent, dialogic and more involved than suggested by thin discourses of choice, resistance, and constructions of passive unified citizen-consumer identities (Newman 2007, Clarke et al 2007). My research makes a major contribution to the debate on the practice and empowerment (or not) within community co-governance through the citizen-consumer identity. My findings suggest that the practice, rights claiming, and identifications with choice and the citizen-consumer identity is more nuanced than suggested by previous researchers (ibid) particularly within disadvantaged communities.

My research contributes to the debate concerning the importance of a single collective identity for effective collaborative working. Hardy et al (2005) suggests that a single collective identity and agreed set of meanings is essential to effective collaboration. In
contrast to Hardy et al (2005), my research provides evidence of multi-hyphenated collective identities within participation that reflect situated collaborative alignments between the actors involved. For example, alignments between councillors and residents or between different residents to mount challenges evidence the production and mobilisation of oppositional collective citizen-consumer identities. This contributes to evidence of the importance of multi-hyphenated and collective identities within participation (Prior 2009, Emejulu 2011:117). The research also contributes to the validity of the citizen-consumer identity and empowerment as suggested by the radical communitarian thesis. It shows that within neighbourhood-based public co-governance meetings disadvantaged ‘communities of fate’ are not necessarily ‘doubly disadvantaged’ but attempt to exercise citizen choice, challenge and claim to receive appropriate services more ardently than the advantaged. Also, I show that where citizens identify a lack of power over local priority setting, they manoeuvre to display passive dissent and dis-identification. Together these three contributions provide a more considered account of collective identity positions within the practice of co-governance.

8.3.2.2 The Politics of Co-governance
I contribute to an understanding of the messy, complex and political practice of co-governance, including what Newman (2007:65) calls the micro-management of dilemmas in the production of local enactment and meaning that draws on its relationship ‘with wider frameworks of meaning and legitimation’. For example, the overlay of participatory governance on systems of elected governance (Sullivan 2009) adds a wider contextual dynamic to the local dilemmas, power struggles and contestation over the positioning of elected representatives in relation to residents and public service officials. The wider critique of the new governance via multi-agency partnership reveals the dominance of public service officials and how this may disempower and silence other participants, as well as creating issues of mistrust and contestation over the goals and conduct of partnership (cf Balloch & Taylor 2002). As part of this power dynamic, I also consider my contribution to the local practice of deliberative democracy and what Giddens (1994:16, Chandler 2000:12) suggests is best conceived as the ‘democracy of the emotions’. By revealing the power dynamics within the practice of co-governance, my research shows how the identity positions of professional stakeholders and their struggles to retain control act to limit the opportunities for both vertical coproduction and procedural, distributive and outcome justice within public meetings (Tyler & Fagan 2008, Somerville 2009).
Four main implications arise from this conclusion. Firstly, it contributes to the debates concerning coproduction by suggesting that the opportunity for coproduction is more limited within universal co-governance initiatives than others have suggested (cf Innes & Roberts (2011). This can be understood by the way that professional partners controlled discretionary allocation, their dominance in decision-making, and their dismissal and rejection of citizen inputs, lay knowledge and citizen-led constructions of problems and solutions. My demonstration of how the practice of the dismissal (directly, indirectly or by deflection) of resident contributions is operationalised within deliberative democracy goes beyond previous research that suggests how officials hold power in these settings and try to write out emotions as unacceptable (Clarke et al 2007, Barnes 2008:472). It contributes support for the need to focus on these difficulties and reconceptualise co-governance and its public meetings in ways that incorporate the politics of emotions. This emphasises the potential development of co-governance that draw on models like Mouffe’s (1999) conceptualisation of agonistic democracy to enable further empowerment of citizens voice and choice and professionals capacity to tolerate and potentially work with challenges. As discussed in the outline of my conceptualisation of the knowledge hierarchy, the devaluing of lay knowledge (including both resident and elected representatives) and privileging of professional expertise is an area that needs further research (Collins & Evans 2007).

Secondly, it makes a critical and new contribution to the literature by suggesting the need to explore the opportunity for and importance of procedural justice. Specifically, my research revealed how procedural justice seemed to occur more easily within advantaged middle-class public meetings, and for residents who may already receive superior levels of service and have access and potential to influence (Gilling 2007). There was no evidence of disadvantaged communities receiving procedural justice and I revealed how comparisons and identifications concerned with distributive and outcome justice were important within neighbourhood participation and co-governance. This contradicts the suggestion of Tyler & Fagan (2008) that procedural justice will be sufficient to satisfy the expectations or gain the confidence of citizens-consumers within collective participation. It further confirms that all citizens are not equal within deliberative democracy. This links to my first implication, as rejected challenges are often driven by discourses concerning the potential of co-governance to deal with issues of distributive and social justice (Newman 2007). Further research is needed to explore the potential and importance of procedural, distributive and outcome
justice within co-governance; in particular within engagements involving disadvantaged communities and with those suffering wicked social issues.

My contribution to the body of knowledge shows that the local implementation of co-governance initiatives are often undertaken in regressive and constrained ways to restrict changes in power dynamics with citizens (cf Edwards 2002, Gilling 2007:230). It acknowledges the prerequisites of effective participation, namely administrative integrity combined with the provision of performance results, are not in place (Wang & Wort 2007). It supports the contention that while some of the apparatus and structures to enable effective participation may be built, the professional identities, trust, will or capacity to enact fuller power-sharing are not (Yang 2005). This reinforces my conceptualisation of co-governance public meetings as ‘therapeutic laundry meetings’ rather than spaces of representative and politically accountable decision-making.

Thirdly, my extension of the Clarke et al (2007) model contributes to the debate concerning the divisive nature of co-governance. It provides evidence of the identifications of those that remain excluded, marginalised and ‘othered’ within neighbourhood-based public meetings. Specifically, these include the youth, transient groups, and BME populations whom are not fluent in English. This reflects the potential domination by ‘good citizens’, and a minority of residents who are interested in attending public meetings. Therefore, it can be concluded that critical issues of inclusivity (or lack of) are of continuing importance within these developments of co-governance.

Fourthly, the importance of the politics of the practice of co-governance is brought into direct focus by the range of positionings and manoeuvres of local elected representatives and the difficulties this causes for professionals who describe them as their most ‘awkward customers’. I showed that councillors positioning was particularly important within the conduct of co-governance for citizen voice, choice and challenge as well as problematic for public service officials. For example, their struggles with the range of councillor identifications when councillors can identify as full and even lead partners, as part of the partnership team, or as ‘special or ordinary’ residents who add to challenges. In doing so, it contributes to the call for the investigation of the overlay of participatory and elected systems of representation (Sullivan 2009, Foot 2009) as a critical area for the future study of local implementations.
My final contribution concerns the relationship between horizontal and vertical partnership.

8.3.4 The Relationship between Horizontal & Vertical Partnership

Research has focused on the practice of horizontal partnerships and vertical partnerships few studies explore the relationship and interactions between these two levels. My research makes a contribution to this literature by revealing the impact of horizontal partnerships on vertical coproduction and the ways those initiatives that privilege horizontal collaborative working result in the potential powerlessness of community members and the dismissal of community voices (Stephens & Fowler 2004, Barnes et al 2008). My research reveals that decisions and policy-making concerning resourcing took place at levels above and beyond the influence of PACT, within service organisations’ own hierarchies and increasingly via horizontal Neighbourhood Management partnership. It also builds on some previous research on collaborative working to reveal both power imbalances within horizontal partnerships and the different priorities and cultures of individual organisations involved in these partnerships (ibid, Hardy et al 2005). I show how the power struggles within these horizontal partnerships and the prioritisation of these collaborative activities dominated the operation and introduction of vertical co-governance. For example, my findings reveal the tensions between stakeholders (public service officials) regarding ownership, meaning and the purpose of partnership (Hardy et al 2005, Foot 2009) were exacerbated by the unilateral introduction of these public meetings. Of key importance within this implementation was the power dynamics between the different agencies that arose from their specific historical experiences (cf Edwards et al 2008), including their different planning timescales and cultures, and the lead agency’s performance targets (the police, and not the other partners) to conduct these meetings. This resulted in partners’ unwillingness to be co-opted and involved and their resistance to being positioned as ‘partner’ within vertical co-governance.

My research found that this most commonly resulted in public service officials distancing themselves from participation with elected representatives or local citizens, only paying selective attention to the outputs and priorities arising from vertical co-governance. On the occasions that these outputs were drawn on, they were used as a discursive resource to ‘rubber-stamp’ horizontal partnership actions. Hoppe (2011) refers to this as ‘cherry-picking’ acceptable suggestions and ignoring those that are undesirable and unwanted. This reinforces the need to look at the complexities of the practice of co-governance within its own geo-
historical and local context, paying attention to the micro-level relationships, identifications and struggles within relevant horizontal and vertical collaborations.

**8.4 Policy & Practice Implications**

My research provides a number of implications for the practice of co-governance to inform future policy and assist in the planning of implementation. These will be relevant to the conduct of public meetings and to the practice of co-governance within social policy and policing.

It could be concluded that more effective engagement between professionals and residents would need to consider ways to prevent certain groups dominating or exerting more influence over the process. There is also a need to find ways to engage with those who are currently excluded and marginalised by co-governance initiatives. This could be achieved by using other avenues of engagement in addition to - or in place of - public meetings or by establishing specialist public meetings to capture excluded groups, for example the youth. Also, if reassurance and the related concept of confidence is paramount (Gilling 2010) it may be that more attention needs to be paid to procedural justice in all interactions and to providing communication and feedback through local news letters (Hohle et al 2010). I would also suggest that an understanding of locality differences in the practice of co-governance and public meetings needs to be incorporated into any new policy, recognising the contribution of local history and the circumstances and identifications of local residents. This would also need to include a willingness to work with elected representatives and recognition of the political nature of co-governance, accepting the legitimacy of challenge from communities rather than the current expectation of co-option. Linked to this, consideration needs to be given to how understandings of responsibilisation can be enacted in this context, what level of community representativeness is acceptable, and how the expectations of residents can be met given limited resources. Addressing these challenges is important for developing what I have called ‘therapeutic laundry meetings’ into more effective vertical coproduction. These policy recommendations could also draw on the Innes & Roberts (2011) typology of community-police coproduction and their full range of options could be considered as part of an assessment of issues and priorities. Such initiatives may need to be driven by horizontal partnerships where there is access to budgets and decision-makers, and would also require that effective monitoring and reporting relationships between more locally based community partnerships and these horizontal partnership are in place.
My research also suggests the need to improve relationships and power-sharing between the stakeholders in vertical coproduction, which would necessitate a critical evaluation of the exercise of power and control by professionals within the process. This may be achieved by building awareness of the ‘knowledge hierarchy’ and of the difficulties that arise from privileging professional discourses and information at the expense of the knowledge and experience of residents and elected representatives. Levels of trust within collaborations have been shown to influence their effectiveness (Myhill 2006, Yang 2005, Ansell & Gash 2007) and a further implication of my research is the need to address issues of trust within the context of community co-governance. The dismissal of citizen-consumers as ‘usual suspects’ with their own partisan agendas, emotional contributions and personal stories is a common approach adopted by policing officers, who in turn are cast as ‘failing heroes’ by the residents who attend the meetings. However, it should also be recognised that levels of trust are closely aligned with the potential for power-sharing within these contexts and the possibility and limits to delivering procedural, distributive and outcome justice within vertical coproduction. This will necessarily involve the input of public service decision-makers and resources to capture and respond to both the issues raised in public meetings and to the demands of the citizen-consumer to exercise choice and challenge. I will now consider the implications of my findings in the context of the current political and policing context.

8.4.1 Policing & the Introduction of Police Crime Commissioners
The agenda of the current Coalition Government is driven by reducing government borrowing, freeing policing from the degree of centralist targets imposed under New Labour, reviewing the police remit (Morgan 2011) and emphasising horizontal professional partnership. This is reinforced by the Coalition’s intention to achieve a 20% cut in police budgets by 2015, and the potential removal of the Policing Pledge with its requirement for public meetings to set local priorities (ibid). Manpower cuts in 2012 will follow the 2010-11 reductions in the number of police, PCSOs and support staff, despite protestations from ACPO and the Chiefs of Police.59 Morgan (2011) predicts that successful police-community engagement and coproduction will remain a high priority, but also one that the police will

---

59 BBC News on 26th of January 2012 confirmed Home Office figures showing 4.2% cuts in staffing across the 43 Forces in 2010-11, an overall reduction of 6,000 staff including uniform and PCSOs. Gloucester’s Chief of Constabulary suggested his force was at a crisis point - a ‘cliff edge’ - in providing services. ACPO representative Peter Farhy was reported as stating the cuts were too severe to maintain services. Nick Herbert the Policing Minister responded that it is the way resources are allocated not numbers that is the issue the police need to address (see [http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-16739311](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-16739311) accessed 26th January 2012).
struggle to achieve in the face of reducing resources. Whether this will include police-community public meetings is not clear at this time. There is a possibility that these public meetings may be superseded by the resurgence of elected representative and regional structures which will be focused on working with the new force-wide Police Crime Commissioners\(^60\) who will need to connect with their electorate. I would suggested that my findings could inform current debates concerning how, in the future, the police and these new Police Commissioners can connect and serve local community needs more effectively.\(^61\)

In a recent speech to the Institute of Government, Nick Herbert (2011), the Minister of Policing, stated that these changes herald new ways of policing and refocus the emphasis on horizontal collaboration with other forces, with other public services and with private sector providers to find what ‘best fits’ in local services. In the face of ‘low active participation’ – for example at PACT meetings - the task of holding the police to account seems to be shifting to non-specialist and elected Police Crime Commissioners as ‘the voice of the people … [and for] building a strong connection between police and public as the very foundation of policing by consent’ (ibid). At the same time, these Coalition-led changes are positioned to reinforce the expertise of police and professionals who should be allowed to run their Forces free from ‘bureaucratic control from the centre with a plethora of targets and initiatives [oriented] to the Home Office rather than their local communities’ (ibid). This may – or may not – strengthen local public influence over policing but it seems unlikely that this will be underpinned by fora of public engagement such as neighbourhood-based public meetings, especially as the evidence of low and exclusionary attendance patterns may affect their legitimacy as being representative of communities.

---

\(^60\) Police Crime Commissioners have been introduced by the Coalition and represent a return to elected representation to achieve accountability and be public champions - beyond the operation of existing Police Authorities over all 43 Forces (except the Metropolitan Police) in England & Wales. Their constituency will cover whole regions; for Southern Police this includes six BCU areas. They have to live within the Force area, and will be able to hold Police Forces and Police Chiefs’ to account, set precepts and the strategic and operational priorities - though not how Forces achieve these. Highly publicised is their ability to remove Chief Officers. The elections will be held on 15th November with appointment on the 22nd November 2012 (see Minister of Policing Nick Herbert’s 21st November 2011 speech to the Institute of Government available at [http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/media-centre/speeches/a-new-era-for-policing / accessed 26.01.12](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/media-centre/speeches/a-new-era-for-policing / accessed 26.01.12) also [http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/police/police-crime-commissioners/ accessed 26th January 2012]).

\(^61\) This alludes to the debate on the function of the police and whether this needs re-centring to good old-fashioned policing. For example, Mark Easton’s BBC radio 4 series ‘What are police for?’ commenced on 30.01.12 and discussed the political nature of decisions concerning the range and ‘core’ duties of the police, including its relationship and how it connects with citizen priorities and communities. You and Yours, aired mid-day on Tuesday 31.01.12 on BBC radio 4, discussed different views on the role of police and suggested the need for a Royal Commission. ACPO, the Chief Police Officer of Thames Valley Sarah Thornton, members of the public, local Police Authorities, politicians, and past and serving officers were part of these debates.
These developments initialise two key changes; a move away from localism and local power-sharing to regionalisation, and a re-assertion of representation based on elected representatives. It remains to be seen how a regional, force-wide elected representative of local communities can work effectively and how these elected representatives – as well as paid staffs – may enact strategic decision-making capacity. This will potentially change power-relations within horizontal and vertical coproduction as it is likely to be senior officers and Police Chief Constables who work collaboratively with the new Police Crime Commissioners. The vital question arising from my research is the extent to which these commissioners will be able to reflect the identifications of different publics or will be able to hear and champion the needs of different types of communities across whole Force areas. It also raises the question as to how the different publics’ identifications, contestations and experiences of service might be heard across whole Force areas, and in ways that acknowledge the differences in locality experiences across advantaged, disadvantaged, rural and city locations.

8.5 Researcher Reflections

From a critical organization studies perspective, researchers are often critiqued for trying to maintain a privileged position within the research process (Whittle et al 2011). I wish to conclude with some further reflections on my presence and influence within my research, and acknowledge the choices that I made. In doing this, I am enacting an approach to reflexivity that embraces the complexities around researcher-identity-knowledge within social constructions of the research space (Crang & Crook 2007). In March 2009 - when my key Local Authority gatekeeper (and positive proponent of PACT) retired - my access to Neighbourhood Management and consultative meetings was politely ceased on the basis that ‘your core research agenda is PACT meetings and it seems appropriate that your access and attendance should focus on these’. My choice at this point was to re-negotiate my research emphasis to maintain access to Neighbourhood Management but it had already become clear that my PhD would not incorporate analyses and presentations of both settings and my longitudinal timeframe for the core PACTs was due to end within four months.

My withdrawal from attending the three PACTs was difficult as I felt embedded and invested in attending, particularly in Evergreen and Redbank where I was identified as an ‘expected attendee’. I had also built relationships around attending that I decided were not appropriate
to maintain if I was not engaged in fieldwork; therefore these ended with this phase. Also, when I designed my longitudinal framing I had thought that I might see developments and changes in identifications and practices within and about PACT. Part of me wondered that if I attended one more meeting or followed one more example there might be an incident or development that could dramatically contribute to my findings and lead to a reframing.

Letting go was hard for me. It also heralded the harder work of the identity ‘researcher and writer’ focusing on analysis and writing; what can be regarded as a difficult and intense phase (Van Maanen 1988). This was a difficult transition that drew me into the complexities of honing and struggling with my craft skills as a research writer; I found this more testing than the task and identification of ‘fieldworker’. At times I have struggled with my data and my skills at writing an account that draws in relevant theories to assist in interpretation (Rhodes & Brown 2005:483) without silencing or drowning out the voice of my co-producers, the residents, staffs and councillors. This does not mean that they would have drawn the same conclusions from the data (ibid, Van Maanen 1988). It was important to me that the live interactive data from PACT public meetings should be heard in a candid and contextualised way. I believe I have achieved a workable balance between the faithful uses of participants’ voices, combined with researcher-led analysis and theorising (Llewellyn 2007:7) to present an analytic story that does justice to all our voices and my PhD agenda.

There are limits to ethnographic fieldwork: it is time and resource intensive and produces large amounts of qualitative data. Also, it is more suitable (and limited to) certain styles of research questions, such as exploring why and how things occur (Ling 2002). My access was also at the community-level; while this extended to Neighbourhood Management and some otherwise closed horizontal partnership meetings, I did not have access to other closed meetings, to follow decision-making concerning budgets or local regimes within the police. This may be an area for additional research beyond the remit of this PhD. Finally, it is important to note that my research was not sponsored by the stake-holders in these processes of co-governance and does not have a natural champion or setting to directly influence practice and policy in the same way as policy-led and sponsored research. Its key influence will be dissemination through academic and practice journals or events to reach practitioner and academic communities.
The final ubiquitous and unexpected challenge of my PhD journey was the complexities of conducting an inter-disciplinary project; whether naïve or hopeful, it was an ever-present delight and barrier to progress at every stage. The difficulties of inter-disciplinary research became clear in the initial theoretical and methodological approach, and continued through design and data analysis as a persistent and thorny issue that seemed at times to dominate and demand compromises in the final construction and writing. Whenever I thought it was resolved it reappeared in another guise. At this point it is possible to say that I - and my supervisory team - have trodden this path with a mixture of enthusiasm, stoicism and good humour, enabled by strong working relationships. I can only conclude that we are committed to inter-disciplinary research and that my own journey has convinced me of the value of this process.
## Appendix One PACT Meeting Profiles 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity / White (by PACT and Police Sectors)</th>
<th>Deprivation/ Crime (From Appendix 2 NIP March 2007)</th>
<th>Community Led / Frequency of Meetings / Councillor Supported / Use of Panel. Setting of Priorities (e.g. panel whole meeting, hidden bidding or written voting etc.)</th>
<th>Well attended / active / issues raised / other criteria / supplementary PACT activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong>* / City South Sector**</td>
<td><strong>B</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>B</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>B</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st highest proportion ethnic minorities / non-white population</td>
<td>Combination of most deprived and least deprived mixed PACT (i.e. Butetown 1 &amp; 2 and City Bay) 1) Part of NIP and original Communities First Area 2) 347th highest crime no data ASB 4) Potential LSB Youth pilot area 2008 /9</td>
<td>Police led 1) In last few months introduced anonymous voting with money to guide and influence panel selection of priorities 2) 6 weekly</td>
<td>Now get 30 to 40 attending – beginning to build good rapport [ Roz attended around 15] Supplemented by Chinese PACT – unclear if joint with Raytown also seems to have been one-off Attendance not high enough to warrant two separate PACTs Mixed Police and council issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Bay Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong>* / City South Sector**</td>
<td><strong>B</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>B</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>B</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed white and non-white communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Bay Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raytown</strong> / City South Sector**</td>
<td><strong>Raytown</strong></td>
<td><strong>Raytown</strong></td>
<td><strong>Raytown</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint 2nd highest proportion ethnic minorities</td>
<td>1) All LSOAs show some deprivation 2) North Grangetown Renewal Area Working Group</td>
<td>Police led + has 3 residents on panel 1) Introduced voting with fake money to guide and influence panel selection of priorities</td>
<td>Reported usual attendance 60 and up to 100 + good mix of ethnic &amp; white communities [Attended 27 March 2007 meeting counted 32 residents, 6 top panel + 6 police]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed white and non-white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities</td>
<td>City &amp; Bay Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; highest crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; highest anti-social behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Councillor and AM supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location varies amongst acceptable venues i.e. Somaj March meeting and St P*** August 31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported FLSO usually progresses Council issues through contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March meeting all white apart from two Asian men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemented by Chinese PACT possibly joint with B***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed police and council issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Centre / City South Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited residential mainly businesses or people travelling into City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre Police Led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced voting with fake money to guide panel &amp; influence selection of priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown – Councillor support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported usually FLSO progresses Council issues through contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly attended – now get 20ish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been supplemented by dynamic youth pact outside City Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South West Sector: Think all Community or Councillor led in this sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redbank/ South West Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; highest proportion ethnic minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed white and non-white communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Combination of most deprived and least deprived mixed PACT (North Redbank nickname ‘intelligencia’ &amp; South Redbank BME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) South Redbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbank New Community Chair – first meeting 25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe 6 weekly –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two very good councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLSO reports councillors usually progress council actions and report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 + attendance ‘Cracking range’ good mixed meeting with all communities &amp; religions represented – been like this from beginning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemented by Chinese PACT (see B*** )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen &amp; Ganton Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen/ South West Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen &amp; Ganton Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolgreen/ South West Sector (T*** &amp; Coolgreen joint PACT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen &amp; Ganton Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganton / South West Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikkleton/ South West Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganton Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bluewater</strong>: All Police led except R &amp; M in this sector, mix rural, suburban and more metropolitan city areas influences PACT priorities; apart from P*** and Treigia most PACTs have some or mainly Police priorities; 4 teams led by PC or Sergeant as Neighbourhood Manager with PCSO support; could be PCSO or PC lead meetings. Since set up number have declined – attend if issue + some PACTs political dynamics (Interview Inspector &amp; FLSO 14.09.07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P***/West Sector</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Wards &amp; 7 PACTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluewater NP Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong>* Rural - villagy style, good mix of communities involved.**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P*** Police Led</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 8 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P*** Panel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to set priorities as not many problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P*** Less Attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small scale local issues relative to Evergreen trivial compared to other areas and city locations e.g. location of litter bins. Tends not to be Police related priorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treigia/ West Sector</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bluewater NP Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treigia</strong> ditto P***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Treigia/StMagans ranked 28th for crime)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treigia</strong> Police Led</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto P***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 8 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treigia</strong> ditto P***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lla*** /West Sector</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bluewater NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lla</strong>* Nearer city so more metropolitan. An element of social housing; mixed catchment area / education.**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L1*** 22nd crime)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lla</strong>* Police Led</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector attends Lla*** Community Council which is based on community / agency engagement – few member of public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lla</strong>* More problems &amp; more attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lla***20 – 40 attend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly higher attendance than P*** &amp; Treigia can be tactical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well run, well received by community and well attended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Crime &amp; anti social behaviour slightly higher than P &amp; C attends. Lla*** Community Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; M / West Sector</td>
<td>R &amp; M ditto Lla*** (R &amp; M &amp; M*** ranked 27th for crime)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluewater NP Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W*** &amp; T*** / West Sector</td>
<td>W*** &amp; T A mix of affluence and social housing. Issues concern what is affecting value of our houses. Ranked 15th highest for crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluewater Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluewater / West Sector</td>
<td>Bluewater Bluewater &amp; L1*** North similar areas lots of problems deprivation, low level Bluewater Police Led Already have Bluewater ASB (asb / abc group – tape/ rough notes p8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bluewater Sector

- income & social housing.
- NIP: Bluewater & P*** invited to become Communities First Area.
- Bluewater: 14th highest crime

Inspector trying to set up a network which could lead to a ‘gold standard’ Bluewater Panel (tape and rough notes p8 & 11) this would look at all issues arising area and help set priorities with pre and post PACT meetings – so gain a broader picture than views of ’40 out of 3000’ at a PACT meeting.

councillors who do own notes and report. Political Issues: Only one party but tend to get heckling or “councillor in waiting in the wings / audience and causes problems” (tape p6).

Bluewater sent out 500 letters and got 200 replies particular action council to take – (tape 14.09.07); surprised how many people like emailing.

M* has office in Gantonia High School so hoping more youth contact, plus goes to Mother & Toddler, and elderly to get broader range of views.

Have used PACT surgeries

Tend to have issues such as residential burglary, car break ins, acts of criminal damage.

Small panel set priorities – discuss these between them. Will where a possible choice take a hands up vote from audience.

Lla*** North

Bluewater NP Sector

Lla*** North

- Bluewater & Lla***
- North similar areas lots of problems deprivation, low level income & social housing.
- Ranked 20th for crime

Lla*** North Police Led

Lla*** North

- Political issues this PACT.
- Also factional: Really two different communities. Last meeting very much two groups with separate issues to progress.

Lla*** North

More problems and more severe problems, and more attendance.

North Sector: 6 out of 10 PACTs Councillor Chair

L*** L*** L*** L*** L*** L***
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L &amp; L NP Sector</th>
<th>One of ‘best off’ areas of City</th>
<th>6 out of 10 PACTs now Councillor Chair</th>
<th>Believe good councillor support FLSO reports Residents see lack of council officer attendance as lack of commitment</th>
<th>FLSO reports 20 – 30 attendees + when councillor led council issues when police led get police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; L NP Sector</td>
<td>Mainly middle aged white, middle class and well off</td>
<td>Believe 6 weekly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Po</strong>* L &amp; L NP Sector</td>
<td><strong>Po</strong>* Through a local parent have sustained attendance of a small group of young people which has resulted in acting together engagement</td>
<td><strong>Po</strong>* New Community Chair – first meeting 6th September 2007</td>
<td><strong>Po</strong>* Good councillor support - Got Police, ASDA and council working together to organise some youth facilities &amp; - Youth packed bags at ASDA</td>
<td><strong>Po</strong>* May be influenced by community chair FLSO reports 20 – 30 attendees. Also, when councillor led council issues when police led get police issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentwin L &amp; L NP Sector</td>
<td>Bentwin NIP renewal area with Bentwin Panel 3) 13th highest crime</td>
<td>Bentwin Concerns about having community resident chair. Check if Police led or rotated Chair between two councillors. 6 out of 10 PACTs now Councillor Chair Believe 6 weekly</td>
<td>Bentwin Councillors 1 lab &amp; 1 cons party &amp; never able to work together over the whole term of their office but have found through PACT can work together and achieve a lot for constituents</td>
<td>Bentwin FLSO reports 20 – 30 attendees + when councillor led council issues when police led get police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Pe*** L & L NP Sector | **Pe*** Ranked 16th for crime. | **Pe*** 6 out of 10 PACTs now Councillor Chair - guess 6 weekly | **Pe*** Check councillor commitment – see Bentwin | **Pe*** FLSO reports 20 – 30 attendees + When councillor led council issues when police led get police issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; L NP Sector</td>
<td>Cy***</td>
<td>L ln</td>
<td>Sergeant Th***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; L NP Sector</td>
<td>Cy***</td>
<td>L ln</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Sector</td>
<td>T***</td>
<td>T***</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**South East Sector:** Had major change with end of Communities First dedicated Policing Teams and seems to be quite different South / North Sector

**T*** / South East Sector:**
- Twillsmoor Rd
- Southside of Area
- Issue disbanding Communities First Team & loss of community trust
- This side not guided as well as should be PCSOs / PACT not as focused toward working with PACT. Part of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twillsmoor Rd Southside of Area</td>
<td>T***</td>
<td>T*** – No Panel</td>
<td>Councillors go to T*** but do not get on – lots of strife and politicking issues. Councillors some buy-in but will heckle from the floor. Sometimes Councillors take issues from the meeting but not always done e.g. G*** C*** previous meeting – no feedback to Police announced at last meeting it wasn’t a Council issue but a Police one. C*** H*** (Councillor) does a lot for community and holds surgeries so lots of issues come from her and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**T*** – Break in PACT from March to end of Aug 2007.**
- Low attendance
- Struggling to keep PACT meetings going need to kick start it here again – problems police with changes in staff / sickness.

- Spoken to C*** H*** and a few councillors to get T*** PACT up and running again and the need for an independent Chair.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Inspector role.</th>
<th>PCSO’s not so welcome this side &amp; Police need community support.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different type of area – homeowners and young professionals, who don’t identify as a Neighbourhood nor join in T*** PACT.</td>
<td>T*** not one community anymore either great diversity or transient members (e.g. asylum seekers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last meeting to attract more attendees but had less attendees (11) some went to old venue. So decision last meeting made to stick with old venue. Not able to connect into existing meetings e.g. Com 1st never have anything to do with PACT; TAPs well established – no engagement from this. Cllr C*** H***’s husband did try to keep multi-agency group going but couldn’t (Interview Neighbourhood Inspector 28.09.07 p15)</td>
<td>Not through PACT. Spenchurch and T*** had excellent multi-agency group including health working under Neighbourhood Inspector – might have been Com 1st related to S&amp;T. This disbanded with lack of police lead / clear support (see Interview Neighbourhood Inspector 28.09.07 p14-15; Also interview with new Neighbourhood Inspector R &amp; C 25.09.07 p15,18; and comments at 21-22 June work shop). Police &amp; Councillors tend to ask crowd / full meeting what want as priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACT and meetings can be disjointed not same level buy-in and many changes so no continuity from staff, really needs re-launching &amp; continuity.</td>
<td>Issues far more like Evergreen to be Police issues and ASB than on Southside Newrun Road. T***: ASB, racist behaviour, traveller issue – horses in street and park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Spenchurch / South East Sector | Spenchurch  
S & T: Area of mainly white deprivation + original Communities 
First area / 3) 
Spenchurch combined with T*** is:  
2nd highest crime  
4th highest anti-social behaviour | Spenchurch  
Can be heated and anti-policing problem with being police driven – e.g.  
last meeting 24th Sept ask Rachel ‘nastiness’ 
Not able to connect into existing meetings e.g. 
Com 1st never have anything to do with PACT; think TAPs well established might be only T*** – no engagement from this. | Spenchurch  
Community Chair – (also works for 101) 
Spenchurch and T*** had excellent multi-agency group including health working under Neighbourhood Inspector – might have been Com 1st related to S&T. 
This disbanded with lack of police lead / clear support (see Interview Neighbourhood Inspector 28.09.07 p14-15; Interview new Neighbourhood Inspector R & C 25.09.07 p15,18; and comments at 21-22 June work shop). | Spenchurch  
Can be 20 usually 40  
Echo article – August 2007 rows and frustration with PACT  
MM (OM with Council) feedback Spenchurch councillor many fed up with PACT ‘waste of time’ (Aug 2007 interview) – possibly growing / general feeling about PACT not just Spenchurch.  
Home Start Manager – went to first Spenchurch meeting 3-4 hours most of it community shouting at Police (April 2007 interview)  
Spenchurch issues: Prostitution, car vandalism, parking on bus stop, improve lighting, (see tape 25.09.07). |
| Southside of Area  
Issue disbanding Com 1st team & community trust  
This side not guided as well as should be PCSOs / PACT not as focused toward working with PACT. Part Neighbourhood Inspector role.  
PCSO’s not so welcome this side & Police need community support.  
R & C NP sector |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>R &amp; M/ South East Sector</strong> A***</th>
<th><strong>R &amp; M/A</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>R &amp; M/A</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>R &amp; M/A</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>R &amp; M/A</strong>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southside of Area</td>
<td>1) NIP renewal area working group</td>
<td>3) 10th highest crime</td>
<td>PCSO’s not so welcome this side &amp; Police need community support</td>
<td>Police not sure if affected by loss of dedicated Communities First Policing Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; M &amp; C*** NP sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This side not guided as well as should be PCSOs / PACT not as focused toward working with PACT. Part Neighbourhood Inspector role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>P</strong>* / South East Sector</th>
<th><strong>P</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>P</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>P</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>P</strong>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined due to low attendance</td>
<td>Large transient population getting asylum seekers taking up what used to be private residences for students as more purpose built blocks open.</td>
<td>Struggled 6 priorities easier now 3 and combined.</td>
<td>Forum – existing meeting completely separate to PACT not managed to engage with this.</td>
<td>Low attendance – P*** has had lots of police changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside of Area</td>
<td>3rd highest crime.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbourhood Inspector “not gone so can’t comment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; M &amp; C*** NP Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>C</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>C</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>C</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>C</strong>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northside of Area</td>
<td>Mixed area of residents and high level of student population who are</td>
<td>N Inspector – believe Police led causes ‘nastiness against police’ Interview 25.09.08.</td>
<td>Councillors “on board”, active &amp; drive it forward. Some interest Student Union officers – see relevance good</td>
<td>C*** has been close to 100 in part due to drive of PCSOs and that they are well respected by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C*** side PCSOs more focused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACT and PACT activities</td>
<td>R &amp; M &amp; C*** NP Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainly here for part of the year and whose ‘community’ is University not neighbourhood area. Rented and some own homes. C*** ranked 1st for crime.</td>
<td>Have an existing separate C*** Consultative Panel (Council &amp; Students) on student matters / PO based at Central covers Student issues (not able to engage with these meetings).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community relations. Late night licence applicant attended PACT heard residents issues and withdrew request.</td>
<td>community. Began as strongest most well attended PACT – Crossing Lady told everyone now overtaken by Nabalfa &amp; M*** which is community led.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late night licence applicant attended PACT heard residents issues and withdrew request.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Nabalfa & M*** /South East Sector |
| Mixed area of white well off and deprivation: a few walk over from M*** |
| St J*** Social club (W*** Rd) has bar and find Nabalfa & M*** NIP 1) Nabalfa Estate & Lla*** North is a Renewal Area 2) Potential LSB for M***/ Youth pilot area 2008 /9 3) 20th highest crime no asb data Majority attendees from better off W*** | Nabalfa & M*** Excellent dynamic Community Chair – (S*** L*** who does agenda, minutes etc. personable, fully skilled in running meetings, creates good impression, runs agenda and briefings with Panel / Partners. Workaholic who goes far beyond role in what he |
| Nabalfa & M*** Both councillors E*** B*** ‘on the ball and active’ & C*** P*** never / rarely miss a meeting. Sergeant S*** has never missed = continuity, stability and commitment Councillors, Police & Chair – who got involved very early in PACT process. Councillors active and take issues back to council. | Nabalfa & M*** Attendance 60-70+ Tend to get 50 PCSO does leafleting –except not done in August 2007. Greatly improved with independent Chair – loads of people attend. Meeting I visit max 15 residents attend. Chair also involved in numerous other quality of life, and relevant |
for some people tend to stay on after meeting. Also for elderly seems to be a social occasion.

Northside of Area C*** side PCSOs more focused PACT and PACT activities e.g. going into Schools.

R & M & C*** NP Sector

Rd and Col / Canberra Rd. Two or three come from M*** – tend to bring more serious issues to meeting. M*** social housing. A lot more people are working frequently M*** e.g. ASB officer / ABC (?) letters from Council also Sergeant S*** gets calls from people and here about problems and deal with them outside PACT.

puts into meetings and between meetings (see interview notes 25.09.07).

Lots consultation / emails from Chair with rest of Panel sorting things out between meetings.

Panel – Chair + Councillors+ Police + 5 of panel residents members – 4 live + 1 business Owner Dorset Fish bar. All 5 or 1or 2 attend – names from PCSO.

Tend to work priorities out in whole meeting, rarely by Panel. Once Lant Rd (M*** ) brought issue raids & drugs. This became single issue for 60-70 attendees. Kept a rolling issue though it lost some momentum (interview 25.09.07).

Meeting I attend PCSO starts meeting with a Police summary on area and what’s happened (see p17).

6 weekly

East Sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R***</th>
<th>R***</th>
<th>R***</th>
<th>R***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R*** 7 PCs/ 7 PCSOs</td>
<td>Police led.</td>
<td>In process of setting up a Panel. Pros and cons of Panels meeting and choosing priorities – want</td>
<td>Issues - ASB, drinking &amp; youth After 4 PACTs had five letters of residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community /neighbourhood panels and activities on behalf of community and brings additional feedback to this meeting. e.g. flyover + community service initiatives. Whether Council or Police issues get dealt with = success. Mainly Council issues such as parking, litter, housing, and anti-social behaviour.

Car park conversation after meeting:- Feel really last two months got H*** working properly – taken lot of work and effort. Now need to do the same for other PACTs.

Lucky been able to build trust and relationships – all about trust.

Interview notes 25.09.07
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LlanR*** NP Sector</th>
<th>R*** NP Sector</th>
<th>LlanR*** NP Sector</th>
<th>Tr*** NP Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LlanR</strong>***</td>
<td><em>R</em>** NP Sector*</td>
<td><strong>LlanR</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>Tr</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R</strong>* 7 PCs/7 PCSOs**</td>
<td><strong>R</strong>* NP Sector**</td>
<td><strong>Police Led</strong></td>
<td><strong>St Fellons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R</strong>* NP Sector</td>
<td><strong>R</strong>* NP Sector**</td>
<td><strong>Has a panel</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 PCs/5 PCSOs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LlanR***</td>
<td>LlanR***</td>
<td>LlanR*** Forum</td>
<td>Tr***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewal area working group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Police Led</strong></td>
<td><strong>mentioned Chief Inspector Interview 28.09.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>1)NIP invited to become Com First Area/ Tr</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 11th highest crime</td>
<td><strong>Meet every two months</strong></td>
<td><strong>2) Council &amp; housing association large social deprivation, high</strong></td>
<td><strong>2) Council &amp; housing association large social deprivation, high</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th highest anti-social behaviour</td>
<td><strong>Meet every two months</strong></td>
<td><strong>Highly</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>1)NIP invited to become Com First Area/ Tr</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically area of social deprivation former housing estate. Still some poverty and unemployment but largely now owner occupied and well off.</td>
<td><strong>Meet every two months</strong></td>
<td><strong>Police Led</strong></td>
<td><strong>Police Led</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Led</strong></td>
<td><strong>LlanR</strong>* Forum**</td>
<td><strong>Tr</strong>* Police Led**</td>
<td><strong>Tr</strong>* Police Led**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meet every two months</strong></td>
<td><strong>mentioned Chief Inspector Interview 28.09.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet every two months</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet every two months</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LlanR</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>LlanR</strong>* Forum**</td>
<td><strong>Tr</strong>* Police Led**</td>
<td><strong>Tr</strong>* Police Led**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Led</strong></td>
<td><strong>mentioned Chief Inspector Interview 28.09.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet every two months</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet every two months</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tr</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>Police Led</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tr</strong>* Police Led**</td>
<td><strong>Tr</strong>* Police Led**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Led</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet every two months</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet every two months</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet every two months</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R*** though Councillors want every three months. Chief Super directive is to go with what communities want. Community participants to fell set priorities. Whole meeting tends to vote for priorities by show of hands. Saying thanks tidied up and noticed difference. R*** settled with home owners longer than LlanR*** and tends to be better off. Issues tend to be Youth annoyance and vehicle crime.

**LlanR*** Know each other – tend to be mature community. Get a lot of Neighbourhood disputes as well as ASB.

**LlanR*** Old reputation as crime ridden place. Now one of quietest and lowest crime / ASB areas but not public perception.

**Tr*** Have had as few as 3 people – have to be careful when time meetings i.e. not to clash with big episode of popular TV programmes or soaps - like East Enders etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St Fellons</th>
<th>St Fellons</th>
<th>St Fellons</th>
<th>St Fellons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Fellons Area of Housing Association and Council Housing. (Po***/St Fellons 24th ranked for crime)</td>
<td>St Fellons Meet every two months Have an existing St Fellons Forum – Ex-Deputy Chief Police Officer attends this multi-agency forum; works well. Police give an update on area each month.(e.g. auto crime – p4 notes). Same people attend: AM/MPs, N Watch, Residents, Youth, Education, local schools, Princes Trust, Councillors, Community Leaders</td>
<td>St Fellons Pros and cons of Panels meeting and choosing priorities – want community participants to fell set priorities. Whole meeting tends to vote for priorities by show of hands.</td>
<td>St Fellons Issues tend to be domestic disputes + see tape 28.09.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deprived tend to look for relief from their situation such as: drink, drugs, bingo, sky tv to escape but not long-term solutions.

Issues tend to be drink and drug abuse and turn to these in times of need. Also more serious crimes e.g. robbery / burglary rather than ASB.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old St Fellons</th>
<th>Old St Fellons</th>
<th>Old St Fellons</th>
<th>Old St Fellons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Fellons</td>
<td>High priced houses</td>
<td>Police Led</td>
<td>No Panel: because can’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 PCs/ 5 PCSOs</td>
<td>and people with high</td>
<td>meet every two months</td>
<td>agree who goes on to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R*** NP Sector</td>
<td>ranking professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>Panel: lots of in-fighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>within community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillors will go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>along.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decide issues meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will discuss by paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>written submissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very little crime and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>should be a fantastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>area – surprisingly get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lots of neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disputes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All names of places, people and locations have been changed.
Compiled July to October 2007: PACT Information gathered on a sample of PACTs within City from interviews with Neighbourhood Police Inspectors, Sergeants and Front Line Service Officers. The statistics are from Appendix Two City Council Neighbourhood Improvement (NIP) Plan / March 2007.
Appendix Two – Ward Profiles Evergreen, Redbank & Whitewood

Contents
Summary
Evergreen Ward Council Data – census 2001 + adjusted local data
Evergreen Welsh Index Multiple Deprivation Rankings 2008
Redbank Ward Council Data – census 2001 + adjusted local data
Redbank Welsh Index Multiple Deprivation Rankings 2008
Whitewood Ward Council Data – census 2001 + adjusted local data
Whitewood Welsh Index Multiple Deprivation Rankings 2008

Summary
WIMD 2008 – Lower Tier Super Output Areas (LSOAs = per 1500 population)
Wales = 1,896 LSOAs
City = 203 LSOAs
Eight domains of deprivation within index: Income, Employment, Health, Education, Access to Services, Physical Environment (used to include crime/safety), Community Safety

Extract Statistics from City Neighbourhood Improvement Plan (NIP) (2007:28)

Evergreen
WIMD 2000 Evergreen ranked 2nd most deprived Ward in City (in 10% most deprived Wards in Wales)
WIMD 2005 Eight of Evergreens LSOAs in top 10% most deprived in City (all eight in 10% most deprived in Wales)
Evergreen 5th highest total crime in City (2005-6) / 2nd highest ASB (2004-5)

South Redbank
WIMD 2000 ranked 11th most deprived Ward in City (in 10%-20% most deprived Wards in Wales)
WIMD 2005 Three of South Redbanks LSOAs in top 10% most deprived in City (all three in 10% most deprived in Wales)
Redbank 8th highest total crime in City (2005-6) / 7th highest ASB (2004-5)

North Redbank
WIMD 2000 & 2005 ranked in top 10% least deprived Wards in City (in top 10% least deprived Wards in Wales)

Whitewood
WIMD 2000 & 2005 ranked in top two least deprived Wards in City (in top 5% least deprived Wards in Wales)
Ranked in top 5% Wards in City for lowest crime (2005-6) and lowest ASB (2004-5)
## Persons Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,731</td>
<td>3,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>6,771</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7,960</td>
<td>1,901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Structure Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>21.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-99</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Age: 34.51 36.57

### Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons 16+</td>
<td>10,949</td>
<td>242,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>34.24</td>
<td>37.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>49.48</td>
<td>48.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>67.39</td>
<td>66.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>18.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Country of Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>74.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER EU countries</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>94.90</td>
<td>91.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Ethnicity</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>15.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Welsh Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All population aged 3+</td>
<td>13,958</td>
<td>284,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks, Read &amp; Write</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks &amp; Read</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks only</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands Spoken Welsh</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributions</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No knowledge</td>
<td>85.83</td>
<td>83.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Longterm Sickness</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>18.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Longterm Sickness (16-64)</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>14.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good General Health</td>
<td>64.30</td>
<td>59.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Good General Health</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>20.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Good General Health</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>10.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Provision of Unpaid Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide unpaid care (a)</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>1,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-19 hours a week</td>
<td>53.06</td>
<td>55.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-49 hours a week</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>11.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ hours a week</td>
<td>33.47</td>
<td>23.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons aged 16-74</td>
<td>9,663</td>
<td>220,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>47.79</td>
<td>28.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to level 1</td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td>12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to level 2</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to level 3</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to level 4</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>25.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Full Time Students aged 19-24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically active employed</td>
<td>31.99</td>
<td>25.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically active unemployed</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive</td>
<td>61.76</td>
<td>70.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Travel to Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons aged 16+</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>130,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who work from home</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>19.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor cycle</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>50.62</td>
<td>56.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/Taxi passenger</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons aged 16+</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>130,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>16.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>16.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. prof. &amp; technical</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>15.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. &amp; secretarial</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>14.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; customer services</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process, plant &amp; machine ops.</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>11.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Industry of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons aged 16+</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>130,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; fishing</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy &amp; water</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>10.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution, hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>20.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Communication</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking, Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>17.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin, Education &amp; Health</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>23.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hours Worked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males aged 16-74</td>
<td>2,684</td>
<td>67,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time 1-5 hours</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time 6-15 hours</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time 16-30 hours</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time 31-37 hours</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>17.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time 38-48 hours</td>
<td>53.46</td>
<td>49.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time 49+ hours</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>20.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Males aged 16-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part time 1-5 hours</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time 6-15 hours</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time 16-30 hours</td>
<td>34.06</td>
<td>28.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time 31-37 hours</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>24.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time 38-48 hours</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>27.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time 49+ hours</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. hours work (males)</td>
<td>40.83</td>
<td>43.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. hours work (females)</td>
<td>28.98</td>
<td>31.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Economic Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons aged 15-24</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>385,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- working FT</td>
<td>35.66</td>
<td>191,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- working PT</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>70,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- self-employed</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unemployed</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>2,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PT Student</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retired</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>6,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- home/family caret</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>5,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- permanently Sick</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>5,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>3,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male aged 15-24</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>226,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- working FT</td>
<td>44.65</td>
<td>101,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- working PT</td>
<td>44.65</td>
<td>101,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- self-employed</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>16,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unemployed</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>14,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PT Student</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>5,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retired</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>26,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- home/family caret</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>25,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- permanently Sick</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>23,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>8,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>13,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female aged 15-24</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>158,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- working FT</td>
<td>22.16</td>
<td>33,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- working PT</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td>29,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- self-employed</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unemployed</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>7,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PT Student</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retired</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>21,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- home/family caret</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>17,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- permanently Sick</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>16,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>6,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>10,583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons aged 15-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaired outright</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>28,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>52.99</td>
<td>454,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part rented / Part mortgaged</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>38,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>41.58</td>
<td>368,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed with minor</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>5,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>466,374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average household size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- % of total</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- number of rooms</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average person composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with dependent children</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>15.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- without dependent children</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>15.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average person composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with dependent children</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- without dependent children</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average person composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with dependent children</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- without dependent children</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (all children)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (other person)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dependent Children Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (with or without children)</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>39,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Parent</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Parent</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Parent (working FT)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Parent (working FT)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income Parent Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (with or without children)</td>
<td>8,286</td>
<td>88,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Car</td>
<td>32.79</td>
<td>28,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Car</td>
<td>40.49</td>
<td>35,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cars</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>11,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cars</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Cars</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Car Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Car</td>
<td>32.79</td>
<td>28,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Car</td>
<td>40.49</td>
<td>35,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cars</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>11,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cars</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Cars</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2008 Wales Index of Multiple Deprivation

**[Wales Ranks out of 1,936 Lower Super Output Areas, Source: WMD 2008.](#)**

**Cardiff Ranks out of 203 Lower Super Output Areas, Source: Derived from WMD Wales Ranks.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Index</th>
<th>Income Domain</th>
<th>Employment Domain</th>
<th>Health Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 02</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 06</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 07</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 09</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills Training &amp; Education Domain</th>
<th>Housing Domain</th>
<th>Geographical Access to Services Domain</th>
<th>Physical Environment Domain</th>
<th>Community Safety Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 01</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 04</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 06</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 07</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 08</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELY 10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Persons aged 16-64</td>
<td>4,082 106,425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working FT</td>
<td>58.15 36.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working PT</td>
<td>8.63 10.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-employed</td>
<td>8.15 8.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unemployed</td>
<td>4.43 4.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FT Student</td>
<td>2.97 4.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retired</td>
<td>8.08 11.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Homeless Sitter</td>
<td>6.53 8.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Permanently Sick</td>
<td>9.25 9.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student</td>
<td>7.49 9.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>6.55 5.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age 16-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>44.10 47.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working FT</td>
<td>5.23 5.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-employed</td>
<td>11.10 8.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unemployed</td>
<td>6.09 6.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FT Student</td>
<td>3.32 3.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retired</td>
<td>7.54 10.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Homeless Sitter</td>
<td>8.97 7.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Permanently Sick</td>
<td>10.73 7.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student</td>
<td>7.27 6.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>4.51 5.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population aged 16-64</td>
<td>4,082 106,425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working FT</td>
<td>34.06 28.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working PT</td>
<td>12.13 17.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-employed</td>
<td>5.08 5.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unemployed</td>
<td>2.32 2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FT Student</td>
<td>5.36 4.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retired</td>
<td>8.83 13.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Homeless Sitter</td>
<td>12.16 10.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Permanently Sick</td>
<td>7.24 9.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student</td>
<td>7.71 10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>6.30 7.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned outright</td>
<td>22.25 28.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgaged</td>
<td>31.63 41.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part rented / Part mortgaged</td>
<td>0.71 5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council rented</td>
<td>8.67 10.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Association rented</td>
<td>11.33 6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented</td>
<td>23.93 10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other rented</td>
<td>3.76 3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Composition</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average household size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>3.59 3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.14 4.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependents Children Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No adults in employment (0)</td>
<td>6.34 6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adults in employment without dependents (0)</td>
<td>31.15 31.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With dependent children (all ages)</td>
<td>23.91 30.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With dependent children (0-4)</td>
<td>10.62 12.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,064 184,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>1,064 184,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>34.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenanted</td>
<td>50.89 34.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat (purpose built)</td>
<td>16.77 13.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat (conversion)</td>
<td>21.94 16.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat (commercial building)</td>
<td>2.97 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>0.00 0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car ownership</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Car</td>
<td>41.59 29.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Car</td>
<td>42.64 44.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cars</td>
<td>13.65 21.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cars</td>
<td>1.76 3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Cars</td>
<td>0.64 0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>4,082 106,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2008 Wales Index of Multiple Deprivation

**Wales Ranks out of 1,936 Lower Super Output Areas, Source: WIMD 2008**

Cardiff Ranks out of 203 Lower Super Output Areas, Source: Derived from WIMD Wales Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Index</th>
<th>Income Domain</th>
<th>Employment Domain</th>
<th>Health Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 02</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 03</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 04</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 05</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 06</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 07</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 08</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills Training &amp; Education Domain</th>
<th>Housing Domain</th>
<th>Geographical Access to Services Domain</th>
<th>Physical Environment Domain</th>
<th>Community Safety Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 01</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 02</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 03</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 04</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 05</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 06</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 07</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 08</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONS DATA

Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,249</td>
<td>308,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>159,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>148,771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age Structure Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>21.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>26.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>36.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons 16+</td>
<td>9,277</td>
<td>242,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>19.28</td>
<td>37.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>64.54</td>
<td>48.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>79.93</td>
<td>66.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Country of Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>79.28</td>
<td>74.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other EU countries</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>91.11</td>
<td>91.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Welsh Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All population aged 3+</td>
<td>10,944</td>
<td>284,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak, Read &amp; Write</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak &amp; Read</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands Spoken Welsh</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Constructions</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Knowledge</td>
<td>80.87</td>
<td>83.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel to Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons 16-74 in employment</td>
<td>7,163</td>
<td>120,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who work from home</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>10.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor cycle</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>66.39</td>
<td>56.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/Taxi passenger</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons aged 16+</td>
<td>4,763</td>
<td>120,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>13.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>15.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. prof. &amp; technical</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>15.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. &amp; secretarial</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>14.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; customer services</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process, plant &amp; machine ops.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>11.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males aged 16+</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>67,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>16.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>16.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. prof. &amp; technical</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>16.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. &amp; secretarial</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>14.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; customer services</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process, plant &amp; machine ops.</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>11.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16+</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>62,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>14.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. prof. &amp; technical</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>16.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. &amp; secretarial</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>22.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; customer services</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process, plant &amp; machine ops.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industry of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Div.</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons aged 16+</td>
<td>4,763</td>
<td>120,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; fishing</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy &amp; water</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution, hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>21.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Communication</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking, Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>17.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin, Education &amp; Health</td>
<td>26.20</td>
<td>20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males aged 16+</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>67,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; fishing</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy &amp; water</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution, hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
<td>16.53</td>
<td>20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Communication</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking, Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>17.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin, Education &amp; Health</td>
<td>36.20</td>
<td>20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females aged 16+</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>62,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; fishing</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy &amp; water</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution, hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>16.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Communication</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking, Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin, Education &amp; Health</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>41.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Economic Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Activity</th>
<th>All Persons aged 16-24</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons aged 16-24</td>
<td>7,952</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working FT</td>
<td>3645</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working PT</td>
<td>127,23</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-employed</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unemployed</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FT Student</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retired</td>
<td>2451</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Householder</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Permanent Sick</td>
<td>5,685</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>2,389,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>52.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>47.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Owner-occupied</td>
<td>40.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Renters: Total</td>
<td>47.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Renters: Retired or pensioners</td>
<td>28.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Renters: Other</td>
<td>19.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Household Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average household size</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of rooms</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of persons</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons aged 16-24</td>
<td>112,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>52.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working FT</td>
<td>28.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working PT</td>
<td>19.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-employed</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unemployed</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FT Student</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retired</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Householder</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Permanent Sick</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dependent Children Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Children Households</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total with dependent children</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Parent</td>
<td>14.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Parent</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Car Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car Ownership</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Car</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Car</td>
<td>48.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cars</td>
<td>28.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cars</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Cars</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cars</td>
<td>92.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2008 Wales Index of Multiple Deprivation

(Wales Ranks out of 1,856 Lower Super Output Areas, Source: WMP 2008. Cardiff Ranks out of 263 Lower Super Output Areas, Source: Derived from WMP Wales Ranks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Index</th>
<th>Income Domain</th>
<th>Employment Domain</th>
<th>Health Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 01</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 02</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 03</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 04</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 05</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 06</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 07</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills Training &amp; Education Domain</th>
<th>Housing Domain</th>
<th>Geographical Access to Services Domain</th>
<th>Physical Environment Domain</th>
<th>Community Safety Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 01</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 02</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 03</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 04</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 05</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 06</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHWN 07</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Map of Wales showing the areas mentioned]
Appendix Three Transcript of Typical PACT Meeting (Evergreen)

Evergreen PACT Meeting 01.09.08

Field Note: Cold wet night – heavy & torrential rain since 2pm: no community chair attending. 1st meeting since FLSO transferred to new post; three labour councillors in audience (Harris, Jones and Smith as observer); top table just 2 PCSO’s – PCSO Carl chaired; John sat at back taking minutes. Total attendance 19 people + me; Typical Evergreen PACT – emotional, loud, angry views expressed, mothering, dissatisfaction 101 & Police & ‘roles’, some challenges to councillors [MP’s here] (as opposed to PCSO’s). Contrast far less adversarial PACTs that typify Whitewood. First PACT seen Councillor Russell Harris (out of 8 attended); Councillor Smith (Ganton) attending as Researcher for AM & MP (Russell Harris & City West MP); as usual Evergreen PACT all cllrs in audience (community members).

Researcher regular attendee and greeted by some of regulars at beginning. Most faces recognised as regular attendees: Acton Road five residents- husband & wife, mother & daughter, older man. Other regulars – Bob, Peter K, recognised another older man; 2 women Dana and Lois from CONCERNED GARDENERS group; one man not recognised and one young woman from Moon Farm Rd

Comments from Cllr Sue Jones in aside to me as meeting beginning: “we’ve got to get more new people” (see section 1). Also in small talk / conversations post PACT meeting Cllr Jones: Political platform that’s all that was [usual suspects CONCERNED GARDENERS & Plaid MRS WILLIAMS and representative ness 1:38.33 (see section 4).

Pre-meeting & small talk: laughter and chat Evergreen style. Meeting already full of people chatting to each other, conversations loud and gregarious; obvious people feel at home in PACT; conversations and chatting goes on for over 4 minutes, and has been going on before I arrive. Some small talk some PACT talk. BOB and JOHN talking together in a corner, others in their seats, I am almost the last person to arrive, LOIS, Peter and DANA are chatting to some people in the row in front of me; when the meeting formally starts they move to the front row to the right of the seating area; this is their usual spot. The people from Acton Rd including MRS WILLIAMS & MR WILLIAMS are sat behind them on the right side. Myself, Sue, Cllr Harris and then Cllr Smith are near the back on left; and a new woman I don’t recognise is on my left again.

This volume of chat and easiness to talk with each other is far greater than other PACTs (Whitewood or Redbank; posh Whitewood is sedate sitting and quiet conversations; Redbank though know each other people tend to talk quietly to person next to them or sit silently waiting for meeting to begin- little acknowledgement or interaction of regulars, also more like Evergreen to sit with gaps between seats giving bigger circles of personal space.

Identifiers of residents in order of speaking within the Main Part of the meeting commencing at 13.32 (see section 3). This follows on from a discussion in which residents informing rest of meeting about issues by their houses on the Act Path and Acton Rd with piles of rubbish, rat problems, whose job to sort it out and when going to do it – all vying & raising voices or shouting to be heard – loud, fast paced, highly emotional; (see section 2).

MRS WILLIAMS & MR WILLIAMS husband and wife, other female neighbours R4 & R5: MR ACTON older man MR ACTON (man B from previous conversations at other Evergreen PACTs – lives by church part of Acton Rd; Other parts of Evergreen: LOIS female resident think Lois CONCERNED GARDENERS; Bob – voice of reason/ Portsmouth woods; JOHN – older male active Com First/ Tenants Associations is an Evergreen Resident – sits at back (in past with Maureen) and takes minutes sometimes since Maureen FLSO left; Bonny: Female Youngish 30-40’s quietly spoken Moon Farm Rd;
Peter K- Evergreen res; DANA female Dana (other CONCERNED GARDENERS); BILL regular older man attendee doesn’t speak often only when roused / strong statements; GORDON regular attendee man in his 50’s very quietly spoken and never speaks

Notation Notes:
All voices so close overlapping and no pauses or spaces before next speaker begins that convention of ‘[’ at beginning of next line (persons speech) to indicate immediate change of speaker is not used. Brackets ‘[’ is only used for actual overlap of two or more voices speaking at same time. Where dialogue cannot be distinguished this is categorised as [talked over, cacophony of voices, etc.

Meeting recorded in separate Evergreen in sections:-
1. Small talk – and pre-meeting conversations
2. Introduction Phase of meeting - transcribed last and numbered separate Evergreen lines 1 – 150
3. Main Meeting transcribed with line notes: Runs from lines 1 – 2288 – not including side conversations with resident MRS WILLIAMS and Researcher which is numbered separately
4. Small talk and post-meeting conversations

1. Small talk – conversations before PACT

Researcher: Hello Sue how are you?
Cllr Jones: very good thank you, but very busy, how are you?
Researcher: Not surprised to hear how busy you are but I am surprised how many people are here tonight
Cllr Jones: Yes we do seem to have quite a few, not really new faces though, and of course Russell, Councillor Harris is with us tonight. [Whispering to me] We’ve got to get more new people, we need to hear from others, not the same ones again [my interpretation this is a veiled comment on CONCERNED GARDENERS & MRS WILLIAMS] Plaid candidate, they are just in front of us at this point.
Researcher: Ahh I wondered who that was, it’s good he’s here isn’t it
Cllr Jones: Nods Yes Yes I’m very pleased
[DANA catches my eye CONCERNED GARDENERS]
Researcher: Hi Dana, Hi Peter (regulars) How are you, you look really well, have you lost a lot of weight or been exercising?
DANA: Yes, I’m very pleased I’ve lost a stone, we had a good summer too with the kids we’ve dun lots of football and activities with them, been good,
Researcher: That’s great I’m really pleased. Yes because there wasn’t a meeting in August, well only me a meeting of one! Laughter both of us. If I remember so far back I must have missed the July meeting, and not got the news it wasn’t on

-------------------------------------------------------------

2. Introduction Phase to Meeting 01.09.08 - first 13.30 minutes
Introduction Phase of Meeting

1. PCSO Carl: RIGHT, I think we’re all hear now shall we make a start if I can introduce
2. myself and my colleague. I’m PCSO for the North Evergreen side and this
3. is Mat who is PCSO for the South Evergreen side as you can see we don’t have
4. Jill our community chair tonight unfortunately she couldn’t make it, apologies for that
5. Cllr Jones: whispers to me Whose that who’s taking the meeting?
6. Researcher: whisper back That’s Carl he’s one of the PCSO’s
7. PCSO Carl: As you can see in the audience we’ve got Councillor Smith with us tonight
8. he’s here doing a survey of tonight, anyway I’ll let him stand up and introduce himself
9. and tell you why he’s here
10. Cllr Smith: Those of you who may know me, let me make it absolutely clear, I am not here
11. as a councillor because obviously I do not represent this area or ward. I’m here on behalf
12. of R*** M*** the AM and the Minister, I work on behalf of R*** M*** as his PA
13. so all I’m here to do is listen take some minutes and report these back to R***, but if
14. anybody wants to speak to me on any issue they think R*** should know about or want
15. to tell him they can come and see me at the end, thank you
16. PCSO Carl: I’ll see now if we’ve got anyone else [unclear talked over [3.0] okay
17. Cllr: Jones: ERMM I’m Councillor Jones, for Evergreen [friendly tone
18. PCSO Carl: Err I’m sorry
19. Cllr Jones: I sneaked in you didn’t see me
20. PCSO Carl: Errr we will start with err… we’ll go back to the previous meeting and issues
21. [reads from papers] err.. xxx on Big Avenue anyone here from Big Avenue? [gets a
22. nod audience] How’s it been up Big Avenue
23. DANA: Ohh that was up the shop wasn’t it?
24. LOIS: It wasn’t was it
25. DANA: No, no it was up the shop
26. MRS WILLIAMS: It was the shop
27. LOIS: The shop was it
28. JOHN: The gentleman is sitting xxxx[unclear
29. DANA: Oh 45, yes, 45 someone moved in [unclear 12 seconds discussion amongst residents
30. MRS WILLIAMS: ] [unclear 12 seconds discussion amongst residents
31. DANA: ]
32. LOIS: That was by xxxxx house
33. PCSO Carl: That was a priority for some time, it is occupied now
34. DANA: Yeah it is occupied now
35. Cllr Jones: Somebody was putting rubbish on the field at the back of Bluwelyn Avenue
36. JOHN: Yeah rubbish was being put there frequently
37. BILL: [It was by Bryndawr Road
38. LOIS: ] [Yeah somebody did come to see me to check the address
39. DANA: ] [rubbish all sorts, you name it, someone came
40. Cllr Jones: So the officers of the council did go there
41. LOIS: They never came there, we went to Miltshire House ourselves [Housing Office] and
42. we placed it in black bags and we left it out his back and it still hasn’t been collected
43. PCSO Carl: Where was that from?
44. LOIS: 96 wasn’t it?
45. R4: I don’t know, I think it was 96, 96
46. R5: Yeah it was 96
47. LOIS: 96 yeah
48. PCSO Carl: Do you know [unclear 2.0 some laughter] we won’t go through that one again
49. LOIS: The black bags are still there, they haven’t been collected, we know there still there
50. PCSO Carl: Obviously that still needs sorting
51. LOIS: But somebody had been up there, he’s had a notice now that he’s in danger of
having
52. his tenancy taken away now if ’e don’t stop dumping
53. PCSO Carl: Right, so the issue of the rubbish and the tenancy obviously concerns a
54. council issue so [3.0] ermm can we get in contact with them or can you see to that
55. [councillors] yourselves? [police identity vs councillor identity
56. Cllr Harris: What sort of rubbish is it, is it garden?
MRS WILLIAMS: Basically what it is its loads of xxx every week

BILL: Vile smelling rubbish, more of it, food and all sorts

Cllr Harris: And is it identifiable, identifiable as belonging to somebody

PCS0 Carl: can you [there are black bags over there, one of the council officials did come and speak to me, knocked the door, and I’m not sure who it was, but they were on about going in there to sort it and see if there was addresses in them and then they were going to leave leaflets around. I was told if I want to phone Connect 2 City (C2C)it should be completed and finished by the 12th of July and then in August. That was when I phoned ‘em August, I got it in ‘ere I say I rang them about eight times

Cllr Harris: Who’d you phone

LOIS: Connect 2 City and I’ve got every single record of the person’s name and the time I phoned them

PCS0 Carl: When did you say you rang them first

LOIS: [nods] That was 12th of July

Cllr Harris: And they gave you a date did they

LOIS: Yeah and last time I phoned them they told me it will be collected in the next two weeks and its now four weeks

PCS0 Carl: Does somebody is that for us to monitor or one of yourselves?

Cllr Harris: Leave it with me we’ll look into it

PCS0 Carl: So Councillor Harris will follow that on

I think there, the last PACT meeting only that one priority were there any other issues?

ROIS: RATS

PCS0 Carl: Err that’s?

LOIS: Rats, rats were’n it

PCS0 Carl: RATS! There we are then rats in Evergreen

LOIS: Yeah Rat Man turned up [laughter] and we haven’t seen any rats in last six weeks

PCS0 Carl: Excellent, what’s ‘e dun put like a poison down possibly

LOIS: I think ‘e did put poison down cos someone walked their dog in it and found a dead rat where ‘ed eaten the poison, yeah but other than that the guy can go to his window now and there’s no movement

PCS0 Mat: Brilliant [celebration PCS0’s and residents PACT priority or issue resolved – council issue

PCS0 Carl: so that’s been solved now, we can write that one off

JOHN: Has anything been done about the communal dumping in the corner of Portsmouth Great Woods?

Peter: There’s something being done about Portsmouth Great Woods, I believe there’s funding through Plaid candidate and key figure in friends of Portsmouth Great Woods

JOHN: [You know the dumping up in xxx it was an issue last time I think something was going to be done about it

Peter: We’ve attracted funding now and we’ve had cleansing out they’ve shown a great willingness to do something about this, I know because I’ve had xxx from their out. And basically we’re waiting for the funding to come through now, and I believe it should come through quite quickly so that will be good. There’s certainly a willingness there it’s just waiting for the funding to come through. Yes, there’s an issue of health and safety, there’s
103. lots of dangerous rubbish there, like some ceramics that are very very sharp, ermm lots of
glass really, and hopefully, we are hoping to get that sorted within a matter of weeks
[speaking authoritatively in slow calm voice, ‘as if’ an official or councillor rather than resident &
Councillor Harris has to ask HIM (Peter) where is the funding coming from] 10.33
105. Cllr Harris: Where is the funding coming from for that?
106. Peter: It would be council money for that
107. LOIS: And its Tidy Towns money as well, what’s the name
108. Councillor Harris: Keep City Tidy
109. LOIS: [unclear 5 seconds] No she’s supposed to get back to me I’m just waiting to be rung up
110. PCSO Carl: [7.00] second pause – meeting silent Any other issues to be brought up now? 
[Followed by a [4.00] second pause
111. DANA: You know the gulley in Bluwelyn Avenue [0.2] down the bottom,[0.2] toward the
112. shop, you know there is so much rubbish in there, you know that’s blocked
113. JOHN: Yeah that’s another source of dumping
114. LOIS: Yeah
115. JOHN: Especially all the tyres, you see, they’ve taken the tyres off the hubs intending to
sell them to the scrappy
117. PCSO Carl: so that is [two or three residents talking at once explaining where it is unclear for
[0.3] seconds
118. BILL: Up station gates, you know as you go through xxx it’s up there
119. R4: Yes, its where the gates are [two or three residents talking at once explaining where it is unclear for
[0.3] seconds
120. BILL: NO, no it’s half way between Bluwelyn Avenue and xxx and you see the double
121. gates
122. R4: It’s by 22, or something like that
123. LOIS: Yeah
124. JOHN: Yeah its always under fire because they constantly cut the lock off with a xxx so
125. They can get in
126. LOIS: You know while we’re on the subject of rubbish, also continuously over last six 127.
Weeks I’ve ‘ad to phone, err, you know to get the sweepers out, you know because it’s been
128. An absolute tip in the avenue
129. DANA: Health hazard ‘an it
130. LOIS: It’s an absolute tip, you look, they never comes and removes the rubbish you look t
131. top of Big Avenue you got the Jinala (take away) and you got three take aways ‘n there’s
132.a wall there with fencing and there is TONS, and tons of rubbish there which is a 12.50
133. Nightmare from visitors visiting St.Magans during the holidays. I ’ave ‘ad it removed but
134. I’ve been asking them WHY is it we got three take aways there and not ONE bin? [0.2]
[St.Magans posh area; think means St.Magans Museum national attraction visitors all over, free enty
tourism flag ship. Sited between Nikkelston and St.Magans old village at very top end of area
135. PCSO Carl: Right
136. LOIS: And they keep saying they will put bins there but it’s just not done because it’s out
137. of sight of those driving through isn’t it! You go round the corner past the xxxx into the Nik
138. Nikkelston Estate and there’s no rubbish there. They’re bins are emptied, they’re done
139. Properly but it seems your from around Evergreen and there’s nothing done for us here, why’s that? [Inference Nikkelston as ‘posher’ area is getting better service than Evergreen more
deprived area: Services going to better areas only: different standards of service different parts of City -
poosh vs deprived – Mike has asked about whether this happens at Neighbourhood Management
meetings: Identity deprived rougher area left to go bad vs cleaner posher area, easier to maintain
and/or more pressure residents if don’t (they will put up with it and they wont idea) communitarian,
resident identity & differential service
v
140. MR WILLIAMS: It’s a public highway and
145. JOHN: Why do you think that is then?
146. MR WILLIAMS: it’s a public highway through there and right up the Act Path
147. LOIS: And there’s nobody cleaning any of it, absolutely dreadful
148. MR WILLIAMS: They don’t even come and do our bins
149. LOIS: You go down Big Avenue, down Big Avenue and there’s literally got to dodge
150. rubbish I’ve never seen it so bad

3. Main Meeting Transcribed from lines 1 – 2288 (with line notes)

1. Cllr Harris: What’s this about why’s it got so bad out there?
2. MRS WILLIAMS (Wife): It’s those youths the youths we’ve got out there
3. MR WILLIAMS (Husband): IF it was just the rubbish THAT WOULD BE GREAT. The
4. problem is the people who put it there
5. MRS WILLIAMS: Our gardens, we got so many youths outside our ‘ouse, use our gardens
6. as a lavatory
7. MR WILLIAMS: The only reason why we’re asking you to [do something is italked over
8. LOIS (CONCERNED GARDENERS): [Where’s this happening
9. MRS WILLIAMS: It’s Acton Terrace and italked over
10. R4 Female neighbour: italked over
11. R5 Female neighbour: italked over
12. MR WILLIAMS: For the last month its gone big time, there’s drug dealing, there’s drinking,
13. there’s all sorts [pause] I mean it’s all around its over on the Act Path and Acton
14. Terrace, [on the main road, its
15.  R4: [It’s happening all the time now
16.  MR WILLIAMS: They’re there until four o clock in the morning the other night, I mean,
17.  I’ve been having arguments with 101 and the police
18. MRS WILLIAMS: Do they ever call the police or do nothing [what’s happening
19. MR WILLIAMS: [hang on luv I’m having problems getting the police out, they don’t seem to
20. want to call them out I’ve had that many arguments with 101 I’ve even called 999 because
21. They’ve [refused to come out
22. MR WILLIAMS: [it’s not just that its their attitude to YOU, they make you feel, YOUR
23. ALWAYS ON REPORT [its something to you, its just
24. Peter:: italked over
25. MR WILLIAMS: I mean you don’t sleep in the street, anyone who lives in the street will say
26. that you can’t live like that, its unbelievable noise its not just that
27. MR WILLIAMS: italked over
28. Peter: [sorry about that Nigel I’m going to ask the MP’s as they’re here [Local Councillors:
    Cllr Jones regular, Cllr Smith from Ganton ward - as AM R*** M***’s PA / observer & taking
    minutes; Cllr Harris ]
29. now Saturday night I went out and on the way back xxx Rd was shut so I had to go
30. round Radial Way and there were five police vans there at the gypsy site I don’t
31. know how many police were in the gypsy site so when I came home on Saturday
32. night and we wanted one car to attend the street and we’re told “oh no we’re too
33. busy there’s more important incidents to attend to”.. [interrupted
34. R4: [talked over
35. MR WILLIAMS: THEY DON’T PAY TAXES GYPSIES SO WHAT ARE THEY DOING
36. DOWN THERE? fvoice rising – indignation
37. R4: Honest to god we must have made 37 calls SO WHERE WERE THEY? fvoice rising
38. MR WILLIAMS: no, 27 calls we’ve we had
39. MRS WILLIAMS: italked over
40. MR WILLIAMS: [talked over]
41. R4: [talked over]
42. MR WILLIAMS: well listen 27 calls we’ve had to 999 and 101 and NOT one car have we h
43. Had and I was up until 3 in the morning, and NOT [1.0] ONE [1.0] SINGLE
44. [1.0]POLICE OFFICER [pauses of emphasis & enunciation]
45. PCSO CARL: What day was this happening? [low pitch voice 15.31]
46. MR WILLIAMS: Saturday
47. PCSO CARL: Saturday just gone?
48. MRS WILLIAMS: [talked over]
49. R4: [Yeah
50. MR WILLIAMS: [talked over]
51. MR WILLIAMS: I spoke to, I don’t know some sort of supervisor [interrupted
52. MRS WILLIAMS: I’ve got to tell you this, some of there replies, 101’s replies were
53. “they had tactical on the street the same as you have WHAT AT FOUR IN THE
54. MORNING [voice rising
55. Peter:: They’re doing drugs, there’s drug dealing going on, underage street
56. drinkers, they’re blatantly selling drugs on the street in front of you and they’re doing that
57. in the AFTERNOONS AND NO ONE CAN COME OUT
58. MRS WILLIAMS: It’s their attitude that gets to you we’re living through this and they ma
59. Make you feel out of place [interrupted
60. [talked over [1.5]
61. R4: [talked over
62. PCSO CARL: [Now come on
63. MR WILLIAMS: It makes YOU feel like a BAD person FOR BRINGING IT UP AND
64. ASKING THEM TO COME OUT AT 2 AND 3 IN THE MORNING AND MOVE SOME
65. KIDS and I got to be fair one set of Police Officers turned up last night and they got out of
66. their vehicle and they moved them on, they did the job properly for once, now for
67. two weeks running every night this week and last week I’ve been asking them to do
68. that and NOT ONCE did they do that they drive past and the kids are swearing at
69. them and calling them all sorts [interrupted [Sunday evening 31st Aug 08?
70. MR WILLIAMS: [what
71. [talked over by others [2.0]
72. MR WILLIAMS: [BUT] [raises voice to take floor back
73. last night they moved them on so they DID A GOOD JOB last night [interrupted
74. MRS WILLIAMS: I don’t know if
75. PCSO CARL: [Go on [interrupted
76. MR WILLIAMS: Can I JUST ASK YOU[PCSOS] AND the MP’s what is the law on police to
77. attend an incident. I wanna know what the ACTUAL law on that [pause 2.0] ave
80. they GOTTA stop and get out of the vehicle or can they drive straight past and
81. think [1.0] [oh no I don’t want to deal with that] [peters out, dropping volume
82. R4: [talked over [2.0]
83. Cllr Jones: Well its [interrupted [accidental rescue or meant to rescue PCSO/ Police?
84. Cllr Harris: It’s a danter for the POLICE and whether they respond at all, well
85. that’s MY understanding for what its worth and I’VE NEVER been happy with it,
86. I mean I’m, I’m [one of these] people, well I’m not happy [with 101 but there you are
87. Cllr Jones: [we’re not]
88. MRS WILLIAMS: [we’re happy] with you but we’re not with 101
89. R4: [nor are we]
90. R5 Female: [talked over [cacophony of women’s voices
91. R6 Female: [the problem with] 101 [talked over
92. Cllr Harris: Well my understanding is that somebody will take a [0.5] view on the
93. severity of [the incident] and THAT [0.5] will determine whether there is a response
94. Peter: [well YEAH] [high pitch]
95. Cllr Harris: at ALL [1.0] well I mean I’ve rung them myself and, never allocate
96. anyone, two days later they’ve [rung me] back to say ‘I did this and did eventually’
97. MR WILLIAMS: [Yeah] /high pitch
98. Cllr Harris: then say nothing there and I said ‘well I didn’t say they were 17.16
99. there waiting for you’ it’s obvious they were there when I rang
100. MR WILLIAMS: [BY THE TIME THEY DO COME OUT OF COURSE] 101. THEY’VEMOVED ON [0.1] well you know [whole statement shrieking high pitch
102. Cllr Harris: /talked over
103. MR WILLIAMS: /talked over
104. MR ACTON Male: /talked over /deep low voice
105. R4: Well, I mean Saturday night they were fighting, there were two girls they were
106. nearly killing each other out the front, I mean absolutely nearly killing each other
107. did anybody come? [0.5] did they hell, absolutely nobody come [interrupted
108. R5: Well I see to it myself because we’ve just had a car broken in on the drive,
109. Saturday, my daughter just has xxx [interrupted
110. MR WILLIAMS: [talked over] /cacophony women’s voices
111. R5: [well I’m not phoning] 101 I’ll be out there because if they don’t I’ll be out
112. [do, costa [1.0]] NO[1.0] because they don’t do nothing I’ll do it myself
113. MR WILLIAMS: [too Dangerous] /issue whose role community/residents vs Police to deal with
114. MR ACTON female: [well you shouldn’t]
115. PCSO Carl: [Can I ask] /talked over by numerous voices
116. R5: WELL I DO cos that’s how I FEEL
117. MR WILLIAMS: /talked over
118. MRS WILLIAMS: NO I AGREE with you it’s what they don’t do [101] WE CANNOT GET
119. YOU [Police] out there, it’s not yoursefls, [it’s it’s] they cannot get you out there
120. MR WILLIAMS: [when you] /talked over lots of voices
121. PCSO CARL: [Now I] totally understand what you’re saying,
122. but then you have to understand what we’re saying. YOU know we’ve explained
123. before, before, time and time again its not [that] /calmer slower & quieter spoken meeting
124. MR WILLIAMS: [Even when we get you] its ‘oh I’m off my
125. shift in a minute’ [1.5] and we all know it may be one in the morning but
126. [we all gotta work]
127. PCSO CARL: [all the calls] are graded we know this now and that’s how it works
128. [the calls are graded] 1, 2, 3 and 4
129. MRS WILLIAMS: [yeah we all know how it works] /low tone sarcastic
130. PCSO CARL: Like the councillor said the severity of the [actual incident taking place]
131. R4: [whats going to happen] you
132. going to wait till we’re MURDED or something?
133. MR WILLIAMS: I MEAN well sometimes when we’re talking to them [to 101] they say well
134. What like Saturday night we ad [1.0] err [0.5] how many, how many in total? /shouting
135. again, looks at neighbour to add info to complete point
136. R5: I don’t know how many we ad in total, there was TOO many
137. MR WILLIAMS: It was over 20, over 20, and the woman who has moved in over the road
138. by us has three kids and she let them out it was over midnight to play FOOTBALL those
139. three kids must think there n’evan [exasperation, amazement & disbelief have to put up with
this – sub text and no help from relevant agencies
140. MRS WILLIAMS: no sneakers on their feet
141. MR WILLIAMS: WHAT’S ALL THAT ABOUT [0.5] [its unbelievable] by a church
142. MRS WILLIAMS: [Quarter past midnight] and out on a
main road to play football INCREDIBLE

MR WILLIAMS: you, YOU’D have to see it to believe it [exasperation

PCSO CARL: Yeah unfortunately that’s [interrupted [lines 146 to

BOB: Ben: This, this particular situation has been going on for [sometime] [calm voice and mounting challenge to account giving by PCSO / Police representative

MRS WILLIAMS: [YES]

MR WILLIAMS & LOIS: [Yeah]

Councillor Harris: [that’s correct]

BOB: Is there a police strategy for dealing with this particular type of thing?

PCSO CARL: In where, in Acton Terrace at the moment?

MR WILLIAMS: Yeah

R4: I don’t think there will ever be because in [talked over [cacophony of numerous voices indistinguishable, women and men speaking at once for [3.0] seconds ‘chaos’ or being heard?

PCSO CARL: NO, NO, no because UNFORTANETLY what you’ve also got to consider I KNOW the youths are there and causing problems [0.5] BUT they actually live there as well

MR WILLIAMS:[NO]

R5: [No]

PCSO CARL: [WELL] NO [0.5] NOW LISTEN [command] I know what you’re saying but a few of the youths in your area DO live there

MRS WILLIAMS: [There is that]

MR WILLIAMS [I don’t think] that’s th[e issue]

MRS WILLIAMS: [Yeah BUT] you don’t know that when they’re ringing up

PCSO CARL: No, there’s no tracking

PCSO CARL: LOOK there’s no tragedy in saying these kids can’t be told to go if they live [there] [talked over

MR WILLIAMS: [WHAT DO YOU MEAN] IF THESE KIDS HAVE [GOT TO GO] [shouting

R5: [What you mean is]

R4: You’re saying just cos they live there they can be out there [all night]

R5: [Yeah]

PCSO CARL: It depends [interrupted

MR WILLIAMS: IS THAT WHAT YOUR SAYING? [interrupted [voice rising in volume and tone 20.00

PCSO CARL: Well [drowned out by residents reaction (Levellyn 2005)

MRS WILLIAMS: [That’s not] good enough [talked over [cacophony of voices

MR WILLIAMS: [I don’t believe your saying that [disbelief - challenge account
general shouting for [4.00] seconds unable to make out individual voices / content.

MR WILLIAMS: EXACTLY, you can’t be saying just because they live across the street [we have to]

MRS WILLIAM [SURELY you can’t argue if we

MR ACTON: [If we cross the street] [older man regular Acton Rd by church spoken to man B in earlier conversations other PACTs

BOB: Ben: […] that cannot be. it…… make sense [general shouting for [2.00] unable to make out voices / content until PCSO shouts loudest to stop this.

PCSO CARL: HANG ON, [claps hands] HANG ON SHHHH LISTEN [clap] SHHHHH

IF THEY’RE CAUS::ING ANNOy::a::nce [then obviously [lengthens words to control pace [interrupted

MRS WILLIAMS: [I WOULDN’T] ring you unless they were [doing that [interrupted by PCSO
184. PCSO CARL: [THAT’s fine] THAT’s fine but what I’m saying is if they’re out there until 185. or four or five o clock in the morning there is no law that says they can’t be out 186. there until four in the [morning [interrupted loses turn & some control ] interrupt 187. MRS WILLIAMS: [NO I’m not sa[ying that…[interrupted to regain control ] interrupt 188. JOHN: [What do…[interrupted to regain control ] interrupt 189. PCSO CARL: [That:’s fi::ne THERE’s no law to say they cant 190. be there until three or four in the morning there’s no law to say [talked over by audience members who seem to be challenging speech rights & account giving PCSO/ Chair 191. PCSO CARL: you have to be in [at a certain time 192. MR ACTON: [what about th[eir behaviour …. 193. BOB: Ben: [you have to deal with… 194. MRS WILLIAMS & others: [talked over… [Higher pitch female voice comes in louder trying to be heard over other voices but indistinct. 195. MRS WILLIAMS: I doubt you could take a man outside [your house... [talked over 196. PCSO CARL: [I, I,… [struggling to be heard 197. Audience: [lots of voices at once for [4.0] seconds 198. PCSO CARL: It’s a possibility [talked over – could suffer same situation 199. R5: [Co::me on now, your not saying [interrupted by MR ACTON who has been attempting to be part of community challenge to account lines 191/3 200. MR ACTON: Mr. Chair [0.2] I live next door to these folks, I live next door, I, I, I’m in the s 201. same position as [0.1] I vouch for what they’re saying, we need discipline, these people n 202. need to get up to work, I don’t go to work but I still lead a disciplined life and have to get 203. up for a certain time of the morning I’ve still got to have my hours of sleep [otherwise I [youths out on street are denying this ‘right to us’ good law abiding citizens in our own homes 204. MRS WILLIAMS: [WHY DO THEY PAY HER RENT? Why do they pay the mother’s rent 205. when the kids are out in the street all night [why do they pay the mothers rent? [co-operative turn which picks up and continues argument of othering 206. MR ACTON [I rang 101 myself, at 10 to midnight, it was a 207. busy night they said they’d be with me in 10 minutes to an hour 208. [at quarter to 2 they HADN’T COME] 209. MRS WILLIAMS, MR WILLIAMS & R4: [talked over MR ACTON – all raising voices at same time] 210. PCSO CARL: [right 211. MR ACTON: and the kids were sti::ll out there and its not quarter to 2 in the afternoon its 212. quarter to 2 in the mor:::ning and they’re shouting and screaming as if its quarter 2 in the 213. afternoon [and there’s still NO] police 214. MR WILLIAMS: [well it CAN be done] you know, when they can be bothered, because last 215. night they did it, IF they can be bothered they can move them [they seems to be police 216. MR ACTON: WHEN [emphasis I wrote to the council, [when I wrote to the MP’s [talked over 218. PCSO CARL: [whenever there……(2.0) can I [talked over by residents not allowed speech rights to take turn as Chair 219. MRS WILLIAMS: [I wants to 220. MR WILLIAMS: [NEVER [emphasis 221. MR ACTON: when I wrote to the MPs, AND I WANTS THIS RECORDED [talked over 222: MRS WILLIAMS, MR WILLIAMS, LOIS etc: [talked over 223. and I wants to be [HEAR::D] 224. MRS WILLIAMS: [shhhhhhh] SHHH 225. MR ACTON: When I wrote to the MPs bout the AN:TI social behaviour he returned my 226. letter he referred my letter to the CITY COUN::CIL housing department [spits word ‘council’ out]
and they wrote back to him and said this gentleman has NOT COMPLAINED IN ANY WAY, I HAD NOT complained about the neighbours, I'M COMPLAINING ABOUT THE WHOLE ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND WE'RE PAYING THIS MAN'S RENT WE PAY THERE SALARIES AND WE DON'T GET ANYTHING FOR IT, IT'S A WASTE OF TIME THERE'S NO POINT GOING TO SEE THESE COUNCILLORS AND MP'S ON THEIR SATURDAY MORNING SURGERIES BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT DOING ANYTHING ABOUT IT AND THE PROBLEMS WE'VE GOT IN EVERGREEN

MRS WILLIAMS: I can understand, I do know what it is you come out to our street and you get 50 calls from another street wherever they go. You're going to get calls from whatever street this gang goes to (I know)

Bonny: Female Youngish 30-40's quietly spoken: Yea:h got the same Problems on Moon Farm Rd over by the bus stop its actually been going on many many Years and I'm surprised not more calls about it, I actually rang about it and they're all Elderly and I actually feel very protective of them but there are youths 50-60 on a Friday night and they are drinking, they're fighting, everything. I rang 101 at 7 o'clock and I said LISTEN there's 30 of them out there in the bus stop and surrounding it (shelter) and There's at least another 30 in the park and I can see its going to get worse NOBODY WAS DONE NObody came to help, 2 o'clock in the morning they were still there and no one had come

MRS WILLIAMS: you know the only time they come out [talked over – voices rising louder]

MR WILLIAMS: this is exactly what we're talking about

[lots voices talking at once, none particularly raised. The audience seem to be having conversations about this between themselves and can’t make out any specific dialogue. This seems to go on along time six seconds]

Councillor Smith: That gentleman I'm sorry one of the people over there, I'm sorry, I don't know his name, he said he'd been to see his MP He'd go see J*** B*** MR WILLIAMS: Yeah, that's what I wanna know what it is because I (talked over)

Cllr Smith: If I could just continue, if they continue with that action, the Police should go about serving, basically its a stage one Anti Social Behaviour Order, when I say order, it's a letter and they go through one, two, three, four and the fourth stage is when they actually go to court. In most cases it can be dealt with by the first few letters. I'm sure the MP or xxxx might have given you that advice but generally speaking you've got the professional police to do that

LOIS: So you're telling me they're not doing their job when they just drive past

Cllr Smith: It's not my job to tell the police what they have to do

LOIS: [so what happens now are] they going to [talked over other Acton Rd residents voices all shouting at once]
273. Cllr Smith: All I can say, if you listen to what I’m carefully trying to say to you its your job
to say to the police have you actually taken their names and taken their details and 
what have you done about it [community care takers, responsibilisation, communitarian,
community identity, police identity, voice is low and firm trying to calm things down]
276. Cllr Harris: Well what’s going to happen to stop [them and] have 
277. Cllr Smith: [well that’s] the point I’m making
278. Cllr Harris: But that’s the problem is [talked over numerous voices shouting]
279. MRS WILLIAMS, MR WILLIAMS, LOIS, R5: [all shouting can’t make 
out dialogue [3.0]]
280. Cllr Harris: That’s the [situation] [responding to someone]
281. JOHN: [Who de]cides, WHO decides how many Policemen we have
282. well we pay rates and for the police an’ that
283. Cllr Harris: Well that’s the Police Authority
284. JOHN: You mean the councillors and [the xxxx] [talked over other voices from whole meeting]
285. Cllr Harris: [NO you can’t say that]
286. Cllr Smith: no it’s a government problem the law and sufficient police [government vs police 
and council, police authority identity]
287. JOHN: Because all this really is because we haven’t got enough policemen [an]d to
288. counteract that they downgraded a lot of crimes so that NOW we don’t know whether
289. the police are hiding behind the government rising crime scheme or whether they’re
290. really telling us the TRUTH because we don’t know
291. Cllr Jones: NO [nodding & agreeing with JOHN & Cllr Smith not enough police]
292. Cllr Harris: What do you mean by that they really xxxx we don’t [KNOW]
293. JOHN: [WEL:L] for instance
294. are [talked over each other
295. Cllr Harris: [talked over each other – fails to keep speech rights & looses turn to MR ACTON]
296. MR ACTON: FOR INSTANCE, if I get burgled a policemen won’t come round and get a
297. crime number
298. LOIS: EXACTLY 26.01
299. MR ACTON: OTHER TIMES they won’t even come to your house [talked over others but
keeps turn [1.0]]
300. JOHN: There was a time when they’d come to your house and take finger prints
301. Cllr Harris: Yeah (noding)
302. JOHN: Now mean for instance even little crimes like riding a bike around on the
303. pavement used to be a thing a policeman would see to [PACT priority Whitewood]
304. I gather now they don’t have to go checking cars to see if they’ve got tax err
305. and bald tyres because that’s been taken off em and well bit by bit their job is being
306. taken off em and [it’s [police identity / role
307. PCSO CARL: [SORRY, what’s been taken off them? That we don’t check
[interrupted - Seems to have woken up in response to line 304 reference to Police identity roles]
308. JOHN: Well I read in the paper that the police, if they ever honoured these, that it’s not
309. their job to check tax on the cars it’s the wardens job
310. PCSO Carl: Well obviously we do, and we’re always around, you’ve said we’re
311. around, we do check peoples tax and do you know what the sad part is I even go
312. home when I’m not working and check peoples tax [0.2] that’s how bad its got
313. Bonny: EVEN though [interrupted lots of voices shouting at once (MR WILLIAMS,R4, R5,
Bonny [0.2]]
314. LOIS: You do a better job [PCSOS], and you’ve had trainin an whatever than the Police
315. force themselves [PCSOS vs Police identity / role
316. MRS WILLIAMS: Yeah but if you as the Police can be bothered if there was more of
317. your driving cars at night then doing other work during the day xxx [drowned out lots of voices shouting ]
318. LOIS: Yeah but what you mean is actual POLICEMEN [not 
319. MR WILLIAMS: offended at challenge] [EX]CUSE ME I’m 
Lots of residents voices raised men and women with LOIS & MRS WILLIAMS, MR WILLIAMS speaking [1.0] 
320. MR ACTON: I haven’t finished yet love [comes in lower deep slow voice to pick up turn from line 299 but then drowned out by lots voices including MRS WILLIAMS for a about four second [4.0] the last time 
321. we came here we had 101 well since we had that talk a person down by me rang 101 
322. and said these boys had filled err boots or something down by the river and they were 
323. seen by someone walking by mid day and they seem to have attacked a swan xxxxx 
324. with bravado so she rang 101 and they said to her, you know, we’ll see to it. Then they 
325. rang her back and said they won’t be coming round [police] because they’ve probably 
326. already got rid of it now. Well I mean 
327. PCSO Carl: That’s an aside [but] [PCSO drowned out looses turn 
Audience erupts lots of voices talking trying to take turn, including Peter & Cllr Harris joins in, but I 
can’t make out any of dialogue [7.0] ]
328. LOIS: That’s bad, they shouldn’t be allowed to kill a swan 28.13 
329. Peter: This needs to be dealt with we need to do something constructive 
330. MR ACTON: You’d probably get fined one thousand pounds but these kids they did it 
331. openly they’re out of control and they [101 / Police] seem to be doing nothing so they’re 
332. Getting away with it 
333. Cllr Harris: The issue that I have with this reporting business when you ring up [101] 
334. and they say there is a process to go through and I think I know, I can guess what 
335. xxx [MP City West] was on about when he replied to you there is an ASB 
336. engagement nuisance process now even if its not the tenant themselves they can get 
337. the person living in the tenancy because then the tenants responsible but its left to you 
338. to identify who they are /shouting erupts of voices raised in anger [1.5] but WHAT GETS ME 
339. is the police very often are not prepared to get out of the car and ask these kids who they 
340. are and establish where they live, BUT WE ARE ASKED TO GO OUT of our houses and 
341. ask these kids what they’re names are so we can identify who they are and put them on 
342. the list. We can’t encourage at two o’clock and three o’clock in the morning ordinary 
343. citizens to go out into a Lane in the middle of Big Avenue when we know there are 
344. kids who are drug taking, where we know they are drug taking because the next morning 
345. the needles are still in the gulley. WE CAN’T expect ordinary citizens to go out and take 
346. peoples names. SO HOW ARE YOU meant to identify who these people are? SURELY 
347. it’s the responsibility of the police to identify them, make a note of them and then 
348. find out where they live and write to the tenants and say this person on Saturday night 
349. was causing a nuisance and they’re living with you if it carries on your tenancy is at 
350. er...er... [ask] f[clr seems to invoke two different identity positions & communitarian issues for 
agencies ‘ask of ordinary citizens 29.33 
351. MR WILLIAMS: [YE]AH and if not get rid of xxxxx [name] and YOU KNOW [police] the two 
352. two tenants, and their now SPECIFICALLY the tenants and you know who they are, this 
353. Is what I mean,, and we could be rid of xxxxx if not specifically tenants him whose 
354. encouraging them. I mean driving past the house at 3am on a Saturday nights not on, 
355. when 20 or 30 youths of a night [loveMrs Williams’s and younger] can be sat outside that 
356. man’s house, and YOU KNOW they do that, you can’t tell me there’s not a policeman in 
357. Evergreen who don’t know they do that 29.54
358. PCSO Carl: What we [we do [talked over drowned out other voices; PCSO not allowed turn / speech rights to respond. Cllrs, PCSO, and residents cllr Smith wins speech rights [3.0]
359. Cllr Smith: You know this goes on as a community you’ve, let me give you an example, you’ve got the choices at PACT meetings to insist Police do something at the end of the day its in your hands [shouting erupt caught snippets dialogue – Police vs communitarian identity – see line 959 – when picks this up again
360. PCSO: Hang on [drowned out
362. Cllr Smith: You know this goes on as a community you’ve, let me give you an example, you’ve got the choices at PACT meetings to insist Police do something at the end of the day its in your hands [shouting erupt caught snippets dialogue – Police vs communitarian identity – see line 959 – when picks this up again
363. MR ACTON: That’s not on [drowned out
364. Peter: It’s not for residents to [drowned out [LOIS & JOHN + Other residents & meeting members drowned out - continues over lines 365 -7
365. MR WILLIAMS: We’re not the law THEY’RE [police] the law, THERE THE LAW [drowned out
366. Cllr Smith: What I’m trying to say, when I say its in your hands, its in your hands at the next PACT meeting [other voices cease and cllrs voice slows down a bit as confidence grows that is being allowed speech rights to continue] to TELL the police when they come to the next PACT meeting you can say to THEM as a PACT priority how many ASB orders have you served? [0.2] How many of these are ones, twos, threes and four? [0.5] 30.26
367. MR WILLIAMS: YOU KNOW WHAT HAPPENS? THEY PASS IT UP TO YOU [COUNCIL & C’LLORS] AND YOU PASS IT BACK TO THEM [POLICE] this is what happens [0.5]
368. Cllr Harris: You can’t expect these people to take the sort of actions you’re suggesting its complicated law and process and they can’t be expected to learn it 30.37
369. MR WILLIAMS: What police do we write to, who, what Police do we write to? 30.55
370. Cllr Smith: When they’re here, there should be officers here, what I’m trying to say is you have a choice now at a regular meeting of what your PACT priorities are and what I’m trying to explain is you can actually say to them when you come down to the next meeting [begins in line 384 with low, slower, calmer voice by end  of  line 386 raises volume & speed to try to keep turn
384. Cllr Smith: You can’t expect these people to take the sort of actions you’re suggesting its complicated law and process and they can’t be expected to learn it 30.37
375. [PCSO attempts to join in but Cllr raises voice and keeps speech rights] AND the trouble is their being passed from pillar to post and its NOT ACCEPTABLE [communitarian
376. MR WILLIAMS: You don’t expect the gypsies on Radial Way to go through all this to get police service [othering: other voices join in cllr Harris & MR WILLIAMS drowned out
377. Cllr Harris: The PEOPLE who need to sort out the process is parliament because they set the rules they tell the police what their responsibilities are and they tell local authorities what their expected to do [speaking really quickly and strongly but drowned out
383. MR WILLIAMS: What police do we write to, who, what Police do we write to? 30.55
384. Cllr Smith: When they’re here, there should be officers here, what I’m trying to say is you have a choice now at a regular meeting of what your PACT priorities are and what I’m trying to explain is you can actually say to them when you come down to the next meeting [begins in line 384 with low, slower, calmer voice by end  of  line 386 raises volume & speed to try to keep turn
388. JOHN: [unclear talked over [3.0]
389. MRS WILLIAMS: [unclear talked over [3.0]
390. LOIS: [unclear talked over [3.0]
391. MR ACTON: [unclear talked over [3.0]
392. MR WILLIAMS: [they’re] down the place so many times we’ve got to second level even do you know what I mean er., er ,[1.5] [very angry, very frustrated ends in exasperation, voice extremely high & thin MR WILLIAMS by this point seems to be emotionally drained – not surprising – the meeting gone quiet MR ACTON comes in in a slow strong voice 31.14
393. MR ACTON: Mr Chairman can I address Councillor Smith on what he’s asked us to do? [0.5]
394. MR ACTON: Mr Chairman can I address Councillor Smith on what he’s asked us to do? [0.5]
395. PCSO Carl: If that’s alright with you? [looking at cllr Smith
396. Cllr Smith: Yes [nods and shifts position to face MR ACTON
397. MR ACTON: Councillor, these two gentlemen [PCSOs], that are stood here [0.2] and I’ll tell you in their presence, are doing a fabulous job
398. LOIS: Yes they are, yeah I agree with that [PCSOs – others in audience nodding 31.33
400. MR ACTON: they have done more than is NECESSARY of on our behalf the issues whether
401. whether Police deal with things is different. I can tell you one incident dealt with and I can
402. Tell you WHY, well a couple of reasons why, they were dealing with a drugs issue and
403. They were given enough leads to str::string up half a dozen dealers, because they were
404.given the information. Secondly, some of the youths that were creating the problem for us,
405.found themselves employment, and they weren’t there during the hours of day daylight
406. and SO they weren’t like bees to a honey pot. It’s like bees to a honey pot when they’re
407.home. Their days off its like bees to a honey pot VOOMMMMM. But why, and I’ll tell you
408. what it went absolutely quiet and you could open your front door, and you could walk out
409. and you could actually breath air [held floor speech rights uninterrupted from 31.33 to 32.22 =
52 seconds - longest input whole meeting; until LOIS line 32.25]
410. MRS WILLIAMS: Until we get rid of these tenants we’re still going to have this problem
411.day in day out. [1.0] That’s the way it is
412. MR WILLIAMS: Why can’t, why can’t the police and council, they’re their landlord aren’t t
413. They, get rid of the tenants from these two houses?
414. MR ACTON: Its not , it’s not what these two officers are doing, it’s the police, they
415. [PCSOS] are doing a tremendous job [clear distinction Police and PCSOs
416. MRS WILLIAMS: It’s the POLICE and the council
417. MR WILLIAMS: Yeah police should be helping us
418. PCSO: [drowned out
419. Cllr Harris: [drowned out
420. R4 : Yes, the tenant on xxxx [name of avenue] we’ve been trying to get rid of him for 421.
years and years and every time you, he nearly gets evicted he finds another excuse
422. why he can’t [1.0] [and that] 32.56
423. MRS WILLIAMS: [But if he’s causing so much problems than [why [drowned out ] that’s
424. w]hat I’m saying
425. MR WILLIAMS: [they’ve always got an excuse]
426. [PCSOS & other voices drowned out for four seconds 4.0] THE thing is [interrupted
427. PCSO: We know which one of the houses he is from we’re down there [xxxx
428. R4: [and s]ince he
429. had the last appointment and avoided eviction things went quiet for months, but all of a
430. sudden their back a[nd that]
431. PCSO: [alright] you show me the address and we’ll go back to the housing
432. [department] again and see what we can do. I did have a meeting before myself and
433. Dan [other PCSO] did and when, with the housing
434. Cllr Harris: Are they council?
435. R4: Yes
436. Cllr Harris: Definitely
437. R4 & MR WILLIAMS: Yes they are
438. Cllr Harris: And their both council tenants
439. R4: Yes both council 33.28
440. MR WILLIAMS: And what you’ll go drive past now, you can go up our street now and look
441. At the one man’s house and you will [see ] them outside
442. MRS WILLIAMS: [Yes] even in this weather [wet rainy September night
443.MR WILLIAMS: Yep even in this weather you’ll see them and by the end of 12 midnight or
444. 1 o’clock in the morning it will have built up to at least 15 to 25 people I’m NOT
445. EXAGGERATING MR WILLIAMS: Yeah that’s one house, its Monday for god sake, that’s
446. every night it goes on not just Friday and Saturdays, yeah [and [other voices neighbours
begin to join in
448. Cllr Harris: If you can give me the address and I’ll follow it as long as [interrupted
449. MR WILLIAMS: And the gentleman has got half a dozen cars in his drive. WHYS he
450. Allowed that, half a dozen untaxed uninsured [whys he
451. PCSO Carl: Are they on his property or on the road

452. R4: They’re drowned out

453. MR WILLIAMS: NO No drowned out by others including PCSO unclear for six seconds [6.0]

454. MRS WILLIAMS: It’s a council property not private shouts above the rest

455. JOHN: I mean the council doesn’t rent scrap yards they rent ‘ouses and you’re only allowed two cars on your drive

456. [all shouting drowned out other voices male and female for three seconds [3.0]

457. PCSO: They have to be taxed if they’re on the road but if they’re on a property

458. Peter: But it’s not private it’s not public, if they’re on a property it’s not public road and we can’t do anything

459. R4: It does seem to be one rule for them drowned out other voices male and female

460. PCSO: But it is on council land & its up to you to phone the council and inform them [1.0]

461. JOHN: There’s a lady with her had up over there?

462. Cllr Jones: Yes I’ve been waiting patiently Se has only spoken ‘yes’ and ‘no’ up to now see lines 87 and 291 not been a contributor vocally so far; Russell Harris senior in labour party and though less PACT attendance is senior in ‘pecking order’ of Ward councillors. Humour injected with laughter from some of residents / audience

463. LOIS: Yes she has

464. Cllr Jones: I tried to report a drug deal this afternoon in xxxx (Howard?) road. 101 I can’t ring on my phone, we’ve had this conversation before, I went home I had a BT fax

465. PCSO:  They have to be taxed if they’re on the road but if they’re on a property

466. Peter: But what’s the answer to wot she just said that she’s a councillor? [2.0]

467. Cllr Jones: BUt IT’S SO FRUSTRATING that even I as a COUNCILLOR cannot report a crime

468. COUNCILLOR cannot report a crime invokes ‘Councillor’ as privileged over ordinary resident identity 35.50

469. PCSO Carl: Yes, but any information you can pass on to us we will [act on

470. MR WILLIAMS: [But that’s not respond in pause so challenged / asked again What’s your answer to that?

471. Cllr Harris: Can, can you just answer will you, she’s a COUNCILLOR and she can’t
472. get through to YOU, I mean you should be accessible [meeting goes quieter and listens, pace of speech slows]
473. MRS WILLIAMS: I don’t think that’s a straight issue, getting through to 101 I’ve never
474. Found a problem yet getting through to Evergreen Police Station, well, half the time its
475. Shut and there in Bluewater anyway
476. Cllr Jones: But they’re still in there, just because there isn’t a receptionist there are
477. Police Officers working in the station
478. PCSO Carl: But unfortunately I cannot answer for the people who are in there who don’t
479. answer the phone
480. LOIS: CAN I ask the councillor, something [speech rights not given to change topic from Cllr Harris]
481. Cllr Harris: Well perhaps you can find out why their not answering
482. JOHN: can I ask, I mean, this is a problem now. We’ve had a lot of of this and
483. unfortunately you’re, your, in the position you are there’s not Policemen ere or (h)igher
484. Police come to these meetings [hoo] can deal with this issue. I mean you can only take
485. it back and
486. PCSO Carl: [Yeah] [quiet yeah as JOHN continues speaking under ‘whoo’] 36.50
487. JOHN: (a)rgue it back and forth [0.5] [you should have the Police,
488. PCSO Carl: [I wouldn’t say argue it back & forth] [JOHN continues]
490. JOHN: in a higher position by your side, I mean your Inspector who should be able to say
491. ‘RIGHT’ and go back the next day and tell PEOPLE OFF if they haven’t responded. The
492. thing is this is what makes these people frustrated your doing your best and you can go
493. back but if they’re [Police and Senior Officers] not taking on what you take back
494. PCSO Carl: Honestly now, anything we can’t answer give us to take back that we
495. cannot address we will go back and speak to someone else
496. Cllr Harris: Yes, but what happens to it then
497. PCSO Carl: Sorry? [Surprise in voice – pace of speaking and volume begins to pick up again
498. Cllr Harris: What happens to it then?
499. PCSO Carl: Well the action is taken 37.28
500. Cllr Harris: It’s the same thing we as local councillors, we don’t get a council officer up
501. there, I mean we as local councillors I can’t go into tomorrow to a council office and
502. INSTRUCT AN [0.2] OFFICIAL [1.0] to do something I [council officers identity vs cllrs
503. PCSO Carl: I DON’T WANT TO INSTRUCT SOMEONE I WANT TO ASK FOR THE[IR
504. HELP [shouts this interrupting cllr Harris]
505. Cllr Harris: [keeping same even tone and pace of voice] That’s right, it’s the same thing
506. these people want to talk to the KING they want to talk to the person that CAN GO IN TO
507. THE COUNCIL OFFICIAL AND SAY ‘I WANT YOU
508. TO DO X’ [2.0] AND THAT’S WHOM WE SHOULD HAVE AT THE TABLE
509. MR WILLIAMS: Yeah
510. Peter: But WHO is that?
511. Cllr Harris: Well the INSPECTOR see [drowned out by shouting [4.0]] or if it’s a Housing
512. issue the Housing Officer should be there
513. MR WILLIAMS: Do you know what gets me, do you know what we ad on Sunday we went
514. to the Council and we complained about [1.0] neighbours right and someone told us the P
515. Police even KNOW who they are, are they going to sit their and be honest they know who
516. they are BUT, it’s like, it comes down to us again. When it reaches so far we have got to
517. put ourselves forward an knows these people [and
518. Cllr Harris: [LOOK the Police should be able to identify
519. people and report on behalf of residents you sh[ouldn’t] [talked over, asb powers & tools
520. Cllr Jones [You haven’t got to know them] [both cllrs talking at once cannot make out [2.0]
521. Cllr Harris: But you have got to keep a record and you do have to be able to identify
522. them and as I say very often [shouted down by MR WILLIAMS & MRS WILLIAMS
523. MRS WILLIAMS: [YOU can’t expect us]
524. MR WILLIAMS: [BUT WE’RE NOT GOING TO STAND THEIR AND
525. WAVE IN THE STREET AND SAY ‘OOER
526. MRS WILLIAMS: Or WORSE, what’s worse can you give me your name and say it slowly
527. While I write it down on a bit of paper [talked over lots of voices shouting police identity [3.0]
528. MR WILLIAMS: THAT’S BEYOND, SURELY we don’t have to do that SURELY it’s only
529. The Police who can take neighbours further details NOT us. You know what I mean
530. surely it should be them [who [residents identity care takers & victims/ communitarian
531. MRS WILLIAMS: [We are the innocent person and THAT would be [enough
532. Cllr Jones: [we agree [cllrs agree 38.58
533. LOIS: you, YOU ARE THE LAW OF THE LAND it’s your job not ours to deal with this
534. MRS WILLIAMS: You ought to be dealing with this not telling us to take the law into our
535. hands, and when we try to ask for help there’s so much umm you know err err red tape
536. And that we can’t get through it
537. LOIS: If we can’t have faith in the LAW [0.5] [throws hands in air - astonished look then [1.0]
538. WEL::L we might as well all give up and be vigilantees then IN IT [police identity and
539. residents communitarian
540. PSCO Carl: We’re, we can, as you know [unclear 0.5] we don’t involve things in [unclear
541. [1.0] we are trying [drowned out by residents [2.0] it’s not a quick fix issue [Police identity and
542. challenge how deal within limits PACT priorities and ongoing issues
543. LOIS: We know that, [inferring we’re not stupid – talking in a slower voice] look, this friend of
544. mine [0.5] he wrote to the Chief of Police and he showed me the letter and he had a letter
545. from the Chief of Police back to me, well back to him, he sent me a copy which said the
546. Act Path would have more lighting and ermm he gave me the name of a a a place to
547. make ermm and that it could be made a drink free zone and needed only xxx people to
548. make it a drink free zone and that we had to [unclear 2.0] But if that means people can
549. still drink there what’s a drink free zone then? [voice rises] I wrote to everybody who else
550. is there to write to? [see line 556-8 below husband confirms, written to Police, Council including
551. Housing, and Councillors,
552. Cllr Harris: It becomes an important issue then of resources, its like everything isn’t it,
553. if you haven’t got the traffic wardens you can’t enforce parking, that’s the issue. If you
554. haven’t got the police to come along and enforce a no drinking zone [1.0] then it doesn’t
555. really mean
556. MRS WILLIAMS: No that’s true, fair do’s, you dun’ your job ‘an the area all quieten down
557. For a bit [y]use dun your half BUT the problem never moves NEVER MOVED, THEIR
558. COUNCIL TENANTS THAT’S WHAT WE’RE ON ABOUT and the amount of letters WE
559. WROTE TO THE CHIEF OF POLICE, COUNCILS, EVERYWHERE [0.5] THE PROBLEM
560. IS STILL THERE [resident seems to stick up for police and what they did and move focus on to
561. what Council have and have not done – Council & councillors identity [lots voices at once unclear [2.0]
562. MR WILLIAMS wins speech rights 40.30
563. MR WILLIAMS: But I can understand its hard you chasin’ them from our street to their
564. Street, or their street, or their street BUT then you still got the same problem, [them
565. PCSO Carl: [we wi::ll chase them
566. round from street to street [1.0] err I don’t think we mean to [0.5]
567. LOIS: But what’s the point of chasin them round and round then. Why can’t somethin be
568. done with those kids, why can’t somethin be dun to WORK WITH THOSE kids. Let me
569. tell you what we’ve don as Villagers right. You know this, you’ve witnessed this over the
570. six weeks holidays, I’ve got a picture here to prove it. All the children we know are goin a
be bored an ave no where to go. WE provided them with activities right. Now the older boys sit on the street, drinking, swearing at pensioners, giving them attitude. Well, at those fields over a hundred children off the streets we took, up the fields. We didn’t get these children we didn’t get money for them [communitarian, care takers vs victims]

Peter: It was a voluntary activity we did with them

LOIS: At the rec, you witnessed it you seen it. The COMMUNITY have seen it, they ALL SAID HOW FANTASTIC IT WAS, they were SO SURPRISED to see these people (kids) that they’ve ad trouble with face to face there playing footie [they

MR WILLIAMS: [but i]sn’t th[at [LOIS keeps turn

THEY needs to

be engaged

DANA: (CONCERNED GARDENERS )They need something to do [Cllr Jones WHISPERS under breath so only I and Cllr Harris sitting on her other side can hear her actual volume of voices from LOIS & DANA is well below levels for most of meeting so far].

Cllr Jones: They don’t have to get hysterical

In other conversations she has described CONCERNED GARDENERS and Peter K as ‘political trouble makers’ (lost election May 08 but making a bid for Evergreen again – see notes consultative meeting Evergreen & Caerau 21st May 2009; May 2009 Planning Application turned down); also Labour seems to be supporting rather than opposing Planning Application for Rec etc (see interviews & meetings of 10.09.08 - think MM said well it’s debatable whether Labour did really change to oppose CONCERNED GARDENERS or just said so around election). CONCERNED GARDENERS is originally a single interest action group originally set up to oppose planning bid; from Autumn 2008 they seem to have gained credibility with Council Officers & Police CCSP and attract positive comments based on a)their voluntary summer play scheme work b) fire work display c) Saturday football club. As at Sept 2008 Peter K reported (he stood for local elections Evergreen Plaid) many Council Officers will not speak to him anymore – blacklisted. Pace, tempo & volume rises again

Cllr Jones: That's what you do isn't it you do engage them [referring to PCSO identity

PCSO Carl: THE thing is, [gains turn so drops voice] the thing is [0.5] all PCSO’s are community police, we're here for the community that's what we try and do [LOIS Raises voice to gain speech rights PCSOs try again lines585,; then 590 & 591 talk/ shout together – anger shows

LOIS: IT’S OK ENGAGING WITH THEM, but it’s not really engaging with them though is it the way you do it [is it

PCSO Carl: [BUT we do try to

LOIS: No, no YOU CAN’T SAY YOU’RE ENGAGING WITH THEM to really engage

because they’ve got to have something to DO WE PROVIDED THEM [referring to PCSO identity

PCSO Dan: [WE PROVIDE THE]M these children with [angry - shouts to try and take turn

PCSO Carl: [we … we do… we..] [also trying to win back speech rights

Cllr Harris: Lets be honest here, the problem hasn’t gone away has it? I’VE HAD COMPLAINTS JUST THIS WEEK from people from people in Bluwelyn Ave saying their cars been damaged, or their son’s car damaged for about the sixth time and he won’t visit them anymore

LOIS: Well that happens around us [unclear talked over by Cllr Harris to continue his turn

Cllr Harris: YES IT MAY ASSIST THE PROBLEM IT DOESN’T ELIMINATE the problem [loses turn to LOIS who directly challenges Cllr Harris

LOIS: No disrespect MISTer Harris, right, it ‘appens everywhere [it’s not [seems to be putting him down, in his place not hold sway as Cllr with privileged position/status/ power’; never seen Cllr Jones and Police don’t challenge Cllr Harris like this

Cllr Harris: fires and fails to talk loud enough to take a turn + other residents male and female all trying to speak here – unclear [1.5] LOIS retains / regains through higher volume

xix
LOIS: it happens in St Fellons and I'M FED UP of Evergreen being picked on as the problem. Issue of area being labelled as bad and worse than others by agencies & press.

Cllr Harris: I'm a xxx of Evergreen. Unclear Harris and LOIS struggling to get speech rights.

LOIS: You just said, right, that its hard to get through. See lines 466 -481 debate involving cllr Jones and Harris... yeah?[0.2] that you're not getting a response how are they going to elp, right, how do YOU expect they're going to cope when they got 1,500 people more living in this area. ARE THEY going to give us extra Police Force? They saying their going to give us cameras, right, they got cameras down on the avenue. A guy was kicked unconscious it going past he was there unconscious on the floor. As I went to the shops to find out what happened there was no one manning the camera. Voice rises in pitch at end indicating disbelief that this is seen as a solution still see notes on line 579 regarding Labour seen as supporting planning application - police resourcing + identity + councillor identity + politics.

PCSO Carl: How do you know there was no one manning the camera? Said slowly in a low resigned voice – this recovers in line 612 – brighter definite tone and pace.

PCSO Carl: The only person who would have known LOIS finishes sentence for him.

LOIS: Are the Police themselves and I knows cause I spoke to a Police Officer at one of The PACT meetings, and he said in that discussion there wasn’t anyone there they were shorthanded. Researcher Notes: Chief Super /City Deputy Commander BCU and because he came Evergreen Neighbourhood Inspector attended an Evergreen PACT meeting on one occasion; same meeting Acton Rd / Act Path residents brought ‘weapons – Shears etc’ dropped in their garden by adult and youth ASB ...... only time Police attended up to this point in my data collection – Beat Manager came once in March or April 2009 but did not come to next meeting in May – minutes of SWCNM meeting for March/ April 2009 record that ‘with new Beat system Police will attend every second PACT meeting’. It seems someone could have put pressure on Inspector Andy Smith for Police to attend PACTs within his sector – has been said at consultative meetings and main SWCNM meetings issue of non-attendance Police and cllr involvement in discussions at PACTs re non-attendance at Evergreen PACT (plus other PACTs); see my notes 21st May 2009 SWCNM meeting Inspector Evergreen highly derogatory comments about two cllrs, Cllr Smith ‘saviour of the world on ASB’ and Cllr Coolgreen and banter about ‘sees herself as ruling /running Evergreen Police sector’. With Police attendance issue he may be being made to fall in line with other sectors to have some Police presence. Pace has slowed again, next two male speakers slow as well – two professionals ‘who work in’ and not ‘live in’ area – see HO Respect website + Karn(2007)

LOIS: Well they turned round, she had actually remembered the incident, it was quite a while ago.

PCSO Carl: An incident like that, I mean Central, its bound to be monitored there’s no way, at Central station the screens are constantly monitored. This wouldn’t have got somebody there to monitor that situation going back to his interrupted turn begun in line 616. Lines 616 to 62 professionals ‘work in’ area working together support each other – cllr and police identity.

Cllr Harris: [looses turn to PCSOs the screens are always monitored]

Cllr Jones: [looses turn to PCSOs the screens are always monitored]

PCSO Mat: Every single screen is monitored.

LOIS: Well they turned round, she had.

PCSO Carl: I'm sorry. Empathic calm voice - hedge, repair work(?) use of apology to establish power and right to turn. An incident like that if there was nobody there at time they would have got somebody there to monitor that situation. Going back to his interrupted turn begun in line 616. Lines 616 to 62 professionals ‘work in’ area working together support each other – cllr and police identity.

Cllr Jones: There's a few of them in there anyway.

LOIS: Well I've got it in my, noted down one from of the PACT meetings. Here I'll go through my notes now it was stated that they were short staffed. The person had taken the time, that was with you, had actually remembered the incident, it was quite a while ago.
629. now [querying / challenging account giving from professionals police and clhrs and quoting another officer back to them

630. PCSO Mat: no, those cameras are on all the time now [contesting residents view again

631. LOIS: [unclear [2.0] raises voice to try and be heard, literally have her version of events heard / accepted both PCSOs and Clhrs trying to take turn back from LOIS and justify their version PCSO Carl raises voice and wins through volume

632. PCSO Carl: No way, I can assure you, those cameras would have been monitored I can check who was on duty at that time [4.0] [For the first time there is a distinct pause in the meeting 44.02

[Researcher Notes: LOIS does not pick up issue again having been put down and defeated in presenting her case. There is a drop of energy levels perhaps clhrs and PCSOs responding so strongly and in concert has silenced residents’ contributions; perhaps this debate has run out of steam to drive it. This defence and denial of resident view is at odds with his earlier statements that ‘he can’t speak for who doesn’t answer phone because he was not there’ within his own station - see lines 478-9 - in contrast he seems quite able to authoritative Evergreen dispute residents account; this may or may not be related to support of clhrs on this issue rather than previously when clr was making challenge of no one answering(i.e. not as dismissible or challengeable as a non-professional lower status / authority figure as a resident – communitarian vs professional culture /roles /identity. The pause may indicate a new phase in the meeting reinforced by JOHN’s procedural contribution

634. JOHN: Err…[0.5] err…[0.2] CARL there’s someone wants to speak 44.08 [From back of room JOHN (note-taker) tries to attract attention and signal to PSCO Chair of meeting someone wants to speak, points to person

635. Peter: With respect to the activities up the rec [footie & CONCERNED GARDENERS]

636. I wondered if it be possible to get some figures on crime and anti-social behaviour say to compare this summer with last summer. I’m talking about accounts.. kkmmm [coughs and clears throat]

638. I was at a meeting when it was announced that thirty thousand pounds had been spent on a camera at Badgers Lane, once the camera had been put in we were told there was no money to switch it ON, we had errm.. there’s a camera near the library in Coolgreen err..

641. which I’ve been told by the librarian works quite nicely but there is nobody there to watch the output [Peter1 speaking in slow calm moderated voice with authoritative air, PCSO jumps in rapidly demanding in tense fast speech that cuts Peter off

643. PCSO Carl: Which cameras that?

644. Peter: It’s the one by the library

645. PCSO Mat: It’s Wisson Road (?) that’s on all the time

646. Peter: Well that may not be true I know it’s not common currency but I do believe it’s not always on [Two PCSOs again working in concert to challenge member of public – who did stand for Plaid in election but not elected so no official position – is an Evergreen resident

648. PCSO Carl: They’re actually on, Clericston Road is constantly monitored, errrr [0.3]

649. Peter: If I could just move on, a bit further [0.3] with regard to the people’s problems that we HAVE [0.5] there is very very little that we have in terms of dealing with the people [0.3] what the solutions that we have, that we are offered are fencing, gates, chains, padlocks, these serve to alienate people even more [0.3]. What the villagers have done with the err..., with the rec for example, something for the bad boys if you like. There are one or two of us here who have been on the receiving end of these bad boys [drops voice even quieter].

655. It’s not a problem because if we can keep them busy it’s not a problem,

656. once you can distract them a little. Now with regard to Badgers Lane this has been a perennial problem, there’s talk now of closing it off, closing it off. Now putting a.. a...

658. fence or gate underneath the bridge, I think will be very very silly because what’s going to happen is kids will come climbing over the top
660. LOIS: They will \text{[LOIS & DANA make brief supporting comments supporting Peter speech rights]}
661. DANA: It’s Dangerous \text{[walk way Badgers Lane goes under live railway line main trains to London]}
662. Peter: Some bodies going to get killed, so my err, my proposal is to basically if
663. the if the residents themselves aren’t prepared or its too difficult somebody else should
664. Come and \text{reclaim the streets for them}. Now we’ve done this in other areas in xxx (?)
665. You Know we’ve got quite a lot of drug dealers, it wasn’t a problem \text{[communitarian, care takers, identity and role police, residents, council etc..]}
666. PCSO Carl: ermm hmm
667. Peter: Now maybe we have to, maybe the police, local adults like me, other
668. agencies perhaps youth workers, not a lot of us, just a few, maybe we just have to stand
669. Around. We then make the area ‘uncool’ by being there, they move on so \text{[voice dropping quieter]}
670. as I say its one thing putting up barriers and steels and chains but it’s another
671. thing to sit down and talk about talking about what the problem is but it really is
672. something else to go out and do something. \text{[seems to be aiming speech at PCSO’s/Chair as well as for rest of ‘audience’ of residents to hear. He is speaking very quietly now: this again slows meeting down in pace; and injects a lighter less aggressive atmosphere]} You know what I’m talking
673. about, you know the situation, and in a way you’re at a disadvantage because you’re out
674. They’re wearing uniforms \text{[0.8] but what we need are people out there who are not}
675. wearing uniforms \text{[Police identity, responsibilisation, care taker vs victim, and communitarian identity; see line below and Evergreen PACT 19.05.08]. Longest turn with some minor additions of inputs and a brief challenge of whole meeting 44.12 to 46.51}
676. PCSO Carl: We are out there, but in one way that’s the problem who else is really going
677. to be \text{[Police identity and communitarian identity – care takers]}
678. JOHN: What if 50 -70 kids, often is \text{[interrupted by PCSO Carl / Chair who raises voice slightly, to get speech rights]}
679. PCSO Carl: As far as I can see, when we’re out there, we’ve only got to stand there, if
680. there’s a crowd and they soon go a way we don’t have any trouble, they just walk on, they
681. say ‘oh there’s the police lets get out of here’ \text{[JOHN tries to speak Carl temporarily raises his}
682. voice & pace of speech to keep turn] THEY DO GO, you know, I'm not saying that every
683. officer, depending on the situation you go into, if there’s a group, err, if there’s a group of,
684. like you say, 70 kids, I’m sorry \text{[1.0] but I wouldn’t put myself in that situation}
685. LOIS: Hmm
686. PCSO Carl: With two of us going in, two officers, I would actually ask for some back up,
687. I’m sorry, I wouldn’t put \text{myself in that situation, what if one of them kicks off and it}
688. develops into a \text{them and us situation, what’s going to happen, what if they retaliate}
689. against us \text{[Police identity and communitarian identity, othering, care takers – interrupted by LOIS]}
690. LOIS: Hmm, yeah well then you can appreciate what the residents feel like \text{[LOIS speaking much more quietly and slower now following Peter’s slow and reasoned inputs – less emotion and volume in voice, now more another voice of reason [unclear [2.0] interrupted by PCSO Carl / Chair who raises voice to get speech rights]}
691. PCSO Carl: YEAH BUT I'M not actually saying the residents should go out there, it’s not
692. the residents job to do that IT’S OUR JOB \text{[Police identity and communitarian identity – care takers]}
693. Bonny: Yeah but what are we supposed to do WHEN nobody turns up \text{[Police] [Bonny is a female resident Moon Farm Road – quietly spoken unclear [2.0] both Bonny & PCSO Carl / Chair speaking: he raises voice again to get speech rights]}
694. MR WILLIAMS: That’s the issue night after night they’re there and nobody turns up
PCSO Carl: I appreciate that, but all I'm saying to you is if they're doing something wrong [drops voice now as confident he is keeping turn] if you don't know who they are [identities & responsibilisation] But if you can provide us with some details and a description maybe because what tends to happen [humour – serious point said lightly - laughs nervously & some other brief chuckles from other residents. Atmosphere is far less adversarial/antagonistic/aggressive and less tense than earlier]

Bonny: But [0.5] THEY’VE got hoods ON how we expected to

PCSO Carl: But all I’m saying is without descriptions we’re not going to know who we’re looking for with up to 70 kids, you know we go in there, they all disperse [0.2] all, they’re gone

MR WILLIAMS: [Yeah] [talked over PCSO Carl / Chair to maintain his turn again]

PCSO Carl: [Yeah] but you know the only way we know whose there, or hopefully who we want, is by description, oh yeah he’s got a black hood on, he’s got some mark on his face [MR WILLIAMS raises voice to get her turn in]

Bonny: [Yeah]h but They're THERE [0.5] EVERY[0.2] SINGLE NIGHT and I don't know how we're meant to get their descriptions

How we’re meant to get their descriptions [unclear [0.2] Uses emphasis but in a firm measured tone – still less emotion; unclear at end because voice / statement gets quieter and fades into a mumble]

MR WILLIAMS: How we going to see their shoes at 1am in the morning [shril louder voice Chair / PCSO responds quickly in quiet tone to take down tempo and keep his flow / speech rights]

PCSO Carl: You don’t have to stop there, I’ll give every single person here my contact number and I will attend, I mean how many times have you phoned me on issues

JOHN: Yeah [nods yes to this]

PCSO Carl: and if I’m not there I will attend and if I’m not I’m sure one of my colleagues or I’m sure every officer in Evergreen on the Neighbourhood Team will attend there. But as you say it’s exacerbated and if you deal with the ASB then unfortunately we don’t work 24 hours a day we work shift work, 8 hour shifts. If we’re there [interrupted by MR WILLIAMS]

and we are able to attend we will attend. If we’re not there leave us a message and I’m sure we’ll get back to you asap and OK I know the issues gone, its gone then by the next day. Well you might say what’s the point now but WE DO need to know about the situation, you do need to contact us so we know what’s gone on. We can patrol the area and we might be able to do something about it, we can be there then when they’re going to be there, I me[an]

Bonny: [I th]ink that’s the kind of thing we’re looking for

Now I mean the residents have put up [firm quiet statement to ‘hold PCSOs/ police to account action residents want - care taker, responsibilisation & police identity [3.0] unclear talked over by MR WILLIAMS]

[Carl doesn’t relinquish speech rights to MR WILLIAMS – see line 734] [If message and I’m sure we’ll get back to you asap and OK I know the issues gone, its gone then by the next day. Well you might say what’s the point now but WE DO need to know about the situation, you do need to contact us so we know what’s gone on. We can patrol the area and we might be able to do something about it, we can be there then when they’re going to be there, I me[an]

727. Bonny: [It's n]o good the police just driving past and doing nothing. I’ve been told you got to MAKE them stop and get out of their car. I wants them to STOP, get out of their car, and ask questions, I don’t care how much paper work got to do] [MR WILLIAMS voice rising and speaking quickly and MR WILLIAMS keeps turn talking over LOIS]

Bonny: [Yeah]

730. 734. that’s not OUR FAULT that [you g]ot to do that, hang on please [MR WILLIAMS tells Bonny & Chair / PCSO Carl
735. PCSO Carl: [I think] [unclear [2.0]
736. Bonny: [It’s so bad talked over by MR WILLIAMS not allowed to take turn, other resident voices joining in built up to shouting danch level again and fast pace 49.35
737. MR WILLIAMS: [W]hat we want is the Police to do somethi[ng] [unclear talked over
738. Bonny: [A week ago it was that
739. severe xxxx [0.5] that severe xxxxxx [4.0]/unclear talked over MR WILLIAMS and Chair / PCSO Carl
740. PCSO Carl: xxxxxx [1.0]YOU HEARD WHAT THE COUNCIL SAID YOU CAN
741. ACTUALLY PHONE YOURSELF, okay have they gone
[4.0] [unclear frequently between lines 728 up to now and for 4 more seconds as many people talking at once, MR WILLIAMS talked over but also unclear she has resorted to shouting to try and take back control, her turn and be heard, but her direct request to do so in line 734 ‘hang on please’ has not been acquiesced to by Chair or MRS WILLIAMS0
742. I mean obviously we’re going to monitor the situation, when you phone up, and say we’re going to be there in
744. MR WILLIAMS: OH YEAH [5.0] [unclear again for 5 more seconds as many people talking at once, including Chair / PCSO and a mix of other residents male and female; considered calm voice of BOB comes through first time spoken &/or heard since line 193 – able to make out talking again at 50.00 50.00
745. BOB: xxx this issue about time it takes to get attendance, it’s ridiculous, I think it was some two weeks ago up at Acton Recreation ground there was an incident of a motor 747. cycle being driven around on the upper part off the road it was reported to 101 and within 748. A few minutes a police van turned up but the police van was only there for about 25-30 749. seconds and then it drove off in the opposite direction [and xxxxxxx [lots of voices at once [3.0]
750. Cllr Harris: [The point I’m trying to make is] [Raises voice to shout over others but not given speech rights, others also trying to speak
751. BOB: [Now there were 100 people] on the ground
752. MR WILLIAMS: [The POLICE [unclear talked over [2.0] 50.38
753. PCSO Carl: If there were a hundred people on the ground of course the Police are going 754. to turn up, if the police turn up what do you think that persons going to do? Of course 755. they’re going to speed off [1.0] it speeds off [0.5] now we’re not allowed to chase them 756. err., for reasons being, I know it sounds silly, but what if they hurt themselves but what if 757. they hurt someone else whose innocent. You don’t want to go in there because 758. assuming with 100 people that person is likely to knock five people over
759. MR WILLIAMS: [unclear talked over
760. BOB: [So what’s the point in reporting it 761. because the threat was there of the motorcycle, driving toward I think it was [forty people 762. PCSO Carl [1.0] [tries to gain speech rights – talked over
763. BOB: [driving directly towards them
764. LOIS: And this motor cycle right, which is so annoying, it’s from the Eastfield Park Estate 765. and that’s St.Magans, there’s terrible crime up there and what we can’t understand is why 767. is their crime for St.Magans coming under Evergreen? They’re up there and quite a lot of 768. posh private houses an that but their called St.Magans when it suits them but when there 769. is crime and violence it doesn’t come under them it comes under Evergreen and that’s so 770. UNFAIR, it’s NOT RIGHT [St.Magans – and Eastfield Parks St.Magans post codes. St.Magans is a neighbouring ‘posher’ and much less deprived well off Council Ward. The entrance to Eastfield estate is through Evergreen off Big Avenue but estate itself is or ‘is seen as’ a different Ward. Acton Rec events – hence so many people including children on the grounds for Saturday morning football is run voluntarily by CONCERNED GARDENERS and for local Evergreen families: OTHERING ‘outsiders’ coming in and causing problems for us; emotional situation and issue of social, spatial and
geographical divide. Logic of situation might say get number plates, however it was not picked up and never said clearly if motorbike had any number plates nor if these details given to police. Adds to unfair and always bad reputation presented of Evergreen, nothing good said about our area / people; see line 601 when this is first raised.

771. PCSO Carl: What do you mean?
772. PCSO Dan: Eastfield Park comes under Evergreen, it’s Evergreen isn’t it?

For eleven seconds all individual voices drowned out lots speaking at once all unclear [11] including both councillors

773. JOHN: I think this is where we’ve got a problem, the police have one way of dividing the
774. area and the council got another, well under the Council it comes St.Magans and under
775. Police, under their boundary I suppose it comes under Evergreen [JOHN is on national and city wide residents and tenants forum plus on Communities First Steering group for Evergreen so likely to know this

776. LOIS: It’s always been like that and that is the problem I THINK IT’S SO UNFAIR

[LOIS raises voice and interrupts JOHN; then she is drowned out by Chair / PCSO Carl speaking very fast / quickly raises his voice over LOIS’s again to get speech rights

777. PCSO Carl: [shouting When you say St.Magans give me an example, what area /drowned out numerous voices speaking at once [6.0] unclear lots of voices speaking, spoken over MR WILLIAMS and Cllr Jones

778. Cllr Jones: You know where [2.0] [talked over PCSO Carl /Chair takes over

779. PCSO Carl: We class that as the Nikkelston area. Okay, yeah that comes under
780. Evergreen, we cover it that’s part of our Sector it comes just on our boundary.

781. Cllr Harris: I guess it
782. PCSO Carl: Sorry?
783. Cllr Harris: I’ll guess it goes down to the level crossing at St.Magans I think that’s
784. PCSO Dan: Yeah, that’s right the level crossing and all the way up

52.33

785. Cllr Jones: The council boundary DOESN’T

786. LOIS: Yeah, BUT isn’t that UNFAIR though that they go through to this stage right and
787. they’re trying to say they want building to stop ASB it hasn’t worked there, the crime up
788. there is terrible the drug dealing is terrible its absolutely appalling it hasn’t worked and
789. this is all being recorded as Evergreen crime, and THAT IS NOT FAIR, it isn’t fair

[Researcher notes: idea Eastfield Park crime figures are distorting Evergreen’s when really St.Magans which is seen as posh area with low ASB & crime figures; this issue is added to the one raised in 764-770 of the motorcyclist being a Eastfield Park and not an Evergreen resident / young person. Eastfield is an up market newly built estate in 2000-02; seen as St.Magans to attract buyers of all or mainly private houses not gated but is walled – built behind the end of Evergreen council estate & accessed through roads in Evergreen not in from St.Magans end – previously on open green space classed as St.Magans and within St.Magans Council Ward boundary. View of area – see also line 601.

Chair/PCSO gets speech rights. Flurry of exchanges, rising voice, and emotions from 712 to 789 dies to normal volume and he is allowed to speak steadily at normal voice, with pauses, and his voice getting slightly quieter and with some potential breaks and pauses that could be used to take turn over in his speaking. Given turn as relevant professional and authority figure as PCSO more likely than because Chair role; but he is given floor and meeting changes pace and emotion dissipates to calmer phase again

790. PCSO Carl: I think you’ll find it doesn’t. The way its classed up there it goes under sector
791. beats and that area is part of Nikkelston beat. Evergreen is down as sector beats, I’ll
792. give you an example it goes 3201 to 3205 [1.0] err.. 3203 I think is Nikkelston area [0.5]
793. ermm so it doesn’t come under Evergreen. Anything which happens in that area is
794. passed to Nikkelston and comes under Nikkelston area [Researcher notes: unsure if PCSO/Chair has misunderstood point being made because crime figures are aggregated for each of the six police sectors – so even though he is technically correct Eastfield Park is a Nikkelston beat it does in

XXV
fact then all come under the larger police sector figures which is within the Evergreen Sector rather than smaller beat. I would not expect him to go unchallenged but am surprised challenge isn’t taken up by more people – residents & cllrs:

795. LOIS: But Nikkelston is still Evergreen though [quick burst of speech pace & emotion picks up again building to line when all voices shouting to gain speech rights]

796. PCSO Carl: But what I’m trying to get at [interrupted LOIS maintaining her point that it is part of same sector for Police stats; professional PCSO/Police version of accounts challenged; police identity & responsibilisation, communitarian, caretaker]

797. LOIS: Nikkelston is still Evergreen

798. PCSO Carl: [but] [but ...... [lines 797 to 808 lots other voices; LOIS dominates this hubbub and determinedly continues the challenge; and every time PCSO tries to gain speech rights LOIS and some of the other members of audience residents & cllrs talk over him: LOIS maintains clear voice [14.0] from line 809 when conversations in audience begin and some also vieing to get turn

799. LOIS: [It still comes under Evergreen]

800. PCSO Carl: [It still comes as]

801. LOIS: [It still classed as]

802. Evergreen

803. PCSO Carl: Yeah but [it's [0.4]

804. LOIS: [We're not talking about Fairw::[later] [Police Sector which covers St.Magans]

805. PCSO Carl: [I kno]w yes but we can't get out of

806. [that]

807. LOIS: [Well] no, it isn’t fair they go to the station it’s Evergreen then call to the estate on

808. St.Magans and that’s not right it’s still called our crime

809. PCSO Carl: But unfortunately [from line 809 most of audience residents and others all talking at once; some in general discussion with each other on this issue of classification of police figures and some raising voices and vieing to get turn /be heard for 11 seconds until LOIS gets turn rights [11.0]

810. LOIS: It’s Nikkelston and it’s not right

811. Cllr Harris: [unclear talked over 11 seconds]

812. PCSO Carl: [unclear talked over 11 seconds]

813. PCSO Mat: [unclear talked over 11 seconds]

814. Other residents: [unclear talked over 11 seconds]

815. LOIS: There’s so much crime going on up THERE that’s added to our figures, and it 816. Makes us look bad, and it’s not fair, if THEY want to be called St.Magans have they’re crime

817. Rate sent over to St.Magans [othering, them & us see line 770]

818. PCSO Carl: With regard to their crime rate, unfortunatEvergreen we don’t patrol up there

819. And our boundaries are set [we] /looses turn

820. JOHN: [An]d because it's Bluewater it sits into account for council

821. purposes as Bluewater and I don’t think the Police station takes into account whether its

822. Evergreen, Nikkelston, Coolgreen, Treigiau or Bluew[ater]

823. MR WILLIAMS: [BUT] [JOHN keeps rights 54.13

824. JOHN: And that’s why it’s under a different thing under the Police when the Council

825. the boundary cuts it off and it comes under St.Magans MR WILLIAMS Shouting to get turn

826. MR WILLIAMS: IT'S RUBBISH, WHY HASN'T THIS BEEN SORTED OUT, your telling me the government or MP’s, whoever it is, your telling me it’s RUBBISH, RUBBISH if it

828. Hasn’t ‘appened to yourself you’d be upset, it’s not good enough [54.38

829. Cllr Jones: [unclear talked over 15 seconds

830. Cllr Harris: [unclear talked over 15 seconds

831. Other residents: [unclear talked over 15 seconds

832. MR WILLIAMS: When are the government going to step in and say enough’s enough
833. man. We'll have the army on the street before you know it because the world is getting
834. so BAD what are the police meant to be able to do about it? [Researcher notes: responsibilisation & ineffectiveness of actions, role police identity; the thread of government and army is not picked up by the rest of meeting but the discussion continues on how agencies and services are letting people down when do ‘responsible’ thing as good citizens; no action, no reward loosing faith in services – see Pat O’Mally first academic (criminologist) to use the phrase responsibilisation (Crim session Gordon Hughes June 9th 2009). Also see talk by Prof John Alford latest book and work on co-production of services i.e. tax man and tax payer, back to work programmes, & housing association etc. Co-production involves both parties and dependent on both playing they’re role in provision of service not just clients of an agency (ERU seminar May 2009)
835. LOIS: I know I sent for 101, right, and this says it all
836. PCSO Carl: [talked over
837. LOIS: people can support me on this one
838. PCSO Carl: [talked over
839. LOIS: It's a good example and they said to me, well, you know they keep stealing the
840. railings, the whole of them, right [up at the Acton Rec
841. R 11: Yeah
842. DANA: Emm
843. Bonny: Yes
844. LOIS: well, we know who it was we phoned the police and they said phone 101 and this is
845. an instance of how it works. I told them where it was, who they were, that it was
846. happening now, and they [perpetrators] would have been there for a long time there were
847. loads of railings, and they had allsorts to take’em away. And they said ‘I don’t know what
848. you’re phoning us for, it’s nothing to do with you’ ‘I said pardon it’s a crime’ they said ‘NO
849. it’s council property so the council got to phone us, sorry there is nothing we can do’. So
850. they took the RAILINGS, taking them’s a crime and they’re saying there’s nothing THEY
851. can do!!! [uproar begins 55.15
852. PCSO Carl: So they [unclear talked over 5 seconds
853. Cllr Jones: SurEvergreen [unclear talked over 5 seconds
854. Peter: It’s [unclear talked over 5 seconds
855. PCSO Mat: It seems [unclear talked over 5 seconds
856. PCSO Mat: I can’t understand that either, when was it [interrupted PCSO Dan
857. PSCO Mat: When were we discussing the football game [interrupted by cllr Jones
858. Cllr Jones: It’s surprising 55.30
859. PCSO Mat: When [cllr Jones gains rights to speak
860. Cllr Jones: I think it was probably a few weeks ago [unclear talked over 6 seconds
861. various
862. LOIS: We told them who [they were
863. Cllr Jones: [we did we] told them who they were
864. LOIS: I says, I said he hasn’t even got his van taxed his van is parked on the street and
865. They said ‘owed you KNOW he hasn’t got his van taxed’ he’s parked on the street, I
866. mean MR WILLIAMS: It’s THERE ATTITUDE, we’re trying to report something, it’s
867. Appalling we’re not the criminals here and they treat us like we are [othering see line below ‘gypsies’ them & us treatment of residents by professional service – 101 & Police trying to be responsibilisation but treated like criminals not victims
868. LOIS: I mean, I’m trying to report a crime here, I said ‘excuse me I live in Evergreen you
869. know who I am I’ve rung you many times before. He’s never worked a day in his life, he’s
870. never paid taxes and he’s never taxed his van, ever, and they said ‘we can’t do anything
871. sorry’. I know if I went one day over and didn’t tax my car they wouldn’t take that into
872. consideration and I’d be rolled over the coals for not having taxed my car and they’re still
873. doing it [othering of criminal citizen versus good citizen; also how treated in an undifferentiated way by services; one rule for us and one rule for them
874. JOHN: Xxxx [calls LOIS by name] did you tell them that they also had the keys to the gate and 875. whose all meant to have keys to the gates like only parks and other services 56.16
876. LOIS: I did, I told them about keys [perpetrators had keys to go into gated area of railings
877. JOHN: [unclear talked over 5 seconds
878. LOIS: [unclear talked over 5 seconds
879. PCSO Carl: [unclear talked over 5 seconds
880. JOHN: And they pulled them out on a trolley and they took the vehicle in their to load the 881. railings up
882. PCSO Mat: What about the keys the 883. LOIS: And I had to work with parks, fair do’s parks ‘ave been excellent and they came up 884. and we had to pay for new locks out of our own purses, so when they came back to 885. collect the rest there they had the shock of their lives [perpetrators no longer have right 886. keys to collect rest of railings]. What they done now is they have one set of keys at Post 887. Office on Bluwelyn Avenue, and me and xxx we got a set of keys now so parks are 888. working and the gypsies haven’t got all the keys now except the ones to go through to 889. their horses, no longer keys to the both. So they’d (parks?) given them keys to all the 890. gates knowing they do what they do. So there’s us coming through, latch the thing down, 891. the gate, and when xxxx tried to open it and go through they couldn’t. So fair do’s to the 892. police they were there within seconds, and told them they couldn’t, and parks and 893. everyone is now up to date with situation. So all sorted, locks changed, but they have 894. gone off and they’ve got the keys to one of the gates 895. JOHN: They’re all in a gang and up to no good 896. LOIS: I’ll tell you what they ‘ave, the gypsy, I’ll give you his name after 897. PCSO Carl: Yes if you could afterwards 898. Cllr Jones: Well that’s it [pace slows, volume, tempo and emotions begin to calm down 899. LOIS: Well it’s all sorted now 57.38
900. PCSO Carl: So the land in question, whose land is it, is it council land or? 901. LOIS. Council, council land 902. PCSO Carl: so it’s council
903. DANA: Well council land, Earl of Portsmouth and 904. Bonny: It’s a real mix some private and some public 905. LOIS: Yeah well bits of it are both but its’ council property ‘in it 906. MR WILLIAMS: The police say its council and the council say its police it’s a real problem 907. police duties different, public and privately owned or council [land
908. LOIS: [it go]es on and on on:---------n
909. PCSO Carl: Well whose land is it?
910. LOIS: It’s council and Earl of Portsmouth it’s both 911. PCSO Carl: Because what I’m say::ing is if it is police or one of our err er:-----:rm
912. extended to the police then one of our, er B*** O*** [parks council employee ex-
913. policeman] can do a lot up the parks in Evergreen, so what I’m trying to say is a lot of the
914. locks may come under ‘im and see if you can change the locks 915. LOIS: ‘e ‘ave though changed ‘m Colin dun it already
916. JOHN: Oh its been done
917. DANA: Yeah they have
918. LOIS: The locks are changed
919. PCSO Carl: well whose in charge then, how did they get keys, I know we have keys, but 920. how did they get them 921. LOIS: Its parks xxxxxx whose in charge of the locks and they’re changed now, that’s
922. What I was saying, and some are kept at Bluwelyn Avenue
923. PCSO Carl: Where?
924. LOIS: Between 110 & 112 Bluwelyn Avenue, that’s where the gates are. And what he’s
doing now is ‘e’s ordering a new set of locks for the whole of Evergreen hopefully then the
keys won’t get out it’s Joe xxxx from Parks he’s the one in charge
927. JOHN: He’s ordering them now is: s he
928. PCSO Carl: Have you got some
929. LOIS: Yes I ‘ave
930. JOHN: [chuckles] it’s a bit late now though the fencing all but gone now
931. LOIS: Took the lot they did, there’s only three pieces left [pace and tempo begins to build
again MR WILLIAMS raises voice
932. MR WILLIAMS: BUT, what about if the roads a public highway have they got normal rules
933. As if it’s a public street? [2.0] is there more regulations or rules if it’s a public highway
934. then a normal street?
935. PCSO Carl: [2.0] well there’s [3.0] [these three pauses are treated with silence, this is unusual
for this meeting PCSO looses turn with last pause; looks as if struggling to formulate his response,
others begin to talk, and Cllr Harris steps in to rescue PCSO and give expert answer
936. JOHN: [unclear talked over
937. Cllr Harris: unclear unless it’s a private road it’s a public highway there is no other
938. difference
939. PCSO Carl: Yes, there’s no distinction [meeting goes very quiet
940. LOIS: What if it’s woods though
941. DANA: Then there’s no way
942. Cllr Harris: no distinction, unless it’s a private road, an un adopted road, well then if it’s
943. an adopted road, then it’s classed as part of the public highway
944. MR WILLIAMS: So there’s no extra powers to stop ‘em playing football then you can’t sort
945. of do nothing about ‘em playing there?
946. Cllr Harris: the council has powers in some cases through passing bylaws to stop local
947. ball games in some cases or prevent them causing nuisance. [voice speeds up dramatically]
948. BUT it’s the important issue again, isn’t it, you can pass as many bylaws as you like but if
949. you haven’t got the police resources to enforce them it’s a pointless exercise if you can’t
950. enforce it
951. MR WILLIAMS: Well that’s what I mean, I mean
952. Cllr Harris: It’s like double yellow lines, like I say, very often the council will want to
953. paint these, and the police will object on the grounds that they haven’t got the resources
954. and they can’t enforce it, so wasting paint [police resources, police identity
1.00.12
955. Bonny: So why can’t, can’t
956. MR WILLIAMS: The Chief Constable
957. Cllr Smith: YES, the Chief Constable, Inspectors and anything higher ranking it can’t be
958. and starting to take some names?
959. Cllr Smith: Well what you should be doing as residents now you should really be
960. contacting the Chief Constable [first raised responsibilisation and residents identity line 359
ditto parliament’s responsibilities - thread re-picked up and built on by Cllr Harris; presenting this
agenda on police responsibilities vs residents and resourcing – police identity & responsibilisation
961. MR WILLIAMS: The Chief Constable 1:00.30
962. Cllr Smith: YES, the Chief Constable, Inspectors and anything higher ranking it can’t be
963. left
964. MRS WILLIAMS: Yes we can’t keep on reporting it if they’re just coming by and none of
965. them are stopping
966. MR WILLIAMS: Yeah I wanna’ know about those laws I wanna’ know what laws were
967. passed, when they were passed
968. Cll Smith: Yes [it ]
969. Cllr Harris: [Yes] it can’t be left to residents, they’re [Police] the people who’ve got to stop it [police identity & responsibilisation issue first raised lines 278,339 & 373 now come back to this thread
970. MR WILLIAMS: Yeah they just keep driving past
972. MR ACTON: It’s no good but unfortunately we don’t want to keep having ago at the PCSOs [see this residents similar statement also in response to Cllr Smith in line 397- PCSO identity vs ‘other’ of Police
973. MRS WILLIAMS: Agreed
974. MR WILLIAMS: No, no, yeah I be fair, they’ve been great to us
975. MR ACTON: I just want to see
976. Cllr Smith: Can I just finish, these two officers are obviously trying their best but what you 977. need to do is actually start contacting the Inspector upwards and basically putting 978. pressure on them as all the residents saying ‘what are you doing about all these issues’? 979. Have you served, erm, served any ASBO’s, if you have what stage are they at? Are they 980. at stage one, two, three? Are they working, are they not working? If they’re not working 981. what are you doing about it what are you going to do?  
982. MR ACTON: Yeah  
983. Cllr Smith: The questions are really aimed at the top, Not the PCSO’s PCSO identity vs ‘other’ of Police – volume and tempo picks up again
984. MR WILLIAMS: Well, why [is it  
985. Cllr Harris: [Yes  
986. Cllr Smith: Wha[t you shou[id do]  
987. MR WILLIAMS: [When] I go down the station [Cllr Smith regains his turn  
988. Cllr Smith: What you should do is, and actually say to the two PCSO’s is ‘when you come 989. to the next PACT meeting whenever it is, if you want to wait until then or you can do it 990. before then. When you come to the next PACT meeting can you give us the answers from 991. the Inspector of how many ASBO’s have been issued in Evergreen, and when were they 992. issued, and what stage are they at  
993. MR WILLIAMS: Because when I’ve rung the police station to try and by pass these 994. [PCSOs] when I ring the Police to speak to someone you can’t get past the front desk, at  
995. the Police station  
996. PCSO Carl: When you [when you  
997. MR WILLIAMS: [you never get say a Police Officer let alone Sergeant or  
998. Inspector  
999. PCSO Carl: What are you ringing in relation to  
1000. MR WILLIAMS: In relation to trying to get someone to call  
1001.PCSO Carl: ATTENDANCE OF THE POLICE  
1002. when I spoke to them before we asked them to put a sign up, a no ball games sign, 1003. when I then phoned the councillor told me [quickly looks apologetic and corrects himself,  
1004. inference meant to say council officer] or whoever I spoke to that, and this was what they 1005. said to me, ‘we don’t put the signs up it’s up to the residents to ‘ave that put up [PCSO has taken repeated cllr comments on role of police and what police are not doing and seems to be responding with attacks on council as an agency who is not doing it’s bit police vs council identity responsibilisation  
1006. JOHN: NEVER  
1007. MR WILLIAMS: [I’ve seen signs, I’ve seen signs  
1008. MRS WILLIAMS: [Signs are everywhere  
1009. Cllr Harris: [of course they put signs up  
1010. LOIS: [They’re six foot high signs

xxx
1011. PCSO Carl: NO, No [has to shout over other voices to be heard and keep some semblance of speech rights – meeting erupts – so shouts louder [2.0] Your saying it’s up to residents to contact us and then you will work with us, well no, I’m saying if I was a resident and wanted to get a sign up in a certain street what’s the possibility of that? [Direct challenge & attack directed at Councillors, looking at Harris when asks question. Also defence of police identity and role as an agency vs council identity responsibilisation]

1015. Cllr Harris [1.0] [meeting silent, know the speech rights are to Cllr Harris who replies in a calm voice] Erm, er if there is a call, say for a sign saying ‘you can’t cycle here’ you’ve got to go to the right officer

1018. PCSO Carl: so who is that now? [I:02.47]

1019. Cllr Harris: You’ve got to go through the proper process [voice firmer again still calm voice; unspoken subtext challenge seen off]

1024. Cllr Harris: When it involves Council Notices, and the Council has to first of all has to decide that it is in the right public interest to do it and create a bylaw, I mean, if you make a request the council doesn’t have to on the basis of your request ermmm, proceed, if they do decide to proceed they have to publish public notices up on the lamp posts and all that, and you’ve seen these and the new paper they have to pay to have these all the newspapers so you get it in the xxx and the xxx Mail. Then they have to ask certain statutory bodies, including the Police, emergency services and the like. I mean a bylaw would be to stop other or block a gulley a road or whatever; and these services may have a view that it prevents them from completing their statutory duties. Now very often when there is a request for a local bylaw the police will object, saying ‘Now look, we object to that because if you put that bylaw in place we are not in a position to be able to enforce. LIKE dogs messing on a lead, you’ve seen notice signs for that, and if there is no policeman there, and a dog is messing or not on a lead, well there’s nothing you can do it’s just a sign.

1035. Cllr Harris: I know what you’re saying [communitarian & responsibilisation, othering – meeting gets loud, fast, and more heated]

1042. Cllr Harris: Well you know basically, what we’re coming back to, is we really want people to respect others and when there’s suitable times and number of places for ball games and their isn’t [suitable times] [communitarian & responsibilisation]

1051. Cllr Harris: Look what I’m saying is most sensible responsible people wouldn’t play football [communitarian & responsibilisation, othering – meeting gets loud, fast, and more heated]

1057. zoo [unclear talked over - communitarian & responsibilisation, othering]
That's a common sense solution that is the society we live in that's why. That's the society we live in that's why.

That's a common sense solution. That's the society we live in that's why. That's the society we live in that's why.

unclear talked over 2 seconds

unclear talked over 2 seconds

unclear talked over 2 seconds

unclear talked over 2 seconds

unclear all talking at once 2 seconds

claps hands 4 times to get attention and try to get his turn and order as Chair

HANG ON HANG ON

A woman here, I don' know said a 1000 extra houses were going to be built in Evergreen

No there’s gon’ a be 330 houses

Yeah another 330 houses each of ‘em with at least three people livin’ in them

Which means between 1000 and 1300 extra people

regular attendee doesn’t speak often only when roused / strong statements

I’m really angry because they gets rates for everyone them houses and we don’t get more police men do we? I mean, do we, I mean there’s got to be a relation hasn’t there? f/resourcing and responsibilisation

NO, these ‘ouses when you read the report and they are out now, these houses

Well I heard the way their gonna’ build these houses we got to police ourselves [1.0] the houses will police themselves

Well that’s why we got to because they will not put enough police

That’s right, they’re trying to build houses without giving the resources needed for them

They say that

Look it’s a difficult f/loses turn talked over – Labour cllrs voting in favour of building houses CONCERNED GARDENERS local action group against houses & planning with support Plaid candidate; also Jill Howell Chair Evergreen PACT – not here tonight – bitterly opposed CONCERNED GARDENERS ‘not suitable issue bring to PACT – family connection feud as well

It didn’t work doing that

They need to be the right number to suit the population

NO IT’S NOT we wouldn’t be here tonight the only reason we are here is because we can’t get enough Policemen to do the job SO WE CAME HERE TO COMPLAIN if there was enough Policemen on the beat to do the job, and I mean POLICEMAN ON THE BEAT [furious now

There needs to be the right number to suit the population

It’s a bit of a red herring saying that

NO IT’S NOT AN ISSUE BUT THEY COST MORE MONEY DON’T THEY f/resourcing and responsibilisation

But what I’m saying is you’ve got the same number of houses in Evergreen but the number of officers on the beat decrease without any increase at all

But every little gap has been filled up with houses there’s no space at all in Evergreen
1105. LOIS: Yeah every, every little stop, and now they want to use the Rec to build more, it’s not on.

1106. Cllr Harris: But

1107. BILL: When I drive along anywhere I wish I got a thousand pounds for every ‘ouse I see [I think referring to council tax] and what have we got to show for it? We 1110. Have to keep complaining because we can’t get anything done.

1111. Cllr Harris: But you pay separate rates to the police 1:06.51

1112. JOHN: It’s all to do with it, isn’t it, it’s all [police precept taken with council tax]

1113. LOIS: It comes in one bill doesn’t it [talked over 4 seconds

1114. DANA: [talked over 4 seconds

1115. RS: [talked over 4 seconds

1116. Bonny: [talked over 4 seconds

1117. MR WILLIAMS: Did you find out about that though. Did you ever find out about that?

1118. Radial Way Saturday night there were five police vans at the side of the gypsy site.

1119. There was five police vans at the side of the camp and I don’t know how many police inside the camp [othering gypsies]

1120. Cllr Harris: They [gypsies] do pay rent on that site 1:07.06

1121. LOIS: Yeah but how much and do they pay taxes

1122. MR WILLIAMS: How come, how come we couldn’t get any police to come out to us last week and that’s bad, how come they can? [othering gypsies, good citizens vs minority of bad citizens minority get it all – good citizens/ moral majority cannot get anything = wrong, communitarian]

1123. Cllr Harris: They probably don’t pay taxes but there is a contribution to local authority services

1124. LOIS: Yeah but they don’t pay taxes do they, do they. We pay our rates and our taxes

1125. And we can’t get services from any of you [othering gypsies, good citizens vs minority of bad citizens minority get it all – good citizens/ moral majority cannot get anything = wrong, communitarian]

1126. MR ACTON: There is another point I’d like to ask while we’re here [talked over 3 seconds

1127. LOIS: [talked over 3 seconds

1128. DANA: [talked over 3 seconds

1129. MRS WILLIAMS

1130. Cllr Harris: [talked over 3 seconds

1131. MR ACTON: BUT, but you may deny it but there seems to be a policy that everyone I 1134. Know who lives in a block of flats is, and I know quite a few [people in different blocks of flats]

1135. They all seem to have one druggie in there. It seems to me the council puts a druggie

1136. In every block of flats, [brief laughter from others in audience – MR ACTON has hands in air gesturing

1137. ‘why’] what I mean is why don’t they

1138. LOIS: [shouts over him It’s that social ‘ousing isn’t it, that’s what they’re doing they’re doing it in ROWDON ROAD, THEY’RE PUTTING THEM ALL IN ROWDON ROAD dealing drugs there and everything [othering druggies ruining it for good citizens vs minority of bad citizens minority – good citizens/ moral majority cannot get anything = wrong, communitarian]

1139. MR ACTON: Yeah but what I’m getting at is if you put a bad apple in a barrel of good apples well the whole of the good apples can’t make a bad one good. It’s a ridiculous policy putting one of these druggies in each block they’re bad, bad apples and they’re dragging the whole block down. Well the poor people living there, the poor people and

1140. what they’re having to put up with it’s ruining all their lives, it’s no good

1141. Cllr Jones: If put them in the same place it creates a ghetto, that’s what it does

1142. DANA: GHETTO, that’s what’s happened in Rowdon Road
1148. LOIS: Yeah you look at what’s ‘appening in Rowdon Road they got the whole street full of problems, that’s what they’ve turned it into and now they want to build more up there. It’s vandalised, its’ dreadful, when you go up there now there’s HOLES in the doors where they’ve busted them all and its so bad all left busted, they [council] moved them there now it’s left terrible

1153. Cllr Harris: [talked over 5 seconds – meeting erupts all shouting/talking]

1154. LOIS, MRS WILLIAMS, Bonny, JOHN, Peter, DANA, BILL, MR ACTON: [talked over 5 seconds]

1155. PCSO Carl: bangs on table a few times Okay, okay [few voices carry on [2.0] 1:08.42

1156. We can’t all talk at once [seems to break shouting & all talking at once Peter starts talking and holds turn in firm, strong, calm voice]

1157. Peter: Just very very quickly I suggest if these residents want a sure fire way of clearing the streets is to have a number of you taking photographs, right, now if 1159. You’ve just seen me round Evergreen or in the woods [Portsmouth Gt Woods] you’ll 1160. Have seen me with a 35m camera with a fairly hefty lens that’s what I’ve been using and 1161. People can clearly see it’s a camera and I’m taking photographs with it. Now if you want 1162. Evidence of what’s happening on these streets photography is the best way to do it.

1163. when you take a photograph you get date time and you can add place and that’s the way to do it. I’m not saying all of you need to do it but if some of you got out there with a variety of these, with camera’s and took photographs that is the way to collect evidence. It’s something that can then be taken further and be used as a tool of community responsibilisation, communitarian & care takers vs victims & fear of reprisals: see Evergreen PACT 19.05.08 whole exchange concerning community responsibilisation and Police / PCSO response to Peter suggesting he work pro-actively with drug dealers & line 669 above]

1167. MR WILLIAMS: But we already went out and spoken to them once and they slashed our tyres. When they were walking up the gulley, we never even spoke to these [Acton Rd / Act Path – husband & wife begins quietly but voice rising with emotion]

1169. Peter: Right

1170. MRS WILLIAMS: You can’t

1172. BOB: Yeah you can’t approach them [unclear talked over 2 seconds - responsibilisation, communitarian & care takers vs victims & fear of reprisals]

1173. Cllr Harris: Yes your actually [unclear talked over 2 seconds]

1174. Peter: There are reasons, there are reasonable ways of talking to them and 1175. Once they understand that trying to deal drugs at a particular place and at a particular time they’re going to be frustrated by adults hanging around and even taking photographs that will put them off [1.0] honestly.

1177. Photographs that will put them off [1.0] honestly, responsibilisation

1178. Peter: I think the residents feel a sense of fear of reprisals [responsibilisation, communitarian & care takers vs victims & fear of reprisals – speaking softly – offers other view to Peter; lots of voices join in ‘yeah’]

1179. MR WILLIAMS:LOIS; BOB; MR ACTON; JOHN;DANA Yeah

1180. PCSO Mat: [talked over 3 seconds]

1181. PCSO Carl: [talked over 3 seconds]

1182. Cllr Harris: [talked over 3 seconds]

1183. Bonny: [talked over 3 seconds]

1184. Cllr Harris: I would be very cautious I don’t think it’s a good idea to confront people. I remember that case just recently, I think up in the Midlands somewhere, and 1186. year old kids they murdered that man didn’t they responsibilisation

1187. PCSO Dan: Yes it’s not advisable responsibilisation

1188. JOHN: Yeah

1189. Cllr Harris: I think you really have to be careful responsibilisation
Cllr Smith: I mean, as I said to you earlier on, I gave evidence in court, I gave evidence against err…. Certain youths, and their danes decided to have a go at me, they firebombed my car.

BILL: Yeah, yeah

Cllr Smith: They attacked my property yeah. Okay, now all I can say is at the end of the day like Russell [Harris] said be very careful.

LOIS: Is it ok now? Are you ok now?

Cllr Smith: Well yes I dealt with it through the POLICE so I can’t really say anything and basically I can’t discuss anything because it’s ongoing now.

LOIS: Well, no

Cllr Smith: But certainly its been sorted out

LOIS: Well that’s what we want isn’t it, we want the police to sort this out for us for once.

MR WILLIAMS: Yeah we never even spoke to them about it, they were there and we were just passing the time of day and we got our tyres slActed

Peter: There are ways and means

Bonny: I only know that when I just paused and looked at some youths that then my car got vandalised within 2 seconds of myself getting in my car had been damaged and you know that was a look not even speaking to them or doing anything or saying ‘why are you hanging around, nothing

Mr WILLIAMS: I mean, what SORT OF THINGS ‘AVE WE GOT TO PUT UP WITH and why’s nothing done. I mean you go to work, and time ‘u go out there

LOIS:

R5:

PCS0 Mat:

MRS WILLIAMS:

BILL:

PCS0 Carl: I don’t want anyone going out there and taking pictures of ANYBODY if they’re committing an offence erm.. I mean we don’t

MRS WILLIAMS: Cllr Harris: MR ACTON: JOHN

MR WILLIAMS: I mean what about xxxx so and so from 101 can we ‘ave ‘em ‘ere, I mean it needs some explaining it needs some discipline

MR WILLIAMS: I mean what about xxxx so and so from 101 can we ‘ave ‘em ‘ere, I mean it needs some explaining it needs some discipline

PCS0 Carl: Well it’s not in my power to tell them to come here but I will ask if someone can attend

Cllr Harris: Why don’t we ask for a visit to 101? [voice is quizzical – asking the unaskable of ‘police / PCSO’s whose meeting it is?]

Cllr Jones: I still haven’t been, though we’ve had them here

LOIS: Yeah can we go to 101 and see how they handle the calls?

MR ACTON: [Yeah let’s have a nice trip shall we? [laughs himself & some others laugh]

MRS WILLIAMS: [talked over 3 seconds

Peter: [talked over 3 seconds

PCS0 Carl: Right [decides to bring meeting to order

MRS WILLIAMS: Cllr Harris: MR ACTON: JOHN [unclear talking at once + some laughter around room

MR WILLIAMS: [Yeah we’ll go from our street then
2031. PCSO Carl: Right, we just need to set some PACT priorities
[tries again to bring meeting to order and some closure now more humorous lets get on and finish it –
also already been running for over an hour; Police identity Police need to have priorities set part of the
rationale & design of meeting. All talking at once and talking over PCSO Carl / Chair
2032. So… [drowned out…. If you have some issues [drowned out….. If we can ]
drowned out 2033. Bonny: Moon Farm Road albeit here in a minority but that would be good
2034. and it would help my neighbours [issue of how many attend a PACT to vote in a priority;
care taker

All talking at once and talking over PCSO Carl / Chair
2035. PCSO Carl: WELL LOOK IT’S YOUR MEETING, IT’S UP TO YOU TO DISCUSS
2036. WHAT YOU WANT AS PRIORITIES [shouting to be heard over whole meeting talking] What
2037. do you want as priorities?
2038. Bonny: Moon Farm Road
2039. BOB: What about Badgers Lane can you tell us what’s happening [unclear talked over 1.0]
2040. PCSO Carl: Unfortunately I can’t answer that for you at the moment I would have to
2041. look into it. What do you mean on the closure or what?
2042. LOIS: What about Moon Farm Road
2043. BOB: Well obviously err… if there is err… ongoing problems
2044. PCSO Carl: There is action to see about putting up cctv
2045. LOIS: It can’t be locked though, my husband is a train driver and he’s seen a lot he’s
2046. Seen what the kids do, you know, it’s the poor drivers whose lives are wrecked [kids
2047. Crossing line and hit by trains]
2048. Cllr Harris: It is a pressing need to look into what’s happening with the closure of
2049. Badgers Lane
2050. PCSO Carl: Okay I can look into it
2051. JOHN: Why close it, who wants to close it [lots of voices
2052. DANA: They’re trying lots of voices
2053. MR ACTON: Who? [lots of voices
2054. Cllr Harris: I believe some of the residents and councillors in Bluewater think this
2055. Cllr Jones: WE DON’T, they’re trying hard [Bluewater is Plaid, Evergreen is Labour [lots
2056. MRS WILLIAMS: It’s a scandal doing that [lots of voices
2057. JOHN: They can’t [lots of voices
2058. PCSO Carl: [hangs the table- gone into ‘business’ like, snappy, lets finish this meeting mode
2059. okay, okay let’s have some shhhhh SHHHHHH [couple of voices carry on 2.0 unclear]
2060. Right, let me look into that then, and then I can give you an update. Right PACT
2061. priorities?
1.13
2062. Cllr Jones: Before PACT priorities, before priorities, lets get to issues, what are the
2063. issues at the moment? [challenges Chair & police rush to priorities and asks for police
updates
2064. PCSO Carl: Right
2065. Cllr Jones: TRAVELLERS. An update from the Police on that [travellers Cherry Close
Road – no one in the community has raised this issue yet; don’t know if cllr Jones raising it to give cllr
Harris chance to ‘sing praises’ of Council/cllrs for actions taken in public meeting?]
2066. PCSO Carl: On Cherry Close? [1.0] [lines 2066 to 2080 PCSO Carl repeatedly pauses for
thought, to clarify (sorry) or unsure how to respond
2067. Cllr Jones: CHERRY CLOSE
2068. PCSO Carl: We’ve had no xxx (stats?) through on that so I can’t give you an exact 2069.
figure on
2070. Cllr Jones: Well how many calls have been made to 101

xxxvi
PCSO Carl: [2.0 long pause] ummmm…

Cllr Jones: You used to come with those figures [when had FLSO these figures reported]

PCSO Carl: I’ve not looked into the actual figures on travellers [Police and FLSO identity]

BILL: I’ve been down there

Cllr Harris: I can tell you the order went to court on Friday

PCSO Carl: Sorry?

Cllr Harris: The order went to court on Friday, the order was issued

PCSO Carl: Right

Cllr Harris: And the council is now pressing for the implementation of the order

PCSO Carl: Yes

Cllr Harris: It’s been passed to the court bailiff and it’s now a matter for the bailiff to decide when he intends to remove them hopefully that will be in the next couple of days.

As soon as the travellers are moved the council will take steps to secure the site

PCSO Carl: Then it will become a police issue and we’ll check

JOHN: Another little issue is Evergreen Bowling Green now finished? Can you clarify please.

PCSO Carl: Is [1.0]

JOHN: Is Evergreen Bowling Green finished?

LOIS: Yes, that’s the one by

Bonny: [talked over 3 seconds – most meeting talking about closure of the Bowling Green and youth vandalism of it – near Badgers Lane]

R5: [talked over 3 seconds]

MR ACTON: [talked over 3 seconds]

R4: [talked over 3 seconds]

DANA: [talked over 3 seconds]

Cllr Jones: There’s been nothing but continuous vandalism 1:14.27

BILL: What can I say, as a young boy myself that was always sacrosanct, [meeting goes quiet – somber mood takes over set by tone and pace of BILL]

Cllr Jones: It was wasn’t it

LOIS: There’s nothing wrong wi[th]

JOHN: [alw]ays, always appreciated as a boy, they increased

The height of the railing because the kids were getting in their playing football, nothing

Was done about it, and they still went in there, now that is a sad occasion, because

That Evergreen bowling green has always been there, and I’m 77 years old and I’ve lived in Evergreen all my life, and to see that go like that, that is a great shame,[claim to authentic communitarian identity of good citizen vs bad youth - othering]

Lived in Evergreen all my life, and to see that go like that, that is a great shame,

DANA: It is

Cllr Jones: It is

Cllr Jones: It is a great shame, in other words the youth of today have won again

Cllr Jones: Yes

MR WILLIAMS: Yeah

LOIS: It is

BILL: and that is wrong, to be honest

LOIS: They’re turning it into, they’re looking into lighting it and putting a little football Pitch in their

JOHN: They’ve got enough football pitches

LOIS: Yeah well they’ve realised, they’re not maintaining it

JOHN: The problem is you give them facilities and they’re not use it they go kick a ball around in the street now [othering youth bad minority vs moral majority]

MR WILLIAMS: Yeah by our ’ouse [laughs briefly]
2119. JOHN: It is a sad occasion
2120. PCSO Carl: Well can we get on and set some priorities other than Cherry Close update
2121. Cllr Harris: Yes well can we have an update on St. Dustan, Nighmeade, &
2122. Welsh Close?
2123. PCSO Dan: Emm what do you mean, what’s the problem? 1:15.39
2124. Cllr Harris: Well, we were having lots of complaints from residents there, I know I
2125. haven’t had as many complaints now as I was but I know that part of the issue was with
2126. one individual who went to live with his grandmother, but then he came back and the
2127. problem came back and I’m now having complaints from people on Cowbrand Rd
2128. whose houses back on
2129. PCSO Dan: You mean Nighmeade and CoronationCottages
2130. Cllr Harris: Yes
2131. Cllr Jones: YES
2132. Cllr Harris: and they’re now complaining, perhaps they’ve moved from Cymric and
2133. St. Dustan into Nighmeade Rd and I wondered if that’s still being monitored [previous
2134. PACT priorities problems with ASB and youth in Cymric & St. Dustan – talking about
2135. displacement]
2136. PCSO Mat: Well that has always been a problem for us because its right near to the
2137. Road, and from xxx people use the parks opposite and jump through the gardens and
2138. use it as a pathway but erm I’m under the understanding that housing and the council
2139. are putting a fence up there [identity & distinction council officers vs cllrs and partnership
2140. working]
2141. Cllr Jones: Well the Council Officers did agree to err.. there are two little openings on
2142. to the grassy verge that’s on the Cowbrand Rd, they were going to block those up to
2143. stop the sort of rat run from Cowbrand Rd, jump over the little fence, over the xxx hump,
2144. through the Cottages terrifying quite a lot of the old people in the process and
2145. running up Nighmeade Rd and in to Big Avenue or wherever they want to go [1.0] but
2146. there’s been no movement. I tried this afternoon [moral majority good citizens vs bad
2147. minority spoiling it & othering youth]
2148. again to get hold of the local housing officer who was there when it was agreed with a
2149. higher officer wasn’t it [identity & distinction council officers vs cllrs and partnership working
2150.]
2151. PCSO Mat: Yes we were there
2152. Cllr Jones: Yes you were, but, so, but I couldn’t get hold of him
2153. PCSO Mat: Right
2154. Cllr Jones: So on that I’ll try again as on many other issues [identity & distinction council
2155. officers vs cllrs and partnership working]
2156. PCSO Mat: So with regards to that we’ll wait for cllr Jones to up date us and Cymric
2157. Close and St. David Crescent, that was an issue, I think for err.. it was for two months, I
2158. think a PACT priority?
2159. Cllr Jones: It was, but it seems
2160. PCSO Mat: Yes, as I say I was the officer for that area and it seems like ASBO referrals
2161. and tenancy letters (threat to) and everything was issued in operation with myself and
2162. the council and fingers crossed, it, it’s [1.0] I won’t say it’s gone, but it’s not as bad as it
2163. was err I’ve been getting one or two incidents reported through to 101 and visited
2164. number xxxx and just for my infordanion they’ve told me their hasn’t been any problems
2165. [2.0] [identity & distinction council officers vs cllrs and partnership working with police
2166.]
2167. PCSO Carl: So Welsh Close is still monitored
2168. PCSO Mat: Yes
2169. PCSO Carl: Yes I mean highly monitored and we are still down there on a regular basis
2170. so it is monitored
2171. MR ACTON: Acton Terrace needs to be brought back into the
2166. PCSO Carl: Right, I am going to get to the PACT priorities this time [laughter from residents [2.0] PACT PRIORITIES
2167. PCSO Mat: PACT priorities
2168. MR WILLIAMS: Acton Terrace
2169. Cllr Jones: Acton Terrace
2170. PCSO Carl: Are we all agreed that Acton Terrace is one of priorities
2171. LOIS: Yeah [flots of yeses, nods, and hands up around the room
2172. Cllr Jones: and Moon Farm Road [see line 2033]
2173. Cllr Harris: Moon Farm?
2174. Cllr Jones: Yes it’s a particular issue
2175. PCSO Carl: [4.0] [pauses to get answer looking around Do we all agree on Moon Farm Road?
2176. R5: Yeah [loads of nods and hands 1:18.32
2177. Bonny: Thank you [said very quietly with huge relief in voice - see line 2033
2178. PCSO Carl: Moon Farm Road, so xxx you say where are we on about now
2179. Bonny: We’re on about the (bus) stop at the bottom near the flats mainly elderly residents
2180. PCSO Carl: Where’s that?
2181. PCSO Mat: It’s down by Moon Farm Close
2182. Bonny: I don’t know, I only moved out there a year ago, so I [care taker come on behalf of elderly residents and neighbours who have lived their for years but too scared to come to meeting – community identity
2183. JOHN: It’s by Moon Farm Place
2184. Bonny: Yeah it’s that bus stop in particular, yeah the bus stops been smActed 2186. Up all the time, it’s drinking, and it’s literally from 5 o clock
2185. JOHN: Yes its bad
2186. Bonny: Too much
2187. PCSO Carl: Okay, any other priorities?
2188. R4: What about Den y gan Road it goes on from morning until late at night whether that
2189. can be stopped, by kiddies play area [quietly spoken can’t pick out
2190. LOIS: DANA – a few other voices start talking [1.0]
2191. PCSO Carl: Shhhh
2192. R4: I don’t know if they’re coming out there tonight playing on their bikes and kicking up
2193. a ball on the side of the house in the gulley, its dreadful for the house next door to me,
2194. just want them to stop, have to go out there and ask them [responsibilisation & community identity victim + care taker
2195. PCSO Carl: We wouldn’t advise you to go out there and speak to them [responsibilisation & police identity
2196. PCSO Carl: What they doing causing general annoyance
2197. R4: Yeah it’s a nuisance and I notice now that they’re using the gulley all night, back and
2198. forth the gulley all night, the main gulley into Big Avenue
2199. MR WILLIAMS: Can you hold people down for loitering?
2200. Cllr Harris: with intent? I don’t know
2201. JOHN: with [talked over 2.0 seconds – some laughter around how tell loitering or loitering with intent
2202. MR ACTON: [talked over 2.0 seconds – some laughter around how tell loitering or loitering with intent
2203. MR WILLIAMS: Why don’t we just ask them into the house laughter others may as well,
2204. It seems THEY’RE THERE ALL THE TIME [humour used to make point of what having to cope with
2205. LOIS: [talked over 3 seconds
2208. Cllr Jones: [talked over 3 seconds
2209. DANA: [talked over 3 seconds
2210. PCSO Carl: [shouts] Den y gan do we want it as a PACT priority?
2211. R4: I just wanted to say it’s still bad down there
2212. LOIS: YEAH IT’S STILL BAD, it’s not really fair that older kids frighten little kids out of
2213. Play area, is it othering older youth vs young kids
2214. PCSO Carl: Yeah
2215. Peter: [talked over 2 seconds
2216. JOHN: [talked over 2 seconds
2217. PCSO Mat: [talked over 2 seconds
2218. LOIS: IT’S NOT FAIR ON THE TENANTS
2219. Peter: No
2220. PCSO Carl: [shouts] Okay let’s put it as a priority, and try and xxxx its all over
2221. R4: For some reason they all seem to be little girls [meeting breaks into laughter and
lots of chat amongst audience for [2.0]
2222. PCSO Carl: We’ll keep it as a PACT priority, IS EVERY ONE ‘GREED TO THAT?
Resounding ‘Yes’ from most of audience
2223. PCSO Carl: Can I ask if there’s any other issues apart from
2224. JOHN: Well the only other issue is the issue about motor cycles, and your issue about
2225. chasing motor cycles, but there’s still motor cycles been ridden down Portsmouth Great
2226. Woods and quad bikes, and also on the Rec an’ it’s usually on a Sunday when you’re
2227. undermanned anyway
2228. PCSO Carl: That’s not a problem any way
2229. JOHN: you know [talked over 5 seconds
2230. BOB: [talked over 5 seconds
2231. MR ACTON: [talked over 5 seconds
2232. LOIS: [talked over 5 seconds
2233. DANA: [talked over 5 seconds
2234. Peter: [talked over 5 seconds
2235. PCSO Mat: Quiet please
2236. PCSO Carl: Are we done

Side conversation turns and speaks to me who is sitting next to her  while these other
conversations & main meeting is going on – whispering doesn’t seem to have any intention of
saying this to main meeting – Moon Farm Road already a priority
1. MRS WILLIAMS: I have to tell my friends and family not to visit I have to tell them not to
2. Researcher: so you tell them not to come because you’d be embarrassed or because
3. they’re cars would be damaged
4. MRS WILLIAMS: it’s because it’s so dreadful with the youths hanging out there from 5 o
clock
5. Researcher: that’s terrible
6. MRS WILLIAMSO: yes it is I wish I’d never moved there but I’ve got lovEvergreen
neighbours, but I can’t do
7. another year of this
8. Researcher: how long have you been there then?
9. MRS WILLIAMSO: about a year now and it’s every single night, I’m like a prisoner in my own
home
10. Researcher: That is bad
11. MRS WILLIAMSO: I can’t do another year of this I’m tearing out my hair I it’s frightening, it’s
too much [voice so quiet she is drowned out main meeting 1:22.40
12. Researcher: Have you been to one of these meetings before
13. MRS WILLIAMS: No, no, I know about them through my work and I’d been to one in xxxxx with

14. work and Cllr Jones said try to come to my own one, so I have [cllr Jones – who gave her support for Moon Farm Rd as a priority – heard /experience of PACT through work]

Main conversation
2237. GORDON: regular attendee man in his 50’s very quietly spoken and never speaks  Well 2238. There’s car crime, there was six incidents on xxxxxx

2239. PCSO Carl: There has been quite a few arrests down as Evergreen autocrine. North

2240. Evergreen is err xxx (reading) South Evergreen is xxxxx and Nikkelston area xxxxxx to be

2241. honest car crime and theft from vehicles has been high in Evergreen in fact there was a

2242. report by somebody near your house for theft from a vehicle earlier today plus we’ve had

2243. a lot of intelligence about whose doing it but again that’s down to public as well giving us

2244. information about people who are doing all sorts of crime  [voice much more confident

2245. and speech fast and clear talking about ’crime and crime stats] which is good

2246. GORDON: The main trouble with the youth is they cover up and you can’t see who they are

2247. PCSO Carl: No I mean that’s the main thing they don’t want you to see them, that’s the

2248. whole point of it

2249. GORDON: There were three instances of actual windscreens

2250. PCSO Carl: Are you just talking about abandoned cars or other vehicles?

2251. Peter: It’s criminal damage

2252. GORDON: There was three different things, there was [2.0] err there was three

2253. windscreens within err and apparently another one, I mean normally people break into

2254. Cars and then one of those cars was subsequently stolen and my car was broken into in

2255. The last fortnight and an attempt made to drive off in it

2256. PCSO Carl: It can be monitored by all means

All talk at once can’t hear what’s said also Bonny begins speaking to me again

Side conversation  [40.0] seconds  1:24.03

15. Bonny: So I’ve only been professionally before
16. Researcher: who do you work for?
17. Bonny: one of the other Community First projects
18. Researcher: Ahh so you would know about PACT then
19. Bonny: Yes I’ve only attended one other meeting
20. Researcher: But not Evergreen?
21. Bonny: No, to be honest, once I’m in the house I don’t go out in the evenings, I’m
22. too scared to leave the house, this is the first time I’ve been out that isn’t for actual work in
23. the evening. In the day time when I’m out I have to take the dogs over to my Dad’s
24. Because the youths taunt and upset them so much. I pick them up after collecting my
25. daughter
26. Bonny: She’s nearly nine now, she’s at my fathers tonight.
27. Researcher: That’s good your happy she’s safe
28. Bonny: It’s not just me I’ve got to think about, I’ve got really elderly neighbours and they’re
29.so and they’re so lovely I really want to sort something out to protect them, it’s important to me  [care taker vs victim identity communitarian

30. Researcher: I can see that, you’ve come tonight
31. Bonny: Yes someone’s got to help them, they can’t be expected to live with this for the rest
32. Of their lives living in fear and being terrorised can they? [care taker vs victim identity communitarian

33. Researcher: Nor yourself
34. Bonny: No, it’s bad, but I will move as soon as I can, I’m lucky I’m able to do that because
35. mine’s a private rental

Main conversation

2257. PCSO Carl: Right can we all get back to the PACT priorities, so we’ve got Acton
2258. Road, Moon Farm Road and Den y gan Rd as main priorities? 1:24.43

Some laughter from the audience – unclear lots voices still talking

2259. PCSO Carl: Right so are we all happy with that? [nods around room from audience
2260. So are we having the next meeting on xxxx [nods around room from audience
2261. So next meeting is on the first Monday at 7pm? What date is that? [nods around room

from audience

2262. LOIS: So that'll be let’s see its September now
2263. JOHN: I think [JOHN sat at back has been doing notes while no FLSO
2264. LOIS: The first Monday is the 6\textsuperscript{th}
2265. JOHN: Right
2266. PCSO Carl: Right so until October everybody then
2267. LOIS: But you [police] sent letters saying it can’t be [who owns meetings Police identity
2268. PCSO Carl: Usually first Monday of month
2269. JOHN: Seems it should be

Lots of discussion and voices talking at once, some laughter

2270. PCSO Carl: [talked over 3 seconds – even PCSOs are discussing this
2271. PCSO Dan: [talked over 3 seconds
2272. PCSO Carl: All happy with that:
2273. LOIS: [talked over 5 seconds
2274. JOHN: [talked over 5 seconds
2275. BOB: [talked over 5 seconds
2276. Peter: [talked over 5 seconds
2277. DANA: [talked over 5 seconds
2278. PCSO Carl: Right if anybody wants a card from hear or to speak to myself or Dan

[bangs on table gets no response people all carry on talking

2279. Cllr Jones: Shhhhhh
2280. LOIS: [talked over 10 seconds
2281. JOHN: [talked over 10 seconds
2282. BOB: [talked over 10 seconds
2283. Peter: [talked over 10 seconds
2284. DANA: [talked over 10 seconds
2285. MR WILLIAMS: [talked over 10 seconds
2286. MRS WILLIAMS: [talked over 10 seconds

It’s like meeting is carrying on with people talking amongst themselves, certainly paying little or no
attention to Chair, PCSO who is trying to bring to orderly close. Loud noise volume as most people
seem to be talking. Good humoured, noise and chaos as has been most of meeting. More chaotic noisy
end then some other Evergreen Meetings

2287. PCSO Carl: [shouts] As I say if you’ve got any sort of problems ring us 1:26.24

Lots of discussion and voices talking at once, some laughter, which carries on past formal end

2288. PCSO Carl: [shouts] Just to remind you next meeting is on the xx of October at 7pm

1:27 Formal Meeting Ends

Meetings lasted just over 1hr 20 mins
Room is buzzing with small groups of conversations, as usual, some people go to talk with PCSO’s and others to councillors; both of these hover in different parts of room so people can speak to them. Busy conversations and lots of noise as these carry on; for next 11 mins; leave with Sue Jones around 1.38

Many people still in hall talking, residents, PCSOs

4. Small talk – conversations post PACT

Researcher: That was another lively meeting
LOIS: There are so many things that are going wrong aren’t there?
DANA: How is everybody, how’s your family? [to me – interviewed her at International Pool]
Researcher: Well my daughters 18 and decided to go off to college, so it’s been getting her ready, and sorting out accommodation, you know, what have you been up to?
DANA: Well I went down their last Wednesday and I was talking to Carl (PCSO Carl) you know sometimes come and help with the football, well he’s one of them [football at the Rec]?
Researcher: Oh brilliant
DANA: Yeah
LOIS: Did you get one a card [cards PCSOs were saying to pick up with they’re contact details]

Researcher: You alright then?
PCSO Carl: Yeah [shrugs – keeps self pleasant still on duty, still on show, still in public gaze
Researcher: I was hoping to contact you to make time to come and talk to you about 20 mins
PCSO Carl: Yeah Maureen said, what do you want asap or what [FLSO – Police culture professional identity everything done immediatEvergreen
Researcher: I don’t mind what suits you best?
PCSO Carl: I’m available tomorrow
Researcher: What time do you want me to come down?
PCSO Carl: About 12
Researcher: That’s fine

Researcher: That was a lively meeting tonight wasn’t it?
MR WILLIAMS: ahh well it’s been a long time since the meeting before, with the summer break because of 6 week holiday there wasn’t a meeting in August, so we knew to come tonight
Researcher: Ah, well I must be out the loop on that, because I came, I was the only one, no residents came, no police, nobody [laughs] I’m an idiot, I didn’t check on ourbobby.com either. It’s a big gap isn’t it. But all the trouble started up again, what with the holidays and that?
MR WILLIAMS: Yeah I suppose it certainly has flared up again, they did come more often and it did die down but it’s certainly flared up again
Researcher: Because you used to come to a lot of the PACT’s didn’t you
MR WILLIAMS: Well there was one time where we missed one, then they had two dates when didn’t have one because they changed them and we ‘ad odd days
Researcher: Yes it’s very confusing, well, what do you think of PACT, is it good, is it worth coming?
MR WILLIAMS: I’m not sure really, but what else are we gone to do if we don’t? I mean you wonder what’s happening don’t you. I wouldn’t say it’s a waste of time, it has helped BUT there’s only so far they can go sometimes in it, only so much they can do 1:32.41
Researcher: Yeah
[MR WILLIAMS starts talking to someone else]
MRS WILLIAMS: Well I wasn’t happy ‘bout that but I suppose we’ll have to see
R5: Yes they should do something it’s being goin’ on for a long time, no good leaving us living with this up to 20 there most nights
BOB (Bob): I do hope they do this needs sorting out there should be a co-ordinated way of dealing with this not leaving it to chance, the Police need to act on this
MR WILLIAMS: I was going to speak to xxx (Cllr Smith) but he shot off pretty quick, ok for some

Researcher: okay guys, I’m off then
JOHN: Are you coming on Wednesday [He attends other meetings- housing federation, Chair’s Evergreen Forum, Communities First]
Researcher: that’s the Forum, where are you holding it
JOHN: Dusty
Researcher: In the morning? I’ll come if I can, not sure if I can. What about the LPG and the elections did that go alright? [meant to be move by CONCERNED GARDENERS to take places on LPG
JOHN: Yeah we all got elected alright
Researcher; Oh good, good, so you kept all the expertise and knowledge 1:33.33

LOIS: Well it’s nice to see our Councillors here, including Russell [first meeting he’s attended since I began attending] I mean they ‘ave said their on our side but their not, I don’t think so. Anything they can do that, we’ll see, I asked them [CONCERNED GARDENERS and planning permission new houses
Researcher: ohh you asked the councillors that if they’re on your side? 1:34.35
DANA: They actually turned round and said they’re on our side [smiling
Researcher: What the Villagers, about the houses? [nods] ooooh,
DANA: Yeah ooooh
LOIS: Hmmmnn
Researcher: well done
BOB: What did you think of the response tonight then [Often talks to me 1:35.05
Researcher: well there was lots of discussion, what did you think
BOB: Remains to be seen what they actually do

Researcher: I was wondering if I could take some contact details for you and perhaps come and speak to you at some time Sue Jones may have told you I’m doing some research on PACTs
Cllr Smith: Yes certainly, take xxxx email address and number as R***s Researcher and get in touch with me because I’m not here as a councillor [reads out email
Researcher: okay, this is where you check if I can spell properly
Cllr Smith: and sorry your name is?
Researcher: Roz Gasper I wanted to chat to you about what you think of PACTs
Cllr Smith: Are you a resident?
Researcher: I’m a resident in Riverside but I’m doing research on PACTs so a bit like you I go to a lot of them
Cllr Smith: Ahh yes, yes get in touch. If you excuse me I think [BOB] this gentleman is waiting to speak to me
Researcher: of course 1:36.10
Researcher: okay guys, [to cllr Jones] Have you got a lift home Sue, do you want a lift home?
Cllr Jones: Yes please [chuckles] it’s a dreadful wet night so that would be good, thank you
......... say goodbyes ........
Researcher: Here we are, I’ll help you in first, come sit behind me Jim [JOHN] there’s more leg room
Cllr Jones: Political platform that’s all that was [usual suspects and representativeness]
JOHN: Hmmm
Cllr Jones: I don’t know where Jill was [Community Chair of PACT]?
JOHN: What was all that about about dates?
Cllr Jones: Well Maureen[FLSO] sent out the dates before she left
Researcher: Yes
JOHN: So what was all that about it not being the 1st?
Cllr Jones: I spoke to PCSO and he said he put all the posters up on xxx, and xxx, xxxx
They didn’t do a street or house to house ones anymore, so we’ll have to speak to Gareth
about that I know he’s taking on co-ordination of PACT while we wait for a new FLSO. But it’s
not contacting those that already know that’s the issue its getting new faces that’s what we
want. I know there was a lady from Coronation Cottages who was going to come, but she’s 80
years old and you can’t expect her to come in this. If my husband had been around we’d have
picked her up, but he went to work at 2 o clock this afternoon. No way expect her to walk up
from Coronation Cottages in this weather [dark torrential rain after grey rainy day since 2pm – still
raining now ususal suspects and representativeness, communitarian, professional culture of cllrs not just
officers]
JOHN: The thing Maureen was trying was to leaflet two or three different streets to try and get
new people to attend
Cllr Jones: Yeah that’s what they were doing, and it stopped when Maureen left.
Researcher: That’s a shame, am I dropping you home Jim
Cllr Jones: No, he’s coming in for coffee he’s secretary of the labour party, and we’ve got
committee on Wednesday so we’ve got lots of things to discuss
1:42

Line 83 [PCSO saved from responding by cllrs. Q: could PCSO answer this? Unlikely PCSO would know
law – Inspector or Sergeant. Is this repair work, turn-taking, or support from another partner agency /
membership category work?]

Line 84 [accidental rescue or meant to rescue PCSO/ Police? Possibly due to frustration, is it role cllr to
respond to such queries? Immediately in line 85 Cllr Harris, senior member of local labour team and
head of party in council interrupts and takes over from the locally active but ‘junior team member’
(Russell is ex-Council Leader & 1st person paid in role interjects – he has a pompous persona speaks
slowly expects to take floor and be heard within his full turn taking, status dominant speech rights

Line 113 [issue whose role community/residents vs Police to deal with

Line 123 [calmer slower & quieter spoken meeting management tactic or Police training in dealing with
incidents / public members

Line 134 [shouting again, looks at neighbour to add info to complete point - grammatically finish
sentence (Sacks – alignment Bluvelyn 2005:708)

Line 138 [exasperation, amazement & disbelief have to put up with this – sub text and no help from
relevant agencies. Barriers seen with Police & 101 for access and/ or Police policies that are the barrier

xlv
Line 145 [calm voice and mounting challenge to account giving by PCSO / Police representative; this challenge is maintained by other residents who do not just accept PCSO explanation e.g. see lines 161, 175 (that’s not good enough) & 176

Line 154 [cacophony of numerous voices indistinguishable, women and men speaking at once for [3.0] seconds ‘chaos’ or being heard? [ditto lines 176 & 181, 200]

Line 113 [interrupted] [voice rising in volume and tone

Line 172 [drowned out by residents reaction (Llewellyn 2005)

Line 174 [disbelief - challenge account] [general shouting for [4.00] [ditto lines 152, 175, 197] seconds unable to make out individual voices / content. The impact seems to indicate account making by Police PCSO is rejected. Councillors Jones and Harris put heads together ‘nodding’ and saying something quietly to each other; Cllr Smith makes eye contact and rolls eyes upward and raises palms ‘as if’ to say this is typical of Police not acting to help citizens with ASB problems [this is his belief reported in interview and said at later PACT meetings ‘have to keep pressure on Police to get them to do anything tried other ways but don’t work’; illustrates differential membership category; also don’t step in to rescue account giver.

Line 180 [older man regular Acton Rd by church spoken to man B in earlier conversations other PACTs

Line 181 [general shouting for [2.00] [ditto lines 152, 175, 197] unable to make out voices / content until PCSO shouts loudest to stop this. PCSO is struggling to gain any control meeting and hold floor to ‘take turn’ given chairing from top table and represents police but immediately interrupted by floor /residents. Repair work (?) by PCSO to gain control and complete account / explanation began in line 144; account giving rejected and turn taking and speech rights continue to be interrupted - Line 186

Line 181 [lengthens words to control pace [interrupted

Line 183 [interrupted by PCSO who quickly intercedes to make sure he retains his speech rights and turn to give his account and get the BOB: Benefit of his work at lines 180 & 181 calm meeting down both emotionally, shouting and slow pace – management of meeting & speech rights

Line 186 [PCSO interrupted loses turn & some control

Line 187/88 [Residents interrupted to regain control

Line 190 [PCSO talked over by other audience members challenging speech rights & account giving


Line 197 [lots of voices at once for [1.0] seconds

Line 198 [talked over – could suffer same situation

Line 199 [interrupted by MR ACTON who has been attempting to be part of community challenge to account lines 191/3; uses formal preface / reference to role of chair to gain his turn & speech rights. Having used this technique is granted floor and able to speak at a quieter, and a slower space (a) uninterrupted by other audience members or PCSO chair (b) to build further support for the theme of audiences arguments for Police action / support began in line 20, and again in 146 about difficulties getting Police out. May have been granted floor as older regular attendee & neighbour who experiences the same issues; also he doesn’t often speak but when he does often speaks in support and based on his feelings concerning what ‘should’ happen. Brings in othering
and rights of moral neighbours as ‘good’ citizens as opposed to ‘bad’ citizens and youths causing problems (ordinary citizens line 344)

Line 203 [youths out on street are denying this ‘right to us’ good law abiding citizens in our own homes. See Evans Chapter 10 vigilantism ‘Catharsis’ unhappy fusion public and private nb part of communitarian and responsibilization agenda - projection and creation of bad ‘other’ psychoanalytic identities work.

Line 205 [co-operative turn which picks up and continues argument of othering which is developed and addressed more particularly to problem family who live on BOB. Benefits, council housed – streets of mixed ownership many council tenants and renting. We are good neighbours, deserving of support and not getting any from agencies like Police who SHOULD be helping us. Same family PCSO has been seen to support with his argument of ‘can be out at any time’; pulls in othering and role of services (Council, BOB, Benefits, housing, Police) acting for moral majority – rhetoric vs reality, conflict & interstices, and embedded local performance of service delivery. Agency & structure type arguments.

Lines 214-5 [identity and role of police – can do something about issues when bother

Lines 216-234 [identity councillors and MP’s – let us down nothing for Evergreen e.g. tackling ASB

Line 238 A new voice manages to take floor / take over speech rights and turn-taking. Quietly spoken speaking at slower pace than rest of voices have been; this person manages to take conversation to a different location moving away from the area that has dominated lines 1 – 237. This break in flow is achieved quietly. Her input turns out to be building and developing existing themes because it is about – youths & gangs vis a vis ASB; also services failure to respond to community requests. Usual suspect v care taker ‘I feel quite protective of them’ – other elderly residents

Line 248 [lots voices talking at once, none particularly raised, tone and aggressiveness indicated by tone and volume seems to have dropped. Change in tempo and meeting process – new phase – open ended conversation no attempt to go through Chair or top table audience has control and in a low key way residents are discussing issues amongst themselves – NO LONGER Chairs meeting or formal structure and convention being honoured. The audience seem to be having conversations about this between themselves and can’t make out any specific dialogue. This seems to go on along time six seconds [6.0] this is a long time without Chair or others

Line 249 Councillor Smith takes the floor – he presents himself as an expert on Police identity as well as part residents need to play to ‘hold the Police to account’ communitarian – he has done this in Ganton and personal experience ASB, firebombing (see later interview Cllr Smith and his statements in PACTs as well ‘have to really push Police hard to get them to do anything, wish it was otherwise, but all other approaches failed until get really tough with them, then they will act’). While he gets his turn over next exchanges he has to fight to keep it and be listened to – not quietly given floor by residents (chaotic). Unclear if he is speaking as cllr (not his ward), resident or knowledge as Researcher / magistrate. Perhaps it is him speaking as an ‘expert’ and authority figure that brings in the local ward councillors. Line 276 They decide to try to take floor / speech rights and join in conversation perhaps as local authority figures – however floor/ residents do not concede speech rights to them either

Line 258 – 400 Role and identity of Police, Cllrs, Residents questioned – various statements made including PCSO see line 306 onwards Line 310 -314 PCSO identity contrasted with Police identity; Line 306 PCSO Seems to have woken up in response to line 305 – police identity / role is challenged
by John (a resident & note taker for this meeting) and they now join in discussion again
interestingly didn’t try to take floor or jump in in same way when authority figures of Cllr Smith and
Harris (lines 249 and 276) held floor on what Police ‘should do’
Line 310-314 PCSO identity contrasted with Police identity and debate about role of police vs
PCSOS begins Line 317 & 318 residents disagree each other ‘actual Police’
Line 340 cllr criticises what asked of residents communitarian when police won’t do it
Line 342 cllr identity ‘we can’t encourage ordinary citizens to…’ Cllr seems to invoke two different
identity positions and change identity from speaking ‘as a resident’ (line 340) thus ‘we are asked’
and again critical of police identity & communitarian (what we can & cannot ask of ordinary
citizens?) when changes to alternative identity position (society, government, agencies) ‘we can’t
encourage’ seems to invoke cllr authoritarian position (line 342 & 4). Line 346-7 this is a police
role. Line 357 & 8 Criticism of police by cllr picked up by resident ‘all police know what’s going on’
PCSO not allowed speech rights to respond.

Line 302 & 303 Illustration differences in local areas – posh area Whitewood and deprived area

WhiteWood PACT major crime and PACT priority riding bikes on pavement – PC Andy Ryan had to go away and research police powers and report back on the options to deal with
this as a Police priority in early 2009 (see PACT notes and priorities). Difference Evergreen minor
matter never figures as priority – way down scale of things Line 344 Evergreen is drug taking

Line 317 & 318 residents disagree each other and Line 318-320 battle to take turn and have speech
rights and have say. MR ACTON gets back in to speak from his line 299 in line 319. Whilst in lines
238 – 299 are another example in the building of exchanges where various residents join in to
jointly build arguments and make points – assisting each other putting story and points want
answered together this has different feel. Turn is given over to MR ACTON in line 319 following his
low voiced and fairly good humoured but definite taking of his turn back from all of audience and
said to LOIS
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This is based on a social constructionist and perspective and utilises a qualitative reflexive approach. The precise design has been based on relevant literature review and use of similar methods within identity, collective collaboration and examinations of power relations and resistances in specific localities involving inter-agency and members of the public. The relevant example looked at within this study is the South Wales Police Partners and Communities Together (PACT) initiative which involves members of the public, other agencies such as Local Authorities, Community Safety Partnerships, Youth Services and Housing that have a remit that involves quality of life and crime and disorder issues within neighbourhoods. Specifically this study has been located within the co-terminus boundaries of Cardiff Council and the Cardiff division of South Wales Police (SWP); and within this will focus on three or four smaller neighbourhood areas and follow their individual PACT meetings on a longitudinal basis to track changes in identities, power relations, attendance, and collective collaboration over a period of 10-18 months. Based on the literature review a key feature of this design is that at least one of these should be a PACT running in an area of relative advantage and the others in areas of disadvantage, or an area of 'mixed' residential composition as identified by the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation. This research is being conducted with the knowledge and permission of the Cardiff division of the Police and co-operation and knowledge of Cardiff Council. The methods of data collection will be as follows:

**Public PACT Meetings**

The main location for data collection is public meetings, to which both members of the public and a wide range of agencies are invited. Although the Police frequently provide administrative assistance and are a key attendees of these meetings which they introduced they are seen as owned by members of the community and they are open forums available for anyone to attend. This data will be collected utilising:

1) Regular note-taking of proceedings and conversations within this public arena by the researcher.
2) One off audio recording of a single PACT meeting / with opt out option: This is planned on the basis that participants attending on this occasion give their permission that one PACT meeting for their neighbourhood can be audio recorded to provide a record of the precise dialogue. This is seen as essential to provide methodological and theoretical strength to the identity analyses within this research. Within PACT meetings names are not usually given and participants are specifically briefed not to mention personal identifying or specific incident information in the open forum; within the analyses it is also possible for the data to be made anonymous based on role and include any necessary changing / removal of names within the transcription stage. Should those attending agree to this general recording, it is proposed to offer an opt out option so that attendees have the opportunity to opt out of being recorded by asking for the audio recorder to be turned off when they speak.

**Individual Interviews**

To gain more insight into identities and power relations it is planned to follow-up attendees with one-to-one interviews, these will be requested on the basis that the researcher is independent and information they provide will be held confidentially and reported anonymously within the research. It is expected that unstructured interviews will be held with both PACT attendees and those who might have been expected to attend but are absent from the PACT meetings. These may be with Police, Local Authority and will be elite, professional staff and / or with members of the public. An example interview schedule is appended.

**Brief focus groups**

It is hoped to gain co-operation to run a single focus group specifically with members of the public at the end of one of the PACT meetings held in each sample neighbourhood to find out their views on PACT, the role it fulfils, whether they feel listened to, and their views on collaborative inter organization working on crime and disorder quality of life issues. These are likely to be of maximum 30 minutes or possibly shorter depending on the co-operation of the members of the public willing to stay behind for such an activity at the end of the PACT. These will only be possible if the PACT itself is shorter than the 2 hour room booking.

**Supplementary information to that gained from human respondents**

Policy statements and website information: SWP host a website that informs people of the dates of forthcoming meetings, the priorities set at previous meetings, and some general information on PACT www.ourbobby.com and this will be used to stay abreast of priorities, dates and locations for meetings within the Cardiff division of South Wales Police. Relevant published Home Office and other organizational documentation and home office web information will be utilised. Other documentation may be used with the permission the originating organization. For example, documents brought to meetings or minutes of meetings these will also be anonymised so individuals cannot be identified.
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2. Describe the participant sample who will be contacted for this Research Project. You need to consider the number of participants, their age, gender, recruitment methods and exclusion/inclusion criteria.
PACT is a potential example of local implementation of move to inclusive governance within crime and policing of New Labour managerial and joined up services agenda. It is the relevant literatures that have led to the selection of the participant sample:

1. Welsh literature has reviewed regeneration / devolution that compares top-down and ‘national’ rather than ‘locally’ developed solutions to inclusive governance, in common with other literatures commenting on the potential failure of centrally developed initiatives that are top-down rather than locally generated (Hodgson 2004, Royles 2006);

2. Wider debate on policing reform concerning the efficacy of ‘focussed’ versus ‘universal’ initiatives which echo’s similar concerns in relation to community oriented policing, now referred to in Wales And England as Neighbourhood Policing (Fletcher 2005, Innes 2005a);

3. Engaging communities and communitarian literature, has considered issues of ‘othering’ and the divisive nature of communities in relation to crime and disorder and quality of life issues enacting negative ‘them’ and ‘us’ potentials; and like some of the organizational collaboration literature has explored the differences in access to power and ability to work in a positive and collaborative manner related to whether they are disadvantaged / advantaged and / or ethnic minorities to gain from other public and policing initiatives (e.g. Hughes 2007, Garland et al 2006)

4. An identified gap in the collaboration literature within organizational studies that has examined previous such initiatives from a post structural and social construction frame looking at barriers and mainly applied to other types of community and partnership collaboration (e.g. Hartley et al 2005). Together with some similar findings within post modern criminology literature highlighting barriers such as conceptualisation of public members as ‘usual suspects’, and questioning their representative ness; whilst others have looked at the operation of professional identities and cultures; conflicting agendas, performance targets, prioritisation of such initiatives affecting the ability of organizations to work collaboratively; and importance of local politics and power (Beech & Huxham 2003, Davies & Thomas 2007, Hughes & Rowe 2007, Fielding & Innes 2006, Thacker 2001) Including criminology post modern review identifying key themes from within criminology of the recent introduction of Neighbourhood Policing in England and Wales and interviews with Community Safety Partnership personnel and police (Hughes & Rowe 2007).

5. The collaborative governance and the crime and disorder governance literature reflect the drive to legitimise through ‘inclusive’ governance, sharing power, new voices, and ‘responsibilization’ of others outside original circle (e.g. Chaney & Fyve 2001a:21; Glennan, et al, Barnes et al 2003, Crawford 2007, Huxham 2000, Stephens & Fowler 2004:127). However they also highlight boundary issues that may make such engagement and power sharing more problematic and reflect issues of both trust, and difficulties with buying into a joint inter-organizational or community led agenda (Karn 2007, Innes 2005b, O’Neill et al 2004; Stephens & Fowler 2004).

6. Some initial collaboration research utilising a reflexive approach and similar epistemology has looked at the operation of PACT in a rural deprived community rather than city location based on PACT meetings and follow-up interviews with police. This has used the frame of identities and highlighted ‘who we are not’ and dis-identification and relational identity as mechanisms of both in-group prestige and distancing (Sluss & Ashforth 2007, Elsbach & Bhattacharya 2001, Karreman & Spicer 2007, O’Neill et al 2004, Davies et al 2007). This literature has also identified issues with asymmetrical power relations and police identities played out in PACT meetings as well as exploring whether marginalised (least visible) and silenced groups (missing voices) can be heard in such settings; potentially applying Simpson & Lewis conceptualizations of voice and visibility (Simpson & Lewis 2007;79-86; Davies et al 2007a).

Based on these literatures the research design and questions have been developed to look at identity and power relations based on a specific locality – the city and urban area of Cardiff; and a specific example of inter-organization collaboration involving communities in crime and disorder quality of life issues – PACT.

The PACT meetings are public so any member of the public may attend, however it is likely that the majority will live within the boundaries of the neighbourhood covered by the PACT or be there because they have a special interest in the meeting. With respect to individual interviews these will be with those participants who agree to be interviewed by the researcher. It is expected that this will be a small minority of those attending. Given the low numbers of participants attending it may prove relevant to utilise a small snowball sample to access members of the public who do not attend their local PACT to find out their reasons for not attending.

The elites and professionals attending will be there in a professional capacity representing their organization; and /or inter-organisational collaboration. Relevant organizations will be selected based on their relevant remit on crime and disorder quality of life issues. Home Office documentation on PACT suggests this will be SWP, Local Authorities, Highways, Parking, Refuge, Lighting, Housing, Social Services, Fire and Youth Services and Councillors: potentially Community Safety Partnerships; Neighbourhood Watch, and possibly Victim Support. It is also expected that organizational elites and non-attendees may be interviewed. These participants will be accessed based on their role responsibilities and contacted via their own organization; as in all cases participation will be voluntary and based on a full explanation of the nature of the research.
3. **Describe the consent and participant information arrangements you will make, as well as the methods of debriefing. If you are conducting interviews, you must attach a copy of the consent form you will be using.**

| Consent, confidentiality, anonymity and openness | It is of the highest priority to have the appropriate consent, confidentiality of findings and openness to maintain the quality of participation. The mechanisms for achieving this and ethical considerations are discussed in more detail in section 4 of this form. Appended is a copy of the anonymous consent forms. There are two versions of these: one, appropriate to interview participants, and one for potential focus group participants. These forms also include details of debriefing and obtaining information on the research findings and a brief report.
| Debriefing & feedback of results | In the interests of openness and integrity it is intended to provide a brief research report to be available to all those who have participated whether agency or members of the public. Like the main report / PhD the information contained within it will be anonymous. Participants have the option to receive this information via a nominated person within their organization; via PACT Chair persons and distributed at a PACT meeting or to be sent a personal copy if they elect to provide a postal or email address to which the researcher can send this. It is envisaged this brief report will be no more than 4 sides of A4 and the researcher will offer to accompany the distribution of this with a presentation opportunity either hosted by one of the agencies; and / or at each of the three sample PACT meetings. The usual CARBs statement to obtain more information has been included in the consent forms. |

4. **Please make a clear and concise statement of the ethical considerations raised by the research and how you intend to deal with them throughout the duration of the project**
Nature of data collected: Whilst it is not intended to collect any sensitive or individual data it may be expected that members of the public may disclose some personal ‘identifiers’ of location or neighbours in relaying their own personal experiences that have led them to attend PACT meetings. All personal identifiers will be removed from the data either during initial note taking or at the transcription stage to ensure anonymity of people and specific locations and where appropriate nominal names will be used (for example: xxx who lives in xxx street, Southford; and Southern Police).

Independence of the researcher from the Police or other single contributor agenda: This is particularly important in this research as there are a number of different agencies and members of the public involved all of whom may express different opinions and need to be assured that the researcher is not acting for, representing, nor reporting back different information to the other parties. The aim is to hear what all participants have to say and to respect the confidentiality and anonymity of all those participating.

Reflexive nature of the research: The researcher is adopting a reflexive approach which acknowledges their own role in data creation and the research settings to be explored as part of the research process (Davies & Thomas 2007). As part of this research memos will be recorded which reflect on the research setting. These will be kept confidential and other participants’ details, and research setting information contained in these will be anonymised in line with other research data collected.

The role of the researcher attending public meetings: Whilst it is accepted that such meetings and the information exchanged within them is by its nature in the public domain the researcher has given serious consideration to how they present their presence and role to those attending meetings, both the professionals and members of the public. The researcher’s aim is to be honest, open, and transparent operating with the highest degree of integrity in their disclosures and dealings within the situation. Within the reflexive nature of this research I have prepared a verbal statement and answers to follow-up questions if asked why I am taking notes of proceedings. I intend to inform people that while I am also a local resident of Cardiff I am attending because I am doing some independent research on how PACT is working; particularly what members of the public think of the meetings and collaboration between partner agencies such as Police and Local Authorities who are either attending meetings or working on PACT priorities. To inform people that none of these agencies is involved in funding my research, nor influencing what I ask or do not ask, nor receiving any more detailed feedback than the brief research report that I am prepared to release to all those participating. I also intend to inform people their participation in talking to me individually is entirely voluntary and anonymous (see section 3 and consent forms).

Researcher safety, credentials, and contact ability: University of Cardiff business cards will be utilised to give bona fide contact details for myself; including Dr Davies college phone number and have taken out a contract mobile phone in order to be contactable without releasing my personal home phone number to participants (for example to let me know if they cannot make a pre-arranged interview or to set up a meeting). These cards will be given to all participants with the request they contact me to discuss any aspect of the research. This also protects me from releasing personal information to participants. With respect to lone researcher meetings with potential participants it is expected that these will be conducted in public locations or organizational locations and not at private addresses. It is a design feature of this research that these visits to private premises be avoided. In the unlikely event such an interview location be requested this will be discussed with my supervisors and arrangements to give them or a named contact details of such a location/time; and to contact them to confirm I have safely left such premises.

Consent, confidentiality, anonymity, and openness: This has been upheld as a corner stone of the design and transcription, and final reporting of findings and is consistent with the wish of most participants in research to remain anonymous. Therefore the selection of data collection methods has been tailored to ensure this can be maintained (see section 1 & 3).

PLEASE NOTE that you should include a copy of your questionnaire if you consider the questions raise ethical issues.
5. **Please complete the following in relation to your research:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Will you describe the main details of the research process to participants in advance, so that they are informed about what to expect?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Will you tell participants that their participation is voluntary?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Will you obtain written consent for participation?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Will you tell participants that they may withdraw from the research at any time and for any reason?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>If you are using a questionnaire, will you give participants the option of omitting questions they do not want to answer?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Will you tell participants that their data will be treated with full confidentiality and that, if published, it will not be identifiable as theirs?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>Will you offer to send participants findings from the research (e.g. copies of publications arising from the research)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE NOTE:**

If you have ticked No to any of 5(a) to 5(g), please give an explanation on a separate sheet.

(Note: N/A = not applicable)

There is an obligation on the lead researcher to bring to the attention of Cardiff Business School Ethics Committee any issues with ethical implications not clearly covered by the above checklist.

*Two copies of this form (and attachments) should be submitted to Ms Lainey Clayton, Room F09, Cardiff Business School.*

Signed
Roz Gasper

Print Name
Roz Gasper

Date
18th February 2008

**SUPERVISOR'S DECLARATION**

As the supervisor for this research I confirm that I believe that all research ethical issues have been dealt with in accordance with University policy and the research ethics guidelines of the relevant professional organisation.

Signed
Annette Davies

(Primary supervisor)

Print Name
Annette Davies

Date
18th February 2008

**STATEMENT OF ETHICAL APPROVAL**

This project has been considered using agreed School procedures and is now approved.

Signed

(Chair, School Research Ethics Committee)

Print Name

Date
18/2/2008
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CARDIFF BUSINESS SCHOOL
RESEARCH ETHICS
Consent Form – PACT & Partnership Working Study

Name of researcher: Roz Gasper, gasperre@cardiff.ac.uk 077 7249 3215
Name of supervisor: Dr Annette Davies, daviesa4@cardiff.ac.uk 029 208 87575

I understand that my participation in this project will involve participating in a group
discussion that will be led by the researcher. During this we will be asked questions about partnership working and PACT which will require approximately 30 minutes of my time.
This will be in the form of a friendly group discussion and as is the convention with PACT
meetings themselves we will be asked to respect others opinions but also to freely express our
own which may disagree with them. The researcher will be making an audio recording of this
group discussion which will be anonymous so neither myself nor any other individual can be
personally identified. During the discussion I can ask the researcher to switch off the recorder
if I do not wish the views I am expressing to be recorded. Any extracts or views used in the
research findings and report will also be anonymous so that it is impossible to trace this
information back to me individually.

I understand that participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I can withdraw
from the study at any time without giving a reason.

I understand that I am free to ask any questions at any time and either now or later can contact
the researcher to clarify any information using the email or phone number given at the top of
this form (see contact details above). If for any reason I experience discomfort during
participation in this project, I am free to withdraw or discuss my concerns with Dr Annette
Davies whose email is daviesa4@cardiff.ac.uk.

I understand that, in accordance with the Data Protection Act, this information may be
retained for the duration of this study and any follow-up research that is undertaken.

I also understand that at the end of the study the researcher will be providing a short report
available to all those who have participated. This will be distributed via PACT Chairpersons
or provided to a nominated person within an individual agency. If I wish to receive a
personal copy I understand that I need to provide either a postal or email address for this to be
sent. I may also request some additional information and feedback about the purpose and
results of the study by applying to the University via Dr Annette Davies.

Thank you for your time and co-operation it is much appreciated.
Roz Gasper

If you are happy to give your contact details so the researcher can follow-up at a later date to
find out if your views have changed with time and developments or if you wish to be sent a
personal copy of the brief research report, please provide the following details:

I, ________________________________________________ (NAME) [Note: if you prefer to you can use a false name here]

Contact Information: [email, phone, or postal address as preferred by you]

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
consent to be contacted / wish to be sent a personal copy of the brief report
[delete as appropriate]
Example Interview Schedule

How long have you been attending PACT meetings?

Why they are there (why do they attend)?

How do they see their own role and what are they doing there?

What do they think of others that attend?

How do other people make them feel like?

Have their attitudes toward meetings changed with their attendance?

Why do they / or will they continue attending?

What do they see as the main benefits of PACT / partnership working?

Are there any problems with PACT or working on priorities that need to be resolved?

Do they have any suggestions how this might happen?

How well do the partners work together?

Why do you think that?

What needs to change or continue happening to make this work?

Who else do they think should be attending or working on priorities raised in PACT?

Why is that?

Do they have any views on why they do not attend?

Are there any particular benefits of getting more members of the public to attend or finding other ways to get their views (for example emails, or meetings held at different times or locations)?

Does any one agency or group have more power over what happens in PACT or setting priorities?

Do they feel they are listened to?

Do they feel they and the other participants hold [equal] power in PACT or setting priorities?

What do they think is the way forward to get the most out of PACT?
CARDIFF BUSINESS SCHOOL
RESEARCH ETHICS
Consent Form – PACT & Partnership Working Study Anonymous data
Name of researcher: Roz Gasper, gasperre@cardiff.ac.uk 077 7249 3215
Name of supervisor: Dr Annette Davies, daviessa4@cardiff.ac.uk 029 208 5757

I understand that my participation in this project will involve being interviewed by the
researcher who will ask me questions about partnership working and PACT which will
require approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour of my time. This will be in the form of a friendly
conversation of which the researcher will either take notes or make an audio recording.
During this I can ask at anytime for the recorder to be switched off. My views will be
recorded anonymously so that no one is able to identify me with what I have said in the
research findings or report. I understand that participation in this study is entirely voluntary
and that I can withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason.

I understand that I am free to ask any questions at any time and either now or later can contact
the researcher to clarify any information using the email or phone number given at the top of
this form (see contact details above). If for any reason I experience discomfort during
participation in this project, I am free to withdraw or discuss my concerns with Dr Annette
Davies whose email is daviessa4@cardiff.ac.uk.

I understand that the information provided by me will be held totally anonymously, so that it
is impossible to trace this information back to me individually. I understand that the
researcher will hold a separate confidential list of my contact details should I choose to
provide her with these so that she is able to contact me at a later date in any follow-up
research to find out if my opinions and views on this topic have changed with time, future
developments or different experiences. This contact information will be held separately to the
data I provide so it is not possible for any other person to trace or link me to the views
expressed and the research report will be anonymous so I cannot be identified in the findings.
However I have the right to withhold my contact information and remain anonymous if I wish
to do so. I understand that, in accordance with the Data Protection Act, this information may
be retained indefinitely, however I do have the right to contact the researcher to request my
information is deleted/destroyed after the original study and report is completed.

I also understand that at the end of the study the researcher will be providing a short report
available to all those who have participated. This will be distributed via PACT Chairpersons
or provided to a nominated person within an individual agency. If I wish to receive a
personal copy I understand that I need to provide either a postal or email address for this to be
sent. I may also request some additional information and feedback about the purpose and
results of the study by applying to the University via Dr Annette Davies.

If you are happy to give your contact details so the researcher can follow-up at a later date to
find out if your views have changed with time and developments or if you wish to be sent a
personal copy of the brief research report, please provide the following details:

I, ________________________________ (NAME) [Note: if you prefer to you can use a false name
here]

Contact Information: [email, phone, or postal address as preferred by you]

................................................................. .................................................................

................................................................. .................................................................

................................................................. .................................................................

consent to be contacted / wish to be sent a personal copy of the brief report
[delete as appropriate]
Appendix Five  Locality Context & Background to the Introduction of PACT in City
This appendix gives the ethnographic geo-historic context and local profile to the introduction of PACT and Neighbourhood Management in City. It also examines the local politics and the roles of councillors, as well as neighbourhood profiles, for the three main PACTs tracked within this study, namely Evergreen, Redbank and Whitewood.

1. Introduction to the local political landscape of PACT & Neighbourhood Management in City
The broader drivers of community engagement and Neighbourhood Policing, and therefore partnership activities and PACT in City, are set by an England and Wales governmental agenda. As illustrated by the Casey (2008) report, this includes providing visible policing and results within a responsive criminal justice system that ‘will win the war on crime’, disorder, and quality of life. This is based on community involvement and joined-up multi-agency working to provide effective neighbourhood solutions, keep communities informed and ‘active’, lower fear of crime and increase public confidence. Since 2010 there have been online street level crime maps (for example see ourbobby.com) and though the current Coalition Government has removed the Policing Pledge and single confidence measure, most Forces and their partners have websites, local newsletters or other mechanisms of community communication and feedback.

At the time my data collection began in 2007, Southern, like other police services in England and Wales, is operating in an era of expanding remits and increasingly limited resources. This culminates in 2010 under the Coalition Government programme of 20% cuts including reductions in staff numbers between 2011-15 (Morgan 2011). In 2007, the then Chief Constable of Southern Police speaks of an increasingly complex policing task within our diverse society utilising a broader policing family. She specifically refers to additions to core duties through the introduction of neighbourhood community engagement meetings, a focus on reassurance and confidence building with all communities and visible Beat policing. She highlighted the key role played by Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) in these provisions as well as the need for reforms in the way policing is provided to meet their expanded and ever changing role.

City in South Wales has national venues for sports and entertainment, with a mid-year 2006 population estimate of 317,500 (Office of National Statistics). It can be regarded as a fairly
small City compared to much larger conurbations in England (e.g. Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool etc.) and it generally experiences lower levels of crime and disorder than many of its English counterparts (see Appendix xxx for more details on crime and disorder profile). The devolved Welsh Assembly Government controls Local Government and the Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) with the main policing agenda controlled via the Home Office and London Parliament. Neighbourhood Policing is introduced and controlled by the police and is governed by Home Office driven legislation.

The separate neighbourhood management agenda to introduce neighbourhood service delivery based on partnerships between local authorities and other partners (such as police, health, and other services) is driven in Wales by the 2006 Beecham report. Within Wales, neighbourhood service delivery prioritises citizen-led and partnership processes that give citizens a ‘voice’ rather than consumer-led ‘choice’. The City neighbourhood management partnership sits within the governmental agenda to provide more cost effective and joined up solutions and delivery of the range of public services. City is one of the path finder sites for Beecham’s Local Area Service programming and the establishment of scrutiny, strategic and operational levels of neighbourhood management. In 2007, the lead of the City neighbourhood management strategic level body is the Police Commander for City Basic Command Unit (BCU). This reflects the initial focus of area based neighbourhood working – called Area Neighbourhood Management (ANM) - on crime, disorder and quality of life related local authority services. In City, ANM is based on the alignment of policing and local authority services into six coterminous sectors and involves an array of relevant council departments, Police, Fire Service and Community Safety Partnership. This is with a view of bringing other partners (i.e. Health) and other areas of locality based services into the later spread of the ANM programme. The difference in timescales between the Local Authority (focused on Beecham implementation by 2011) and the police (focused on Neighbourhood Policing by 2008) may go some way to explain some of the differences of organisational priorities and the struggles over ownership and control of agendas within the orientation to neighbourhood based working. In the beginning, local authority official’s involvement in sectorial ANM is just commencing beyond staff’s sanctioned ‘day’ role. In my interviews it becomes clear that views are split; some officials feel they should not be required to participate in ANM; others see it as hopeful and potentially positive while others wait to see how it will progress. By June 2009 it is clear this partnership and joined-up collaborative
working is approved by the Council executive: an initial (small) budget for partnership activities and solutions is trialled with each of the six ANM sectors bidding to access it.

My research began when I attended a multi-agency City PACT review workshop in June 2007, convened by the police. Senior staff had been invited from both City Basic Command Unit (BCU) and the Local Authority but the workshop was deemed a failure as none attended, junior officers being sent as substitutes. This was interpreted as senior staff according the exercise insufficient priority to merit their attendance. A second workshop, convened in September and refocused under the banner of Neighbourhood Management, was aimed at developing effective horizontal professional partnerships, including the link to the PACT agenda. This was a major attempt to ‘re-launch’ PACT approximately 15 months after Southern Police introduced it in 2006 when they found themselves, in reality, without ‘partners’. City, like the other six local authorities covered by Southern Police, had not agreed or acquiesced to be partners with their police colleagues in the police attempt to present PACT as ‘Partners and Communities Together’\(^1\). They felt pressured and railroaded by the police implementation process and timeframe. As stated, the City local government-owned remit has a 2008-11 remit and is currently concerned with the planned introduction of Local Service Boards and partnership based geographical service delivery. The police, under separate Home Office directives and legislation, updated through the Police Justice Act 2006, were operating to a 2008 deadline for fully integrated Neighbourhood Policing partnership working on crime and disorder. This included introducing the communities ‘call to action’ and ability to set local priorities through neighbourhood public meetings within the 2005-8 introduction of Neighbourhood Policing. The Policing Pledge which enshrines partnership, community meetings, priority setting and feedback to communities became mandatory and was inspected by the HMIC early in this period.

I tracked the introduction of ANM and partnership working between the key players of council, police and City CSP from July 2007 to October 2009, culminating in the formal ratification of Neighbourhood Management by the City council executive in June 2009. The three main PACT meetings I tracked are in the south west sector (Evergreen & Redbank) and the north sector (Whitewood). For both the police and local authority it has been a long road to incorporate Neighbourhood Management and inter-organisation collaboration into their

\(^1\) The Southern Police PACT was described as based on the Lancashire Police Force (an A star rated force) model. They like other Forces in England & Wales had introduced PACT as ‘Police and Communities Together’ meetings.
processes. For the local authority this has included intra-organisation change from separate ‘silo’ functional working to joined-up neighbourhood delivery of services. Throughout my fieldwork, paid council staff, the CSP and police were focused primarily on ANM and horizontal coproduction and partnership issues. They were grappling with issues arising from different working cultures. For example, the police command and control ‘can do’ action-oriented culture contrasted with the council’s long-term planning and non-directive functional organisation. There were also differences in service remits, legal requirements, the council’s mainly 9 to 5 rather than 24/7 operation, different service targets, oversight mechanisms and funding regimes. In addition, it is only the police who are tasked with the ‘call to action’ of setting local priorities based on regular meetings with local communities. These differences are exacerbated within their local partnership history with City CSP. In City, the police have a history of being ‘absent’ partners, with senior staff inappropriately sending different and un-briefed Sergeant or PC to CSP meetings (e.g. the Citywide ASB tasking meetings). The police are therefore viewed as a difficult partner that only comes to the partnership table when they own or are driving initiatives. City CSP is hosted and owned by the council who are a key stakeholder in the introduction of Neighbourhood Management and PACT.

City CSP staffs are dismissive of PACT as both a ‘nutters charter’ and an opportunity for those ‘who shout loudest’ to dominate. They are also adamant that paid council staffs and the CSP do not become acquiescent or closely tied to the police-owned PACT partnership agenda. The overwhelming view from both the police Neighbourhood Inspectors and council staffs is that the community will not be able - and should not be allowed - to set priorities for professional service delivery as priorities, solutions, and resourcing issues are best dealt with by themselves as expert professionals. The complication for the police who are tasked with holding these meetings is the need to find ways to manage expectations and try to achieve this as a partnership activity as many quality of life and disorder issues involve multi-agency or solely council run services (e.g. ASB, graffiti, street cleansing, rubbish collection, fly-typing, noise nuisance).

The June 2009 strategic review of Neighbourhood Management recommends that councillors should have a formal input to discussing PACT and other neighbourhood issues at some level within ANM. Each of the six sectors is given the flexibility to do this in a way that suits their locality. The south west sector ANM which covers four wards is the only sector to setup sub-consultative meetings that include relevant councillors (one for Evergreen and
Coolgreen, and one for Redbank and Ganton). These sub-consultative meetings are run by the operational manager responsible for the south west sector, with overall responsibility for introducing neighbourhood management within City. He invites paid officials to represent their departments on a regular or ad hoc basis dependent on current issues; while some council staffs occasionally attend, the police rarely do. He is pro-active and experienced in dealing with multi-agency and councillor meetings due to time spent in disadvantaged wards across City on regeneration and housing matters. The other sectors suggest the direct involvement of councillors is too difficult. The north sector (which includes Whitewood) advises they cannot do this due to the number of wards (eleven) and subsequently high numbers of councillors within their sector.

By 2011 a system of quarterly sector reporting meetings are held to brief councillors. These are based on quarterly ANM sector intelligence reports covering all aspects of health, crime and disorder, employment and education, and list a couple of PACT priorities. These briefing meetings are for information only; councillors cannot raise ward issues or make inputs to influence ANM tasking and actions. It is known that the Labour group and many other councillors are unhappy with this arrangement and would prefer a fuller role in ANM. During my fieldwork, City council was run by a coalition of Labour, Liberal Democrat and Plaid Cymru members. At the elections in May 2012 City became a majority Labour led council. In June 2012 I am told that the Labour majority want councillors formally involved in each of the six ANM sector and citywide meetings; this is very different to merely receiving quarterly intelligence briefs. Police, council and other professionals fear this to be a retrograde step for neighbourhood management which now includes a broad range of professional partners including health as well as council departments and the police. These paid officials are reticent (and will potentially refuse) to work with or be tasked directly by elected representatives. The situation is further complicated as councillors do not have formal elected powers to directly influence these partnerships and staffs who work in other agencies. This is seen as a potential watershed for the future of neighbourhood management and ANM meeting structures in City.

Pre-dating neighbourhood management and PACT, City local authority staff and services can be held to account by elected councillors in two main ways: through councillor questions and via the political oversight of local government and councils through locally elected representatives’ use of the formal committee system and full council decisions. With respect
to PACT, the September 2006 City’s Executive Committee meeting (Minutes 06.09.06) decided that paid council officials would not attend neighbourhood PACT meetings. This meeting suggests councillors can attend on behalf of their neighbourhoods as the only council presence. Throughout my study (and still continuing to date) it is councillors who attend PACT meetings, with rare visits from relevant council staffs. Councillors are mandated to attend PACT and the police would like to co-join or rely on them as formal partners who represent the council. However, there is no standardisation of councillor roles across PACT meetings. Some councillors are prepared to sit as formal partners on a top panel, some want to Chair their local PACTs while others insist on sitting in the audience with their constituents. The diversity of these roles is a prime example of embedded agency within its local geo-historical context. It would be simpler for the police if PACTs could run with councillors representing the council on panels, as stated in their own police guidance (Southern PACT Guide 2008:11).

The lack of ability of the council or the police to command and control councillors is problematic; the police struggle with the great variety of councillor positions in PACT meetings. They comment negatively on some councillors who are seen as trying to divert the process to make PACT political in order to progress their own agendas rather than those of the community attendees. This is an issue within three of the neighbouring wards to Evergreen. For example, the Bluewater councillor holds additional influence and weight as a deputy council leader; the Coolgreen councillor, while not officially PACT chairperson, is reported as controlling her PACT and has strong views on crime disorder and policing partly based on her membership of the Southern Police Authority; the Ganton councillor insists on chairing his PACT based on his residency within the neighbourhood. These three councillors (all from different political parties, Lib Dem, Labour and Plaid Cymru2) are seen as operating a political agenda either to progress their own issues and priorities or having some party bias. This is seen as an anathema to the police, who try to insist these meetings are non-political and do not wish to be told by councillors how to run neighbourhood policing or set priorities.

During the May 2008 and May 2012 local elections the police cease running PACTs because of issues with some councillors using them as election platforms.

2 Plaid Cymru is the national party of Wales. They hold local government seats as well as some Welsh Assembly Member seats in the devolved Welsh parliament called the Assembly. They also have some Members within the London Parliament.
Some councillors receive praise as ‘good’ councillors trying to do their best on behalf of their residents (e.g. Redbank) and are responsibilised to run their PACT meetings which deal mainly with council issues. This arose in Redbank because the PACT meetings were originally set up as regular councillor surgeries and were transformed into a local PACT meeting at the request of the police. Like Evergreen, other councillors are seen as part of the problem because they persist in sitting in the audience with residents, aligning against the police and council on many issues. It is clear the police would prefer ‘good’ councillors like those at Whitewood who sit on the top-table as formal panel partners and acquiesce to take up council matters with the relevant departments. Westmarland & Clarke (2009) talk about councillors as ‘special residents’ in this type of public meeting because they may hold more sway, power and access to decision makers than ordinary residents. My study considers councillors as a key group.

As mentioned, paid council officials can be ‘held to account’ by councillors through the formal system of ‘councillors questions’. This process has left most staff wary of working directly with elected members, preferring such contact to be left to senior managers outside of neighbourhood management partnership meetings. Staffs suggest they would never attend joint meetings with councillors because councillors would try to task them directly; this is politically complex and challenges their professional independent status. In some sectors and wards, councillors are known to disagree with each other or even refuse to be in the same room due to differences in opinion or party allegiances (for example within the north and west sectors). Paid officials are protective of their professional expertise and independent objective decision-making. Most do not want councillors involved in ANM sector meetings or ward level sub-consultation meetings; the senior manager of the south west sector is unusual in being happy to work with councillors within neighbourhood management on neighbourhood matters.

Finally, it is important to consider the Southern Police wishes for PACT meetings. These are encapsulated in the Southern Police PACT Guide (2008) which provides a generic model for PACT meeting preparation, conduct and recording. It includes the directive to ensure meetings are upbeat and positive, set three recorded priorities, last no more than an hour, are non-political and are preferably led by community chairs so they can be seen as the community’s meetings. At the time my research began there were 44 PACT meetings running across City (see Appendix One). There is no publicity or budgets to support
neighbourhood PACT meetings; they rely on free venues, 101, PCSOs and current attendees to encourage attendance. This might be supplemented with free local or community press and rare articles on crime and disorder that mention PACT, Front Line Support Officer (FLSO) issued written notification of the next PACT meeting to attendees who give an address, PCSO distribution of notices for local libraries and shops and - very occasionally - door-to-door leafleting of streets affected by particular issues. The need to increase levels of attendance and encourage more people to attend is a recurring theme for the police, PCSOs and residents. The police as the owners of the meeting are frequently criticised by attendees for not doing more to communicate and publicise the message of ‘coming to make use of and to support your PACT’. This is often linked to discourses concerning the ‘same old faces’ and ‘streets being represented’ and for professionals’ discourses to be based on the domination of ‘usual suspects’, ‘those who shout loudest’ and ‘lack of representativeness’ (Barnes et al 2003 & 2004).

There are some sector differences concerning who from the police attends PACT meetings. In some sectors the FLSO attends most PACT meetings (e.g. Evergreen and Redbank), in others they do not (e.g. Whitewood). Some PACT always have a PC attending while others never do until in mid-2009 a citywide BCU decision is made for Beat Managers (PCs) to attend PACTs. Within the west and south sector, an Inspector attends a minority of PACTs that are deemed to be too political due to the conduct of the councillors who attend; for other PACTs, a Sergeant may attend. Within the south west sector it is PCSOs who attend and in the north sector a PC. Within the police, brief summaries of PACT meeting priorities are reported up through the command chain and hierarchy; for Evergreen and Redbank this is from PCSOs to PC, Sergeant and up to the Neighbourhood Inspectors. If necessary, PC Beat Managers or Sergeants will allocate resources to particular operations or request partnership resources (e.g. the off-road biking team). However, resourcing PACT priorities is predominantly seen as a PCSO and Beat activity. The detailed nature of PACT meetings, recurring resident concerns and tone of the meetings are not formally reported or recorded.

The 2009 Neighbourhood Management terms of reference suggest sector ANM meetings should discuss and help to co-ordinate a partnership response to persistent and recurring PACT priorities that require a co-ordinated strategic partner response. During my fieldwork PACT reporting to ANM sector meetings by the police is both sporadic and often incomplete, and it is not certain that recurring problems raised at PACT meetings will be reported. At the
ANM meetings I tracked, only a few of the many persistent priorities and problems from disadvantaged PACT - and none for advantaged Whitewood - are reported by the police. There are no tracking systems in place within the police (or within the council) to capture PACT driven actions, operations or specific outcomes. With no system to track ASB reported and driven activities, these are lost in the mix of day-to-day tasking and ongoing work. For the police, day-to-day tasking is driven by COMPSTAT (reports on meeting targets) and NICHE (allocation and grading of tasks to reactive and neighbourhood teams related to the building of ‘hot spot’ incidents), driven by HMIC and other BCU targets. At BCU level, the performance and progress of the six police sectors is reviewed fortnightly; PACT priorities are not taken to these meetings. The 2010-11 Annual Southern Police report states they are participating in a trial to improve recording of ASB incidents and still need to consider tracking actions and outcomes in relation to ASB. Most policing and some council PACT priorities are ASB.

2. Evergreen, Redbank and Whitewood Profiles

This section provides ethnographic details of the areas and their local PACT meetings for the three main PACTs that I tracked. It highlights the importance of local issues, the political geo-histories and personal histories in which top-down governmental policies and programmes are implemented (Royles xxx, Hughes 2007).

2.1 Evergreen

Evergreen is within the southern arc of City. It has a negative reputation as a mainly ex-council estate with associated levels of deprivation, crime and disorder. City ASB rankings place Evergreen as having very high levels of ASB. (see table xxx in appendix xxx). Residents and other professionals report a long history of not expecting the police to respond or deal with problems and a tradition of not ‘grassing-up’ or talking to the police. This means under reporting remains a likely issue for police and other service statistics; low trust in the police is also likely to affect PACT attendance.

Evergreen has a population of 14,754 (ONS mid-year 2006) with a homeownership to rental ratio of approximately 50:50. In the 19th century this area began life as a ‘poor town’ housing area and in terms of the WIMD it rates as one of most deprived areas in Wales.
Consequently it obtained Communities First\(^3\) status with neighbouring Coolgreen Ward (sometimes referred to as South Evergreen) in the first phase of this funding in 2002. Communities First initially involved community capacity building activities, including the establishment of a locally elected steering committee with places for resident organisations, the third sector and a councillor, and issue based sub-groups such as youth facilities/unemployment and crime and disorder. As part of the original programme, Communities First areas had additional dedicated community police teams. Across the Southern Force region these were disbanded in 2006 as part of the universal implementation of Neighbourhood Policing. Both Evergreen and Spenchurch (in the south sector) are reported to have had particularly good Communities First policing teams that built good relationships with residents; both areas are potentially less well served as a result of their withdrawal.

The City Health Social Care and Well Being Strategy (2008-11) talks of ‘A Tale of Two Cities’. Evergreen is part of the deprived southern arc of the city, with high levels on a range of negative indicators and life chances, and one of the highest population densities in City (ibid 19, 20). For example, it has the highest level of receipt of income related benefits by the working age population (34%); with Coolgreen, and two other southern arc wards, it has the highest percentage of households where one or more persons has a limiting long-term illness and lower life expectancy (ibid 27). Part of this report concerns the citywide priority to improve the range of health and safety indicators within the southern arc to match the level of the northern arc, with associated rebalancing of resources and services to achieve this.

Evergreen also contains one of the highest percentage of young people (other than student areas), the highest percentage of young people without qualifications (ibid 21, 24) and the lowest levels of ethnic minority population (ibid 23). The whole of the southern arc has a higher proportion (39.4%) and number (11,000) of children living in relative income poverty than any other Welsh local authority, and is one of the three most deprived areas in Wales (ibid 24, 25). The City Neighbourhood Improvement Plan (2005-2009) suggests the need for partnership work to address closing the gap between the southern and northern arc as a driver

---

\(^3\) Communities First was introduced by the Welsh Assembly Government in early 2002. Based on the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation (WIMD), it initially applied to the top 5% of most deprived wards in Wales. It gave them access to extra resources and services such as policing, training, grants and help with employment and other services. Evergreen is amongst the most deprived Wards in Wales (in the top 5% of most deprived areas in Wales) and received Communities First from its earliest introduction. In the second phase, additional areas including South Redbank were included to receive Communities First assistance.
of allocating partnership resources. In particular, it notes that Evergreen and three other City wards rank in the top 100 deprived wards in Wales on the WIMD (2005), and singles out Evergreen as an area for regeneration and renewal (ibid 53). Neighbourhood improvement is a key part of the background and context to the delivery and planning of joined-up neighbourhood service delivery and underpins neighbourhood management in City.

In late 2007, the police try to change all City PACTs to bi-monthly, or less. The residents and PACT chair in Evergreen are one of the few PACT meetings to resist this directive, maintaining their monthly meetings up to September 2012. The normal pattern for Evergreen is 11 meetings a year; during my research, I attended 15 out of 21 potential meetings all held at the same venue. City BCU are particularly proud of this PACT because it had the first community chairperson in City (a key aim for Southern Police) and an unusually high attendance rate compared to other PACT meetings, including a high male attendance with a mixed age range (see Appendix xxx). Evergreen PACT is presented to me as a ‘success’ story within one of the most difficult neighbourhoods to crack, it being one of the largest council estates in Europe, with a fairly static mainly white population, some families who have not worked for generations, poor health and low educational achievement.

2.1.1 Venue
The venue is a modern red brick single storey building with a small car park at the end of a quiet residential cul-de-sac; it is spotlessly clean, well-kept and furnished, always well-lit and warm or well-aired depending on the time of year. The fact it is a Salvation Army venue is downplayed in its appearance and its variety of uses as a community resource for activities, including play groups and weight watchers. Residents report that it is a space in which they feel relaxed and do not associate it with a religious purpose. However, it is a fifteen minute walk from local bus stops and could be deemed inaccessible - particularly on darker, wet nights - as most attendees and most Evergreen residents do not own cars. By 2010, the PACT meetings are being held alternately at two other venues in different parts of Evergreen, both of which are easily accessible by bus.

2.1.2 Participants
At Evergreen, it appeared that most people had tidied themselves up to attend and are
presentably dressed in clothes that are of basic Primark or Peacocks\(^4\) quality. These often show signs of being worn and washed on many occasions. People are ‘tidy’ rather than fashionably or well-dressed. For women, this can mean track bottoms with little evidence of hair styling or make-up. Older residents are more likely to wear formal styles, and many of the older men wear poly-cotton shirts or ties.

Most PACT meetings are noisy gatherings. People chat to each other the talk is always lively and warm and has be called to an end for the formal meeting to begin. After the formal PACT meeting, groups gather to talk over issues or speak to their councillor or the PCSO; it is normal for this to go on for 15 -20 minutes until the caretaker announces that he is locking the building. It is difficult to clarify how many people knew each other before attending PACT meetings; on some occasions, neighbours with similar problems attend together and it would seem that others may have connected through coming to PACT. Occasionally, some people in their 20’s or early 30’s attend for a couple of meetings but none become regulars. The regulars - between 15 to 30 people - are a mix of men and women; there were usually more men, many of whom arrive alone but then often sit and chat together; the ages ranged from late 30’s up to late 70’s with the majority seeming to be in the 50 -70 age range. What characterised the regulars and the community chair is that they had all lived in the area for many years, some for their whole lives or adult lives.. Evergreen is similar to other PACT meetings in having no youth attendees and minimal ethnic minority attendance. Asian shopkeepers attended to speak about their problems at a couple of meetings but then ceased attending.. Most new attendees are unsure or nervous, often wanting to know the format and style of the meetings, are uncertain whether they can speak at a public meeting or prefer to speak quietly to a PCSO at the end.. Due to persistent ASB and harassment issues in later meetings, one woman becomes one of the more vociferous, emotional and outspoken attendees concerning her own and other neighbourhood issues. In particular, she calls for the police and council to do ‘their job properly’ and provide the services they ‘should’.

The regular councillor attendee is greeted, and greets others, by name. She has been a councillor for a couple of terms. Now in her 60’s, she came to live in the area as a young married woman and raised her family here. Like other longstanding residents, the councillor and other attendees feel they are knowledgeable, authentic residents who can speak for

\(^4\) Primark and Peacocks are well-known High Street chain stores that offer cheap affordable clothing.
themselves and their neighbours concerning local needs. Some of the other professionals, for example the Communities First co-ordinator, also attend as a resident. As a quasi-council employee, the co-ordinator does not play a formal partner role. Additionally, the south west sector FLSO lives in neighbouring Coolgreen. Evergreen had the first community chair in City. She suffered long-term harassment and ASB and became active in 2005-6 to get this tackled; previously a critic of the police and services for Evergreen, she was invited to become chair by the police. She can be described as a typical local woman who brought up her family in Evergreen and previously grew up in Coolgreen. She is a strong personality, is prepared to speak out and takes her chairing role seriously.

Within this PACT there is no link to attendance from Neighbourhood Watch Schemes but a couple of local interest groups seemed to attend. One of these is the Concerned Gardeners. Their attendance is not appreciated by the chair who feels their agenda is beyond the remit of PACT. Mainly women in their mid-30 to 40s, the Concerned Gardeners are younger than some of the other regulars. They can be described as typical residents who are perhaps only untypical in that they have become active in their communities. They are a residents’ group from two streets who formed in early 2007 to fight planning permission to build a large private housing development on their community’s green space (and adjacent private woods). The plan included knocking down their youth and play centre and demolishing some council houses. The estate would utilise their streets as an access route and included no new resources for already overstretched services: no additional policing, GP surgeries, dentists, schools, buses or replacement of lost community facilities are planned. During my fieldwork they fight within PACT and with the support of Communities First for diversionary activities and improvements in resources. In 2008 they run a popular, well-attended and peaceful bonfire event, and by 2009 have started regular free weekend football for children on the green space; they also take an active interest in local issues such as fly-tipping and work with the police and council to tackle these. At the beginning of my research they were seen by the labour councillors (who supported the original planning application) and police in a negative light. Through their persistence and broader activities, including obtaining improvements to the green space and facilities, they build relationships and credibility and are transformed into an acceptable group of active citizens that has earned the respect of professional agencies. My longitudinal PACT attendance reveals this process of acceptance by the formal partners; for example, they move to sit closer to the labour councillor who originally opposed their objections to the planning application and by the October 2009 PACT meeting they are
sharing laughter and asides. This is an example of how such long-term ethnographic involvement can reveal changing local politics and relationships.

Resident associations are informally represented by at least one of the keenest regular attendees, who sometimes take minutes. As an area with high levels of social housing (mainly council with some Housing Association) many such groups are well established. He is involved in running City’s regional housing association, is an elected Evergreen Communities First local steering and planning group member, and runs a quarterly forum – with resident and paid council officer attendance - to discuss youth employment and general quality of life issues that began as part of the 1990s regeneration initiatives (called TAPs meetings) in Evergreen. Born and bred in Evergreen, and now in his late 70’s, he is a respected citizen, ex-trade unionist and Secretary of the local Labour Party branch; he worked in the long-closed traditional manufacturing industries that existed in the area until the 1970’s. Through these activities he is experienced at dealing with council departments (e.g. housing, leisure, education and youth services) as well as voluntary sector providers. He could therefore be seen as having a potential agenda for the elderly, housing association, council tenants, youth or the Labour Party. He is a well-informed attendee, used to working with agencies and a supporter of PACT since it commenced, sometimes assisting the FLSO and producing minutes. In 2010 he becomes the new community chair of the PACT until stepping down when elected as one of Labour’s councillors in May 2012.

In May 2008, one regular attendee stands unsuccessfully for election as a Plaid Cymru candidate. He attends as a knowledgeable local resident and ex-youth worker within City. However, his position is often at odds and includes fiery exchanges with the police and the re-elected Labour councillors he stood against regarding poor levels of service within Evergreen. Another well-informed regular has a history of involvement in the Friends of Portsmouth Woods, a group that protects the public woodland on one edge of Evergreen that suffers from fly-tipping, abandoned cars, arson and off-road motor biking.

Over the time that I attended, the Evergreen resident attendance (including councillors) was normally between 18 and 24, with some occurrences of up to 34. The police do keep numbers but these are neither published nor easy to access; they also include themselves in these figures. Apart from my first meetings when it was difficult for me to clearly differentiate regulars and new attendees, the general pattern was for the majority of attendees to be
regulars with a norm of two new attendees (on three occasions rising as high as five or six). New attendees seem to attend for a single issue and cease their attendance once they have had their say or no longer have interest in the issue. For example, two Asian shopkeepers (brothers) came to three meetings to complain of (racist) harassment and vandalism of their shop which has their family home above. They attended their last meeting in June 2009 to say ‘thank you, thank you’ to the PCSO and police for making their issue a priority and calming the situation through more regular Beat activities.

Councillors: The regular councillor attendee has a long history of working actively for the community and neighbourhood, including a major role in the annual festival she started over fourteen years ago. Professional partner involvement provides some funding for the festival and there is always a fire engine and crew, police dogs or motorbike team in attendance. Other Labour councillors sometimes attend the meeting; they sit in the audience and position themselves variously as ordinary residents, special residents or knowledgeable experts. Evergreen meetings are normally emotional and angry, with residents and councillors perceiving their area as let down by both council and police. The councillors usually align with residents to pressure the police or complain about council services (for example harassment, ASB, street cleansing and fly-tipping). This is a PACT where people and councillors work collectively together to reinforce each other’s points. The police and PCSOs are frustrated with their lack of formal partners and the councillors’ difficult and oppositional positioning; at one point, the PCSOs are instructed to ‘tell’ the councillors they ‘should’ be on the panel and represent the council. This is rebuffed by the councillors who state they represent their constituents and will sit in the audience. However, the regular councillor attendee does attend the ANM sub-consultative group which feeds into the main ANM meeting for Evergreen and Coolgreen. At this meeting she is happy to work as a formal partner with the police and council and make requests of services. This is never revealed at the PACT meetings and it is unlikely that the PCSOs are aware of this connection as they are not involved or, at the time of my research, aware of ANM meetings.

Police/PCSOs: The PCSOs are the main attendees of this PACT, sometimes alone but more usually with the FLSO. The police themselves have been notably absent from the majority of the Evergreen PACT meetings. It is the PCSOs who represent the police; on a couple of occasions, when the community chairperson was unable to attend, they sit alone at the top table and have to run the meetings. Of the fifteen meetings I attended, the second (25.10.07)
was visited by the BCU Deputy Commander. He gave a speech about the benefits of PACT and conversed with residents concerning some of their issues; the Neighbourhood Inspector for Evergreen and other police in his entourage also attended and sat at the back of this meeting. Following the implementation of the Policing Pledge in March 2009 and the introduction of named PC and neighbourhood ‘Beat Managers’ the police begin attending all City PACT meetings by September 2009. Within Evergreen PACT, this presence markedly changed the nature of the PCSO input to a brief report on ‘local good news’ with the PC representing the police and reporting on priorities. The removal of the Policing Pledge and Southern policing cuts and reforms during 2010-12 includes the loss of the FLSO role. During my fieldwork the Evergreen and Redbank FLSO (Maureen) supported the PCSOs and was pivotal within these meetings, particularly in the setting of local priorities.

Partners: At three of the early meetings I attended in 2007/8 there was the occasional partner visit, for example, 101, the Arson Reduction Team and Magistrates; they were always given the first slot on the agenda, presented from the top table and always left after finishing their presentation. The local Communities First project sent a representative to five of the fifteen meetings I attended. At the first meeting they attended in March 2008 they were shocked to be asked to sit at the top table and speak about Communities First projects; as discussed above, their presence is not as a formal partner sitting at the top table. Partners’ impact at Evergreen is more by their absence as attendees at the top table. This absence, particularly of paid council officials, is a source of contention and is deemed disrespectful by residents who at the very least expect the police themselves to attend. They clearly differentiate the PCSO who they saw as ‘trying to do their best for them’ from the mainstream police who were seen ‘as letting them down’ and ‘not providing the support and service they should’. This is a key and recurring frustration and emotional issue for Evergreen residents, particularly as it becomes known that the other five sectors of City PACT meetings are attended by a PC or occasionally Sergeant, and on some occasions a Neighbourhood Inspector. Within Evergreen there is a lot of talk by residents of the risks and huge leap of trust they are making in the local police by both talking to them and attending PACT meetings; the consensus seems to be that they cannot see this trust being repaid by the provision of effective policing and justice services.

2.1.3 Types of Priorities
This PACT can be summarised as a clash of expectations between residents’ frustrations with
unresponsive services and the PCSOs who usually try to defend what is, or is not, provided. It also reflects recurring issues of ASB and harassment that are reported at a number of meetings; these often stop for a while before beginning again. This PACT can be seen as an opportunity to ‘have your say’ but not necessarily a route to receiving more or different services. Over my twenty-five months of fieldwork, the most frequent types of issues raised at Evergreen PACT comprise what is considered by the police to be anti-social behaviour with some criminal damage or drug and alcohol related activity:

- **Harassment, noise nuisance and disturbance on people’s properties and on the street.** This can involve youth, and sometimes mixed age groups, causing problems up to 3am in the morning. Youth problems earlier in the day include congregating in gullies or cul-de-sacs, intimidation of elderly residents, shop lifting, damage to shop windows and intimidating customers and staff.

- **Drug dealing from 3pm in the afternoon in certain locations, conducted mainly by males, both older and younger.** This behaviour encourages youngsters and people in cars to drive into Evergreen to buy drugs at specific locations.

- **Fly-tipping of domestic type rubbish.** This causes environmental health problems as well as making the neighbourhood, front of houses and streets look unsightly and run down.

- **Fly-tipping and abandoned vehicles on open ground, woodland and streets.** This causes fire hazards in addition to the deliberate torching of abandoned vehicles.

- **Off road motor biking on common or recreation land.** This is viewed as ‘aiming at’ and causing a danger to young children playing football matches / training. It also turns common land to mud and causes noise nuisance to nearby houses, frequently on Saturday and Sundays. There is also the issue of dangerous driving and uninsured bikes and quad bikes on local access roads.

- **Burglaries, car or other property crime.** These are rarer but they included instances of fence and gate theft from recreation land in the middle of the day, stolen by thieves using lorries.

- **The trial of evening and night-time closure of Badgers Lane which runs under a railway line and crosses the border between Evergreen and Bluewater Ward within the West Cardiff sector.** Evergreen opposed the timed closure and gating and bid for better lighting, CCTV and more policing; Bluewater and Bluewater councillors supported it. The closure was to deal with levels of ASB, fighting and disorder call outs mainly on the Bluewater side with the ‘culprits’ escaping through Badgers Lane; the impetus for closure
began following a serious stabbing incident and the vandalising of a Sergeant’s car. Youth and gang clashes between these two Wards have been a feature of life for the last 20-30 years.

2.1.4 Structure of Meetings

Within Evergreen there are both formal and informal phases to the meetings. The norm at Evergreen is for lively, intense and energised pre-meeting conversations that give the impression that these are a key part of PACT for resident attendees, if not professionals. While not part of the formal structure of the meeting they have their own significance and can be seen as a normal part of these meetings, beyond the control of the formal structure (Boden 1994, Kunda 1992). These meetings usually overrun the one hour format desired by the police and cannot be said to be a celebration of success and good news stories. These are difficult and taxing meetings, particularly for the PCSOs and community chair at the top table.

Introductory phase: The community chair begins by introducing themselves and the PCSOs (both are sat at the top-table); FLSO sits at the back and the councillors in the audience. The review of information and statistics on calls and past priorities is very brief, lasting no more than five minutes. This does not usually qualify as updating the community or information giving and is frequently missed as the PCSOs and FLSO often come without relevant or detailed information. Often within the first couple of minutes, residents and councillors take control of this phase and immediately take the meeting into discussions, challenges and complaints; for example, disputes regarding the number of calls and incidents reported to 101 and lack of updates.

Middle phase: This is particularly lengthy and fast paced, with some people speaking over each other as they add to each other’s points. This always lasts an hour and twenty minutes, and sometimes two hours. This seems to be the meat of the meeting during which residents have their say and push for the outcomes they feel they deserve. This phase is often emotional and, as voices rise, the chair tries to calm things down, asks supportive questions of clarification and frequently has to bang the table and shout ‘quiet, quiet’ above the rest of the meeting.
Closing phase: This lasts no more than ten minutes, and usually less than five. It is the priority setting phase and this seems to be of most interest to the PCSOs and FLSO. The chair co-ordinates this phase and, like residents, is told by the FLSO that some priorities cannot be met, either because there would be more than three or the area covered needs to be reduced to cover a few houses or part of a street. The residents often start their own conversations and seem to withdraw from this formal phase. They move into their own animated conversations and informal post-PACT meeting which includes having one-to-one conversations with councillors and the PCSOs. Following the end of the formal PACT meeting, residents conversations often include a debrief of the meeting and finding out more information from each other. For attendees, these conversations seem to be a second main event or critical transition phase in their own right (Kunda 1992).

2.2 Redbank

Redbank is a mainly residential ward with local shops, pubs, takeaways, restaurants, some hotels and B&B. It follows the river boundary of the City centre. North Redbank includes village shops, restaurants and substantial inner City parkland that is a major cricket venue and was used for the 2008 Eisteddfod.. The population is 12,009 (ONS mid-year 2006) and it’s one of three inner-city wards with an overall ward ethnic minority population (18%), mainly Asian and Somali. Within parts of South Redbank this ranges from 27-34% and is a lot lower in mainly white North Redbank. Within the Southern arc of the City it has a mixed profile of advantage; North Redbank is in the top 10% of advantaged areas in Wales and disadvantage South Redbank is in the top 10% of the most disadvantaged areas in Wales (WIMD 2005, 2008). South Redbank became a Communities First area in 2006. I tracked Redbank PACT from October 2007 to September 2009, attending nine out of a possible thirteen meetings, and two Asian women only mini PACT. By October 2007 I had interviewed the FLSO twice and also the Sector Inspector covering Redbank and Evergreen.

2.2.1 Venue

The Redbank PACT is held in a community centre within South Redbank that is used by a mix of communities and faiths, mainly Sikh, Hindu, Muslim and Christian. This venue also houses the South Redbank Communities First scheme. Set close to a main road, it has parking spaces and is on a bus route from North Redbank to the city centre. The meetings are conducted in a brightly decorated ground floor hall that is used by many organisations, including a playgroup. Chairs for attendees and the panel’s top-table are laid out at each
meeting. The panel and FLSO sit behind an imposing double trestle table, with the residents spread out in front of them. The lighting is dim, and the hall’s high ceiling means quiet speakers, like the community chair, often have to be asked to speak up.

2.2.2 Participants
Residents: As with Evergreen, people look cleanly but poorly dressed, often in older clothes, sweat shirts or worn shoes. They come mainly from South Redbank with an occasional better-dressed North Redbank resident. The regulars are long-term residents of South Redbank: older, white, often couples in their 60’s and 70’s with a few in their 50’s. On a couple of occasions some English-educated Asian women in their 40’s attended and other fluent English speaking minority ethnic members. These are either professionals who attend to air issues or shop owners who are experiencing problems. It is noticeable that no non-fluent English speakers attend, or young people and, apart from one occasion, none of the newer, younger homeowners or private and social rental tenants that have moved into the area. There is a separate citywide police quarterly ethnic consultation group of key individual network (KINs) to which some Redbank residents and a councillor belong. For long-standing South Redbank residents this area has changed from being mainly white to being between 27-34% BME over the duration of their residency; at times it is not clear if this is seen as part of the problem. Attendance varies between nine and twenty-eight with a slight downward trend; often more women attend than men. A lower proportion of ethnic minority communities attend than the average 18% for North and South Redbank. The female PCSOs capitalise on a Communities First funded English language class for Asian women and run a mini-PACT with this group which involves explaining when to ring 999 or 101 and topics such as house security. There is a separate English language class for Asian men but this does not have its own mini-PACT; the two male PCSOs attend their certificate ceremony sitting at the back and not engaging with anyone. As well as non-English speaking minorities, transient residents and young people are absent attendees, as with other PACT.

At the main PACT meetings, residents are frustrated by lack of responsiveness from services, constructing them as failing to fulfil their responsibilities as ‘servants of the community’ (Herbert 2006). Most resident contributions are personal issues and the meeting then moves on to the next resident and their issues rather than working collectively and collaboratively. The community chair is a quiet, nervous man in his mid-40s. He became involved through membership of his local Neighbourhood Watch scheme and says he is chair because
councillors are not allowed to chair the meeting. He plays a minor ‘figure-head’ role but the councillors run this PACT.

Councillors: During my fieldwork, the councillors all belong to Plaid Cymru; one of the councillors is from the Muslim Bangladeshi community, one is a Sikh, the third lives in North Redbank and is female white and Welsh speaking. A number of the North Redbank residents are bi-lingual professionals who are first language Welsh speakers. These councillors can be said to be networked into a number of the local communities as well as formally through their councillor roles. This PACT can be considered a CACT© meeting. The councillors give full reports to the meeting and take away between nine and fifteen additional priorities to the three formally set in the final priority setting phase. They are seen by the police and residents as working in a non-party political way to do their best for the neighbourhood and are respected for this. This PACT originally began as a councillor surgery and one of the councillors tells me they have been let down by the police who never attend.

Police/ PCSOs: As mentioned the Police, up until the final 2009 meetings, are absent from these meetings. At least one and usually two PCSOs attend and sit mainly silently at the top table. They tell me they would never be able to run these PACT meetings and wouldn’t want to.

Partners: The councillors are the key partners who run this meeting though they also insist they do not represent the council and cannot tell the council what to do. On one occasion some senior council staff involved in Waste and Cleansing visit and on another a Traffic Warden but like the other PACTs this is not a regular occurrence.

2.2.3 Types of Priorities

The priorities for Redbank are mainly council issues. The police suggest that this is frequently the case where PACTs are run by councillors, making this an easy PACT for them. As stated, the councillors are always taking additional priorities, particularly for street cleansing, fly-tipping and parking issues which are consistently raised at most Redbank PACT meetings. Recurring issues include:

5 Councillors and Communities Together
• Street cleansing is reported as woeful in South Redbank and is unfavourably compared to advantaged North Redbank which is always clean.

• Fly-tipping, prostitution, needles and use of alleys as toilets after major entertainment and sports events. In 2008/9 Tidy Towns money pays for many of the alleys to be gated and this does a lot to improve this situation. This comes through Neighbourhood Management but is claimed as a PACT success.

• Dangerous illegal parking & blocked roads during stadium. Residents cannot park in their own roads, are blocked in or emergency services cannot reach them. This is a recurring issue and traffic wardens, the council and police are seen as not doing enough to deal with it.

• Dangerous lights/crossings. The council seems unwilling to sort out two main locations where cars think they have right of way on confusing junction layouts. Drivers have nearly run over residents trying to cross at pedestrian lights.

• ASB youth and drinking parties in the park in North Redbank on summer evenings

2.2.4 Structure of Meetings

These bi-monthly meetings tend to begin with the older white regulars arriving early to chat with each other and the councillors before the formal meeting begins. It tends to start late, there are always latecomers, and the meetings last an hour or a little over. Meetings can vary in intensity from calm to more emotional occasions. They always begin calmly to allow the councillors to report; in later phases it is usual for people to wait for their turn to speak. They are not as fast paced as Evergreen

Introductory Phase: This is the lengthiest phase; based on councillor reports, it often lasts 30 minutes and residents may join in with brief updates on their particular issues. People listen; they want to hear what councillors have to say and, when they begin to attend in late 2009, what the Beat Managers are saying. This phase goes without challenge.

Middle phase: The floor is formally opened to residents who, until then, have mainly been passive listeners. People are outspoken and raise their voices but these meetings are normally quieter than Evergreen. Exchanges can be heated, and at some meetings emotions and tempers flare. Residents seize the opportunity to have their say, expressing exasperation at suffering the same unresolved issues.
Closing phase: Like Evergreen and Whitewood, people seem spent and disinterested in the final priority setting phase. It is a brief perfunctory phase during which some residents might leave. Councillors and the FLSO or PC discuss possible priorities and their suggestions are never challenged by residents who listen obligingly and vote with a show of hands when asked. Following the end of the formal meeting a few of the residents stay on to talk privately to councillors who take notes and, once they begin attending, some chat to the police.

2.3 Whitewood

Whitewood is a leafy suburban ward with many detached houses, due north from the city centre in the northern arc of City. Whitewood is one of the most advantaged wards in Wales and is one of the two most advantaged wards in City (WIMD 2005, 2008). It has some of the lowest levels of crime and disorder in Wales and City; incidents never figure as hotspots and it has some of the best health and wellbeing outcomes. The population is 11,281 (ONS estimates for mid-2006) and is 99% white. It has many large residential properties with drives and sizeable front gardens, garages and private parking spaces; it is served by railway and bus links to the city centre and has easy motorway access. Its population is served by one of City’s best schools (in a neighbouring ward) and it has a well-established ‘village’ shopping area with bistro cafes, the most used library in City and well-kept parks. Originally built as an outlying village, other residential areas have spread to meet it. The outer edge backs on to woods and fields that climb to open countryside and hills that fall outside the boundaries of City. Like the PACT chair, many residents have lived there for over forty years and 45% of the population are over 65. It is regarded as a quiet oasis with its own amenities, easy access to city facilities and a good school. This status is closely guarded and families aspire to live there.

I tracked Whitewood from January 2008 to November 2009, attending six out of nine meetings plus one of the daytime mini-PACT surgeries. Attendance levels increased from fourteen to a high of thirty-six at the last meeting I attended, with the majority of regulars representing Neighbourhood Watch Schemes. At my first attendance, the FLSO introduced me to the chair, the PC and PCSO. Everyone else ignored me. The FLSO rarely attends and residents did not seem to know him. The PC and the PCSO circulate, talking to people by name prefixed by ‘Mr’. These are almost private consultations. As my attendance continues I
am acknowledged with nods but not encouraged to join or speak to regular attendees. At one meeting I was the only woman in trousers and casual dress and with my visibly mixed heritage I was the only non-white person in attendance. These are sedate, polite and often humorous meetings.

2.3.1 Venue
The quarterly PACT meetings are held at All Saints Church supplemented by occasional daytime mini-PACT meetings that move venue to cover the neighbourhood and encourage attendees who might not come to the evening PACT. All Saints is fairly central within the ward. It is an old decorative church with stained windows, set in a small green surrounded by trees on a quiet street just off the main road and bus route. Richly carpeted and heated, it is a bright, sunny venue in summer. In the wedding season it usually has flowers. It is always spotlessly clean and open well before the meeting. The meeting uses the church seats which remain in rows facing the knave. The panel addresses the audience from behind a formal table which is draped with a tablecloth and sometimes decorated with flowers. Attendees obviously feel at home here and while not too far from a bus stop there are plenty of parking spaces that are filled with a number of large expensive cars.

2.3.2 Participants
Residents: People look ‘well heeled’. Women are groomed, their outfits co-ordinated with shoes and tasteful jewellery. Clothes are well-cut and expensive, with a minimum dress code of M&S. Men wear polished shoes or expensive loafers, their clothing a mix of good suits, tailored coats & hats, wool jumpers, pressed trousers, ironed shirts and the occasional tie. They shop from John Lewis. The general feel of the meeting is that one needs to maintain standards and dress appropriately to attend. The majority arrive in upmarket, new-looking large cars that are spotlessly clean. Prompt and ready to start, attendees are mainly couples with a few additional women. Latecomers are rare. Most people seem to know and acknowledge each other. Nearly everyone greets the councillors by name. There is usually a quiet buzz of conversation in the room before the formal meeting. Afterwards, most leave quickly but a few remain to talk to panel members. The majority of attendees are over 60, some possibly over 70. They appear to be professional and comfortably off retirees, for example, an ex-head of Planning and Transport for City. A few are in their 50’s for example, the current Head of Human Resources for a neighbouring local authority; the women seem to be primarily housewives. A younger woman in her 40’s is a regular note-taker. The FLSO
reports that it is a quiet well-to-do area whose main issue is to keep undesirables and problems out.

Like Evergreen and Redbank, this meeting is attended by a core of regulars; the faithful caretakers of their areas with a low attendance rate. There are five Neighbourhood Watch Schemes, represented at this meeting by one to three of their members; at my last meeting two new schemes attend. Often it is the men in these groups who speak for their schemes while the women take notes or prompt them. Other attendees often come about their issue and for an occasional meeting. Whitewood is known to have a high community consultation panel response rate for council and other panel consultations. In the spring of 2008, their responses to the UPSI signal crimes skewed City results and made it look as if Whitewood railway station approach was the most troubled ASB spot in City. This brought the study’s findings into disrepute with council and police professionals (Neighbourhood Network Meeting January 2009).

The community chair is in her early 70’s. An energised woman, she is trusted and relied upon; she runs the meetings with a firm, friendly air. She has a history of community involvement and is a skilled chair who keeps a calm but tight control on the meetings; this includes ensuring that they are polite, respectful, run efficiently and always finish close to or within the one hour guideline. She is supportive of the police - ‘these gentlemen’ - and council, and says it is her job to keep services on their toes and stay up-to-date with what is happening in the area.

Councillors: The three independent councillors all live within the area and run on the ticket of working for the neighbourhood. Two of them are a married couple in their 30’s; the wife speaks for them both about the positive opportunity PACT represents to discuss matters with ‘our’ residents who want to talk to us and the police. She is re-elected in May 2012. They are happy to sit on the top panel and represent the council because it would be too costly and impossible to get paid officials to regularly attend evening neighbourhood meetings.

Police/PCS0: During my research a PC and PCS0 attend, though some of the bad news in 2009 is that the area may lose its PCS0. The PC is the local decision-maker and he and his predecessor are both well informed, calm, confident sure hands who listen and respond to all resident concerns. They report this to be important as their function is to inform and reassure
Whitewood residents who have been nicknamed the ‘worried well-off’ by one senior police officer. The elderly and families are reported as frightened by media reports on ‘gangs of hoodies’ but in reality it’s a group of kids out in park playing or on their route home from school.

Partners: A number of partners visit this PACT (e.g. Trading Standards, TV digital switch over, the Credit Union etc.). The trading standards person tells us he lives in Whitewood. The Whitewood meetings most closely reflect the police desired PACT meeting with plenty of good news stories, council issues and reassurance.

2.3.3 Types of Priorities
The priorities for Whitewood in November 2008 are described as typical for the area: parking, speed cameras and cycling on pavements. While reflecting local priorities and concerns, these can be seen as less severe and low grade compared to those of other, less advantaged areas:
- Parking near to the shops, and speeding cars on the main North artery road that leads to the countryside from Whitewood are discussed at most meetings.
- Youth annoyance is frequently raised, often based on their presence in public places and parks; some of this is attributed to youths from other areas. Otherwise it is en-route home from school problems and, most contentiously, youngsters cycling on pavements.
- Other issues include changes to bus routes, rubbish collection days and the closure of the local bank branch.

2.3.4 Structure of Meetings
The majority of people arrive in small groups and fill the front rows of the church first. The PC and PCSO circulate, handing out information leaflets (for example, keeping warm this winter) and shaking hands. Occasionally there are a few latecomers.

Introductory Phase: The chair welcomes people and hands over to PC who gives full, leisurely and humorous updates including detailed action reports on past priorities. People listen attentively, patiently and with good will, and nod when they approve (for example, to talk of extra foot patrols or displacing trouble-makers).
Middle phase: This formally begins when the PC sits down and the floor is open to residents who begin taking turns to raise issues. They often use humour and talk to the audience as well as the panel and there will be nods or ‘tut tuts’ from around the room. This phase includes giving councillors a chance to update the community on relevant issues and council action (for example, bus route changes).

Closing phase: This is equally as brief as the other PACTs. The panel take at least five minutes to discuss the priorities amongst themselves before suggesting a list to the audience. Residents acquiesce to both councillor and police requests for particular priorities and seem happy and well served. After the formal end, a few speak individually to police, chair or councillors. The majority leave quickly, smiling and rubbing their hands as they leave; there is a sense of having ‘done their job’ for another couple of months.
Appendix Six  City Crime, Disorder & Anti-Social Behaviour Sector Profiles &
Snapshot of PACT Priorities November 2008

1. City Crime, Disorder & Anti-Social Behaviour Sector Profiles
This reviews the City Neighbourhood & Partnership Safety, Crime, & Disorder Priorities data for the two time periods 2007/8 compared to 2008/9. Both periods were within my fieldwork. The data has been extracted from the confidential 2009 /10 Strategic Assessment for City, Safer Capital Strategic Assessment May 2009. This covers the crime and disorder and quality of life strategic partnership priorities that encompass those of City CSP and City BCU policing priorities for 2009 /10.

City Strategic Partnership priorities:
- Intelligence-led Business Process (tasking based on information and analysis)
- Neighbourhood Management & Problem-oriented partnerships
- Offender Management
- Support of victims and witnesses of crime & anti-social behaviour
- Tackling substance misuse
- Providing public reassurance

City BCU policing priorities:
- Auto-crime
- Burglary Dwelling
- Violent Crime
- Neighbourhood Management
- Class ‘A’ Drugs
- Counter Terrorism

(Restricted, Safer Capital Strategic Assessment, Issue May 2009: 6)

A number of BCU-level priorities include the PSA Delivery Agreement 23 to set four priority actions for partnership within England and Wales for 2008-11; for example, tackling serious acquisitive crime, the most harmful crime and drug misuse offending (ibid:11-18).

Most relevant to PACT and this research is priority action three. This addresses the crime and disorder and anti-social behaviour issues of greatest importance to each locality, and the need for increasing public confidence in the local agencies involved in these issues (ibid:19). This gives a breakdown of locality figures for crime, disorder and ASB for each of the six Neighbourhood Management sectors within City. Notwithstanding the issues of bias and compilation that surround official statistics (including police crime statistics) they allow comparison between sectors and paint a picture of the specific locality issues for the PACT meetings studied (Skogan 2006; Fielding & Innes 2006).
Part of this context is a picture of City’s neighbourhoods based on what City police and officials term problem identifiers and ASB. The table below examines a neighbourhood level breakdown of these ‘problem identifiers’, constructed mainly from police data and NICHE data of recorded incidents of ASB. One of the 2010 tasks for the partnership is to build an ASB database that covers partners’ data (not just police) and leads to developing partnership key performance indicators (KPIs) for reducing ASB. Some of this data is used by the police to monitor their performance on targets and assist in the allocation of police resources between and within neighbourhoods. This provides ANM members with an information base to guide partnership sectorial decision-making based on intelligence-led and tasking databases. Some, but not all, of these issues are raised at PACT. It should be noted that Sectors vary in size and density of population. City’s South West Sector includes both Evergreen and Redbank in its six wards; City’s North Sector includes Whitewood in its twelve wards.

Within the North Sector, advantaged Whitewood is ranked highly for burglary and auto-crime. Within the South West Sector, Evergreen and Redbank are ranked highly for criminal damage, ASB, deliberate fires (65.7% of deliberate fires in this sector were rubbish fires or refuse containers; 14.7% were related to burnt out vehicles and 10.6% to grass fires) and violent crime (ibid 48). Abandoned and burnt out vehicles are discussed at the Evergreen PACT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Sectors / Locations</th>
<th>ASB</th>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
<th>Burglary Dwelling</th>
<th>Auto Crime</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Criminal Damage</th>
<th>Deliberate Fires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South West Sector</td>
<td>2nd (1st)</td>
<td>2nd (2nd)</td>
<td>3rd (3rd)</td>
<td>3rd (4th)</td>
<td>3rd (3rd)</td>
<td>1st (1st)</td>
<td>2nd (3rd) 245 incidts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sector</td>
<td>4th (3rd)</td>
<td>5th (5th)</td>
<td>2nd (2nd)</td>
<td>2nd (2nd)</td>
<td>4th (4th)</td>
<td>3rd (3rd)</td>
<td>4th (5th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sector</td>
<td>5th (5th)</td>
<td>6th (6th)</td>
<td>5th (5th)</td>
<td>6th (6th)</td>
<td>6th (6th)</td>
<td>6th (6th)</td>
<td>6th (6th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sector</td>
<td>6th (6th)</td>
<td>4th (4th)</td>
<td>4th (4th)</td>
<td>5th (5th)</td>
<td>5th (6th)</td>
<td>4th (5th)</td>
<td>1st (2nd) 325 incidts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Sector</td>
<td>1st (2nd)</td>
<td>3rd (3rd)</td>
<td>1st (1st)</td>
<td>1st (1st)</td>
<td>2nd (2nd)</td>
<td>2nd (2nd)</td>
<td>3rd (1st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre &amp; South</td>
<td>3rd (4th)</td>
<td>1st (1st)</td>
<td>6th (6th)</td>
<td>4th (3rd)</td>
<td>1st (1st)</td>
<td>5th (4th)</td>
<td>4th (4th)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Neighbourhood Problem Identifiers Strategic Assessment 2009 / 10 based mainly on police and some other partnership data
Within City BCU, the number of ASB occurrences is based on all police occurrences recorded on the NICHE system. These are reported as decreasing from 38,827 in 2007/8 to 35,469 in 2008/9: a reduction of 8.6% (ibid:19). Some of the rankings are based on very small differences in the number of incidents: South East Sector is ranked 1st based on 6598 incidents compared to the South West Sectors which ranks 2nd with a total of 6547 ASB incidents, which is only 49 less than the South East (ibid: 44, 65). ASB occurrences are recorded under a number of different categories but 93% are recorded under five headings:

- Rowdy/ Nuisance – Rowdy & Inconsiderate (accounts for 60.8% of occurrences)
- Vehicle Nuisance / Inappropriate Vehicle Use
- Rowdy/ Nuisance – Neighbours
- Abandoned Vehicles
- Malicious Communications

My discussion focuses on the South West Sector, which includes Evergreen and Redbank; and secondly the North Sector, which includes Whitewood. There are 500 different locations for ASB in the South West Sector. Of these, 26.7% took place in 12 streets with over 90 incidents occurring in each. Out of these 12 streets, 6 are in Evergreen; taking Evergreen & Coolgreen (also known as South Evergreen) together this increases to 8 out of the 12 (see Table 4 below). For Evergreen and Redbank, the streets shown in bold are high on ASB and criminal damage, both of which have also been raised as priorities at PACT meetings. This shows a partial overlap between these figures and some PACT issues. For the streets shown within Coolgreen and Ganton Wards these issues are likely to have been raised at PACT.

Within PACT, minor criminal damage (property or vehicles) is recorded and treated as ASB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASB by Street South West Sector</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>ASB by Street South West Sector</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Rd <strong>E</strong> (Ganton)^</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>St. <strong>D</strong> Crescent (Evergreen Ward)^</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> Ave (Evergreen Ward)^</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>T** Street (Redbank Ward)^</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Rd <strong>W</strong> (Evergreen &amp; Ganton)^</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>A** Rd (Evergreen Ward)^</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca** Lane (Coolgreen Ward)^</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>C** Close (Evergreen Ward)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H*** T**(Ganton Ward)^</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>C** Road (Redbank Ward)^</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F** P** Rd (Redbank Ward)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>P** Road (Evergreen Ward)^</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: ASB Incidents South West Sector** (IssueMay2009:44)

For the South West Sector criminal damage is ranked 1st as a Problem Identifier (see table 1 above). This report suggests this could be linked directly to the high level of ASB and suggests that tackling ASB will have a positive effect on reducing criminal damage offences.
Of the 363 streets experiencing criminal damage, eighteen streets had more than 20 offences, accounting for 34% of the total. When mapped on to the ASB data it is shown that 10 of these 18 streets also experienced high levels of both (^). Nine of these streets are in Evergreen and four in Redbank; the street with the highest level runs through Ganton. This street is a key route into the city centre for all the wards in the West and South West sectors of the city. With many licensed premises, it accounts for most of the ASB and criminal damage in the sector. It is also a throughway to major stadium events. The UPSI (2009) study also found this street was ranked as the highest priority or ‘signal’ for the whole of City. However this street has never been raised at either Evergreen or Redbank PACT meetings. The priority issue at these PACTs has been the inconvenience to Redbank residents caused by illegal and dangerous parking by those attending football or main stadia events. At the ANM meetings, C** Rd E** becomes the key focus and is given the highest priority for resources and partnership action.

The North Sector is the largest geographically spread sector, with twelve rather than five or six wards. Eight of these are least-deprived ‘better-off’ areas, so despite its higher population it remains fifth or sixth in the rankings on the majority of indicators. It does come 2nd highest on burglary of dwellings and auto crime, mainly accounted for within three wards that do not include Whitewood. Looking at the ‘hotspot’ street locations for ASB and other types of issues none are in Whitewood. However Whitewood, through the council’s consultation panels, overwhelmingly gave the highest response rate to the online component of the UPSI (2009) survey. This skewed the results to create an ASB hotspot at Whitewood railway station. One City Chief Inspector coined the phrase ‘worried well-off’ to describe Whitewood and similar wards, suggesting they are what Skogan (2006) describes as respondents having a heightened awareness of overall perception of crime (including ASB) when there is little or no relationship between perception of crime levels and levels of safety. In the eyes of officers, this skewing undermined the UPSI (2009) results and they used this discursive resource to refute the credibility of the survey. This reinforced their construction and perception that official assessments (CSP, Local Authority Partnership ASB unit, and Police) give a more accurate and reliable picture. This became the apocryphal story of the UPSI (2009) report overshadowing many of its other contributions (Bordieu 2000b cited in Karn 2007). When the UPSI (2009) data reinforced official assessments, public service officials drew on it to gain additional police and council resources (for example C** Rd E** as the key priority for the South West sector).
2. Snapshot of PACT Priorities for all City PACTs for November 2008
Table 3 below is a snapshot picture of PACT priorities in City for November 2008. This illustrates the differences between priorities for Evergreen (all ASB) Redbank (youth annoyance, rubbish, and speeding) and Whitewood (parking, cycling on pavements, speed cameras). One reason for PACT priorities being difficult to track is that they are published with little or no detail though ourbobby.com (the Southern Police Neighbourhood Policing website introduced in 2009), although street names and locations are provided. The UPSI report (2009) concluded that ASB ranked as the highest concern of the public in five out of six sectors; only East Sector did not have ASB the highest. They report a high level of agreement between their data on public priorities or CDQL ‘signals’ of greatest concern and PACT priorities within the same period (Spring of 2008). They conclude that PACT meetings and their structured interview/survey both produce accurate assessments and priorities to counterbalance official assessments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South West Sector</th>
<th>Priority One</th>
<th>Priority Two</th>
<th>Priority Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coolgreen</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Drug Dealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganton</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evergreen</strong></td>
<td><strong>Anti-Social Behaviour</strong></td>
<td><strong>Anti-Social Behaviour</strong></td>
<td><strong>Anti-Social Behaviour</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikkleston (sub-ward of Evergreen)</td>
<td>Highways Issue</td>
<td>Dog Fouling</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbank</td>
<td>Youth Annoyance</td>
<td>Rubbish / Recycling</td>
<td>Speeding / Traffic Lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City &amp; South Sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority One</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Two</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Three</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B***</td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>Pedal Cycles</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Traffic Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayton</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority One</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Two</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Three</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Treigia) &amp; St Magans</td>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluewater</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Alcohol / ASB</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L***</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong>* North**</td>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td><strong>Anti-Social Behaviour</strong></td>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pn</strong>*</td>
<td>Rural Watch Development</td>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; M</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W &amp; T</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority One</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Two</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Three</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cy***</td>
<td>Youth Annoyance</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Speeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H***</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>ASB / Theft</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L***</td>
<td>Highways Issue</td>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin***</td>
<td>Youth Annoyance</td>
<td>Youth Annoyance</td>
<td>Motor Cycle Annoyance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lla***</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentwin</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Motor Cycle Annoyance</td>
<td>Traffic / Speeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pe***</td>
<td>Youth Annoyance</td>
<td>Youth Annoy/Fly Tipping</td>
<td>Speeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Po</strong>*</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whitewood</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pedal Cycles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speeding / Speed Camera</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th***</td>
<td>Underage Sale / Consumption Alcohol</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Shops Official Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South East Sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority One</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Two</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Three</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A***</td>
<td>Road Safety</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Littering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C***</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G***</td>
<td>Tenant Eviction</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P***</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Rubbish / Littering</td>
<td>Prostitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencchurch</td>
<td>V*** Waste Incineration</td>
<td>Fly Tipping</td>
<td>Council Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T***</td>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority One</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Two</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Three</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lly***</td>
<td>Youth Annoyance</td>
<td>Youth Annoyance</td>
<td>Youth Annoyance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Fellons</td>
<td>Youth/Motorcycle Annoy</td>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R***</td>
<td>HGV Road Use</td>
<td>Auto-crime</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old St M***</td>
<td>Motorcycle Annoyance</td>
<td>Dog Fouling</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr***</td>
<td>Youth Annoyance</td>
<td>Youth Annoyance</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: PACT Priorities by Neighbourhood (November 2008) based on a table produced by City CSP with street locations removed
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