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1. ABSTRACT

This document provides the background to, and justification of, a systematic review addressing the question of (i) whether the recruitment of minority-group officers and other police personnel improves on police/community relations and (ii) reduces crime. The review will address this issue as an important component of the community engagement agenda in contemporary policing. To be clear, the focus for our systematic review will be on studies that examine the relationship between the enhanced recruitment of minority-group officers and community engagement, and in turn the outcomes for policing. The outcomes may include beneficial effects not directly related to crime reduction, such as better police/public relations or greater social cohesion, as well as crime-reductive effects. This protocol outlines the questions that the review seeks to answer and the methods through which relevant studies will be identified, appraised and synthesised. Like other What Works Centre for Crime Reduction Systematic Reviews, this review will attempt to combine the principles and procedures of two distinct approaches to evidence synthesis: meta-analysis of the type associated with Cochrane and Campbell Collaboration systematic reviews (see Sackett et al. 1996; Petrosino et al. 2001) and realist synthesis (Pawson and Tilley, 1997; Pawson, 2006). Accordingly, this document sets out why and how we will combine these two review methods and the additional benefits for research knowledge and crime prevention policy and practice that we hope will result from doing so.

2. THE POLICY CONTEXT

The policy context is an important driver of this review. Both community engagement and minority recruitment are of high current concern, not least against the context of the rising threat of indigenous terrorism.

First, the general topic of community engagement elicited more comments in the College of Policing stakeholder consultation than any other topic. Since a primary stakeholder group for the WWCCR Systematic Reviews are police managers such as the superintendents in charge of Basic Command Units (and their equivalents), the substantial interest in assessing the role of minority recruitment as a contributor to community engagement is significant in positioning this systematic review. Second, recruitment policy has for some years been a principal mechanism by which forces have sought to better reflect the community they police, and it
remains highly topical, e.g., the recent major policy announcement by the Metropolitan Police to focus recruitment on London residents, a policy directed to better reflecting the ethnic mix in the city’s population. Third, issues relating to women in the police have attracted considerable research. Fourth, existing SRs in the field of community policing and community engagement have not addressed the topic of the crime-reductive and other benefits of minority officer recruitment, focussing instead on service delivery initiatives. Our search strategy will also seek to include empirical studies of the role of minority groups as formal volunteers in auxiliary police services, e.g., Police Support Volunteers, and Special Constables. Finally, it has increasingly been recognised that the public relationship with the police organization is also influenced by encounters with police staff (civilian employees) where those staff are engaged in public-facing roles on the frontline or in the station or other police facilities. Our SR recognises this and will incorporate any primary literature on this group in its search strategy.

It is an important aspect of the policy context that, unlike the US, there is reluctance in the UK polity to adopt ‘affirmative action’ or ‘positive discrimination’ policies as a means to increase the diversity of the workforce, either in policing or other occupations. The London’s Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (2014) recently announced a recruitment policy designed to better reflect the ethnic diversity of the capital city’s population. As affirmative action remains controversial, the Met policy is to recruit only those who have been resident at a Greater London Authority (GLA) address for the last several years. Since the GLA has the largest ethnic minority share of population in the country, this should in theory increase the proportion of minority applicants. The assumption is that better reflecting the ethnic mix of the capital’s population will lead to reduced crime through improving the public’s confidence that police will respond effectively to minority community concerns, leading to enhanced information flows and other forms of public cooperation. It will also meet the statutory duties of the Public Sector Equality Act (Equality Act 2010). However, recruiting a small number of police officers from hitherto underrepresented groups into an existing largely white and male workforce may have less effect than adding new minority officers into an already diverse workforce. In other words, the pre-existing balance of the workforce and the locality can be logically anticipated modifiers of the impact of the addition of new police officers to the force. This consideration speaks to the ‘tipping point’ and ‘critical mass’ themes in, for example, the ‘Women in Science’ literature. Threshold arguments have also been made in respect of female and ethnic minority officer recruitment, notably in the US, where particular proportions of police force gender
composition have been cited as critical to change in service delivery (Cordner and Cordner 2011). The US literature may thus be of particular value in assessing the impact of such recruitment.

3. DEFINING ‘COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT’

The seminal figure in the development of modern policing, Sir Robert Peel, held that the ability of police to fulfil their functions and duties depended on the cooperation of the public. Without public acceptance of the police institution as legitimate, police could not effectively exercise their powers, detect or prevent crime, or resolve disorder. Community engagement has both micro and macro dimensions. In micro, community engagement involves the interaction of officer and citizen in law enforcement and order maintenance situations. In macro, community engagement involves the longer term ties that develop around collaboration between police and communities in pursuing priorities, interventions and plans that are important to the locale in which citizens reside and/or work, and that come about when police and other social agencies provide the resources necessary to such collaborative efforts. In both the micro and macro dimensions, the willing participation of citizens is crucial to productive, effective community engagement.

As a concept, community engagement has its origins in common law jurisprudence. An English court decision in 1891 regarding ‘community benefit’ identified several types (charitable trusts promoting education, charitable trusts promoting religion, and those promoting other beneficial causes). In the US, ‘community engagement’ is a term applied only to individual benefactors and charities. The principal activity associated with it is ‘community organizing’, where enthusiasts work to instil a given community with a sense of its shared interests and promote collective means of achieving these. The US term applied to work beneficial to communities but conducted by government and other public bodies is ‘public engagement’ (a term currently used in the UK for public outreach efforts by universities, such as the Public Understanding of Science agenda). In the UK, the contemporary usage of community engagement emerged from government policy thinking in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Organisations such as the Home Office (Elliott and Nicholls 1996), the Audit Commission (1999, 2003), and the Cabinet Office (2002) produced practice guidance on engaging the public and aimed at a range of criminal justice organisations and other social agencies. In Scotland, there is a national body promoting
‘national standards for community engagement’. The standards cover a gamut of public agencies having relationships with relevant communities (www.scdc.org.uk).

Community engagement is facilitated by appropriate structures of outreach – community consultation meetings, Neighbourhood Watch schemes, formal public scrutiny arrangements (e.g., police and crime panels, ‘community trigger’ procedures), informal public scrutiny (e.g., ‘citizen ride-along’, public observation via accompanied patrol), passive information-sharing (e.g., online crime maps, community newsletters, publication of annual strategies), and active information-sharing (e.g., officer ‘door knocking’ campaigns). The backbone of community engagement is close, regular contact and the symbolic display of outreach through the daily visible presence of officers and auxiliaries patrolling and performing services and interventions in communities. This is not to say that community engagement will ever be more than ‘some of the people some of the time’. The important thing is that when these times arise – individually in moments of crisis or concern, or collectively in the face of wider challenges – the public feels comfortable to come forward and the police respond with respect, openness, and the plausible offer of effective resolutions.

The ‘community engagement’ term includes a number of activities, goals and plans. However, this breadth does not mean that absolutely any interaction between officer and citizen is included. Community engagement is a longer-term, broader and planned form of collaboration between police and public, and thus extends beyond brief encounters. Myhill (2012) offers this definition: ‘The process of enabling the participation of citizens and communities in policing at their chosen level, ranging from providing information and reassurance to empowering them to identify and implement solutions to local problems and influence strategic priorities and decisions. The police, citizens and communities must have the willingness, capacity and opportunity to participate. The Police Service and partner organizations must have a responsibility to engage and, unless there is a justifiable reason, the presumption is that they must respond to community input’. Community engagement can, for example, include the public consultation exercises conducted by UK bodies such as Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (Newburn and Jones 2002) and activities designed to reach out to vulnerable and ‘hard-to-hear’ groups such as New Age Travellers and the homeless (Jones and Newburn 2001).
A systematic model of community engagement, such as Ekblom’s 5Is framework (Ekblom 2010), would cover the following dimensions, represented by the principal headings of the ‘Involvement’ sector in Ekblom’s framework: Communication; Intelligence actions to guide and support involvement processes; Demand; Partnership; Process; Mobilisation; Consultation; Accountability; Building collaborative capacity; Wider ‘climate of opinion’ in which the action was implemented; Risks and blockages to and from involvement. For the full 5 ‘i’s ‘involvement’ framework see Figure 1 below.

**Figure 1 Ekblom’s Involvement Sector, 5is framework**

| 1. **Communication** pervades the Involvement task stream and should be described at various points throughout the description: with whom, for what purpose/s, by what media and methods; successes and failures; obstacles, issues and trade-offs, and how they were resolved in practice |
| 2. **Intelligence actions to guide and support Involvement processes** include identifying stakeholders/ dutyholders to mobilise, and suitable partners; and what motivates or demotivates them, what enables or constrains, including ‘human factors’ in influencing performance |
| 3. **Demand** |
| 3.1 Initiation: who starts the process |
| 3.2. Recruitment of community engagement for other aim e.g. economic regeneration |
| 4. **Partnership** |
| 4.1 Structural issues |
| • Purpose of partnership in outcome terms (e.g. reducing crime, increasing community safety, urban renewal) |
| • Whether partnership is operational (delivering interventions), strategic (providing environment in which interventions are planned, designed and delivered) or provides infrastructure (e.g. protocols for exchanging information or resources) |
| • Composition (which agencies/ individuals/ groups engaged) and structure including leadership, balance of power between member agencies, and whether operating on multiple levels (e.g. an operational team and a strategic advisory board) |
| • Geographical scope |
| • Pooling of resources: which agencies contribute what, how they complement or synergise |
• Governance issues: responsibility, authority and accountability; inherent structural strains e.g. over welfare versus security or justice
• The environment of the partnership, which may include other agencies or partnerships; even higher-level strategic partnerships

4.2 Process issues:
• Practical creation of partnership: including intelligence for planning the partnership
• Creation and maintenance of partnership climate: including building mutual understanding and trust; handling differences of perspective, values and priorities of partner organisations (e.g. security v welfare)
• Handling boundaries, both geographical and of responsibility
• Which of the operational tasks the partnership undertakes; and task-specific issues such as codes of practice on information exchange, service-level agreements on handling offenders etc
• Partnership operations: how it works on a day-to-day basis, including inter-partner communications, decision-making and tactical coordination; partnership management (including performance management) and leadership
• The working relationship between tactical and strategic levels
• Sustainability of partnership
• Dismantling or disengagement of partnership

5. Mobilisation

5.1 For each agent mobilised to support the objectives of the project or service, the following information should be held:
• Who they are and what sort of entity (individual, group, organisation or community): including offenders mobilised through outreach to participate in CE activities
• What roles they play, tasks they carry out, responsibilities they bear or decisions they take in implementing or supporting crime prevention, community safety or security: clarify whether they normally act as crime preventers (to be mobilised) or promoters (to be demobilised)
• Why they were especially chosen for the role (e.g. their competence, numbers, legitimacy) and how they were identified

Mobilisation methods, principles and theories:
• How they were Alerted to the part they could play in crime prevention (e.g. publicity, personal approach)
• How they were Informed about the problem or case, its nature, consequences and causes
• How they were Motivated (e.g. regulations, legal duty, self-interest, naming and shaming, incentives)
• How they were Empowered (e.g. capacity-building including training, equipment, information, guidance, money; legal powers; alleviation of constraints)
• How (if relevant) they were Directed (e.g. codes of conduct for confidentiality, performance standards, crime reduction targets)

Beyond initiation:
• Sustainability of mobilisation: issues and practices in maintaining participation, and specifically alertness, informedness, motivation
• How and why any mobilisation was brought to an end

5.2 Multiple mobilisations
• Implementation chains: how the various agents (and their tasks/roles) connect, ultimately to the ‘business end’ of the chain in influencing preventers and promoters in the Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity
• Systems of involvement: how diverse agents work together to execute and/or support intervention; or how an interlocking system of agents resistant to crime prevention was disrupted
• ‘Gateway’ mobilisations e.g. referral of client victim or offender to other agency: structure and process

5.3 Conflicts, constraints and issues (including ethical issues) in any of the above: their nature and how resolved

5.4 Outreach
• Who is ‘reached out to’, by whom, using what techniques, and for what preventive purpose

6. Consultation With whom, over what issues (e.g. crime prevention/priorities), by what methods and media; at what stage/s in the planning and execution of interventions

7. Accountability With whom (internally or externally), over what issues (e.g. crime prevention priorities, performance), by what methods and media; at what stage/s in the planning, execution and review of interventions and the project or service as a whole

8. Building collaborative capacity Actions prior to setting up specific partnerships or undertaking specific mobilisation exercises, intended to create, for example, a residents’ or a traders’ association or wider social cohesion, as a context within which specific interventions can be implemented, and specific agencies, groups, communities or individuals can be involved
9. The wider climate of opinion in which the action was implemented

9.1 Describe whether the local climate was initially hostile/suspicious or supportive/accepting of the preventive action; and how, if relevant, a positive climate was encouraged and a negative one dispelled; assess whether the methods of Intelligence, Intervention, Implementation and Involvement employed in the present action only work in a supportive climate.

9.2 More generally, describe other issues of awareness, expectation and interest in the action, and issues of public attitudes and beliefs about the social cohesion and/or crime problem, to residents, local businesses, offenders and to community safety; and how these affected the design and performance of the action.

10. Risks and blockages to and from Involvement

Possibilities of failure or of undesirable outcomes: including aroused and disappointed expectations, stigmatisation, breakdown of trust, and exacerbated conflict. How these are identified and managed.

4. DEFINING COMMUNITY

We must also be clear in our use of the term ‘community’. It is widely used to refer to a group of people who are assumed to share characteristics and a sense of identity, but this customary usage is less applicable in contemporary times, in which social relations in urban societies are more consistent with that of an ‘association’, using Tonnies’ (1955) distinction between ‘community’ and ‘association’. Social relations formed in an ‘association’ are confined to specific shared interests, such as chess-playing or amateur photography, and are not geo-local, in contrast to the broad-scale bonds found in traditional, relatively closed and stable communities. While police customarily focus on a place-based approach to community, exemplified by the current UK system of ‘Neighbourhood Policing’, community can also be understood as a matter of ‘identity’ or ‘interest’ (as per the association idea). For pragmatic reasons it is appropriate to think largely in terms of the place-based understanding of community but with the extension that people may belong to a multiplicity of communities, some of which have no geo-local basis and are a matter of identity around some shared characteristic (e.g., the ‘gay community’) or interests (e.g., supporters of a major football team). In going about community engagement, police must recognise the several bases of ‘community’, and the diversity that flows from them. In some matters, probably the majority,
people who happen to live in proximity will have strongly differing views. Police need to negotiate their way to finding the matters around which there are shared views within a locale.

The definitional and conceptualisation issues relating to the meaning of community have several implications for community engagement. First, as a geo-political entity (and/or its physical components such as high streets or village halls) a community can be a crime target that is subject to a policy or programme of interventions. Second, a community can be a source of crime that requires intervention, by virtue of being an area in which offenders reside and/or congregate. Community engagement can be identified as a means of addressing offending both in their host community and elsewhere. Third, a community can be the setting in which relevant agencies and agents plan and implement community engagement interventions.

The relatively diffuse and open-ended nature of community engagement also makes for a holistic view of crime problems rather than one focused on particular crimes and particular interventions in response to them. The implication for analysis of the primary research literature is that greater effort is needed to establish exactly what the intervention was designed to achieve and by what exact means.

5. THE BENEFITS OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Empirical research suggests that several benefits can flow from community engagement. Amongst these are improvements in the public’s sense of safety, with declines in perceived risk of victimisation from crime and anti-social behaviour; indeed, community engagement can result in real statistical decreases in rates of disorder and crime (Myhill, 2012). Where a baseline level of neighbourhood security is achieved there are gains in ‘social capital’ – the preparedness of people to work together to improve local conditions, greater social cohesion, and greater community resilience when problems do arise. An indicator of these benefits is where the local public takes on some low-level policing activities for itself, such as by calling disruptive children/youths to account without involving the police, or improves the visible signs of social order by planting-up communal areas, mowing verges, or tidying up refuse. The formal programmes of community engagement, around regular priority-setting meetings, one-off consultations, and involvement in partnership work, can all aid policing by raising public satisfaction with local police (the Crime Survey for England and Wales regularly finds higher public satisfaction ratings for ‘our local police’ compared to the police more generally). Higher
satisfaction results in more cooperation with police, and more willingly-granted compliance when police have to exert their authority. The direct gains for officers themselves include better morale, higher job satisfaction, less stress and lower rates of medical retirement or absences from work, and stronger motivation (Institute for Employment Studies 2007). In such positive circumstances, officers can pursue a broader role than simply responding to emergency calls for service; for example, these are conditions in which the public will take an element of responsibility for itself by way of taking crime prevention measures. The premise of the present national system of community policing in the UK – Neighbourhood Policing – is that making the police accessible and having the consistency of patrol assignment such that they become familiar faces will stimulate community involvement in addressing local crime and disorder issues, both by modest, direct action and by making an input into police priority-setting opportunities.

6. PROBLEMS OF ENGAGING THE COMMUNITY

Amongst the prime obstacles to such a desired state of affairs are lack of effective police action, an adverse history of police/public relations in the locale, and divisions in the community. The logic of community engagement suggests that these factors are more significant than the absence of formal outreach structures. It is important that expectations of what can be achieved are realistic, both in terms of inputs and outcomes. Where too much is expected or promised, scepticism may grow, to the detriment of future cooperation. Despite its Peelian inspiration, and its consistency with the common law principles that inform the wider criminal justice system, community engagement faces substantial obstacles on the police side. For all its emphasis in initial training, preparation for community engagement is limited in most police forces internationally, and the necessary skills are not a matter of rote learning. Regular unassigned patrol is costly in terms of staff time, and returns can be hard to measure. Community engagement is a ripe target when resources are tight, as experience of Neighbourhood Policing under conditions of austerity demonstrates. Successful community policing is, in general, dependent on managerial support (Fielding, 1995). But these are things the police organization has it in its gift to put right. A greater obstacle is the increasing diversity of communities themselves. In many cases, ‘difference’ comes to mean ‘divisions’. It becomes difficult to know what a given community ‘is’, and indeed whether in its own eyes it is a community at all.
Community engagement is not straightforward. The range of activities it includes shows variety and some of the activities are nebulous and poorly-defined. For example, it is hard to capture precisely what the efficacious aspect is of an intervention such as attending a pre-existing community-based event like a village fete and chatting to members of the public. Community engagement is also sometimes turned to as a last resort when public involvement has proved minimal; a clear instance was the outreach efforts by the former ‘police authorities’ (Home Office, 2003; police authorities were replaced by Police and Crime Commissioners and Police and Crime Panels in 2012).

The benefits of community engagement noted above remain no more than an attractive potential in some locales and regions. Despite the expressed willingness of the public to participate in some way in local policing (Casey, 2008), actual public engagement rests at a low level. It remains an irony of policing and crime that participation in formal engagement measures, such as priority-setting meetings or Neighbourhood Watch, is at its highest in the prosperous communities that have the least serious crime/disorder problems (although this does not necessarily correspond to perception; some of those most worried about crime, such as older persons, are least likely to be victims in statistical terms). Moreover, public participation in policing may be reasonable in an area while still leaving particular sub-groups within it remote from community engagement, and it is a concern that there may be consistencies in the sub-groups that stand aloof. They include the vulnerable, ethnic and racial minorities, those with an unsettled lifestyle, the transient, and the poor.

Lister et al. (2014) provide an overview of factors inhibiting participation: personal traits such as having insufficient time, poor skills of expression in English, low education, disabilities and health problems; a lack of confidence in the police, sometimes founded on a history of frictional relations (in the case of recent immigrants, this may include adverse relations with police in their country of origin); an above-average fear of crime, with feelings of mistrust of others in the community and anxiety that engaging with the police could lead to reprisals; ignorance of institutional structures that feature locally (e.g., the council, local voluntary sector organizations) and/or of the opportunities the police offer for local engagement; cynicism that the police will respond to public input; apathy engendered by frustration at the bureaucratic obstacles that must be negotiated in accessing or participating in local initiatives.
Lister et al. (2014) also point out that the police have their own views on what barriers exist to greater, more effective community engagement. These include the increasing diversity of neighbourhoods (on the basis of social orientations, ethnicity, culture, and politics), where the nature of the housing market increasingly makes for a cheek-by-jowl mix of wealthy incomers, long-established local families living in inherited properties, students, renters and so on. Another police-related challenge is ensuring continuity in local policing teams; the 20% budget reductions imposed by the Coalition Government’s attempts to address the national debt have led to ‘policing under austerity’ and a demand to ‘do more with less’. Long-term assignment to a set area is hard to maintain in areas where personnel need to be re-deployed regularly to address gaps of provision as they open up. It is also a fact that community policing remains remote from some officers’ conception of what policing is about, that the successes of such work in crime-busting terms are ‘invisible’, with community police intelligence-gathering feeding information to other units who act on it, and that in some instances the local occupational culture acts as a redoubt preserving retrograde perspectives. We have already noted that, for all its emphasis on community policing, it is hard to train people to do it in initial training, and there are few forces if any that regularly provide updates or new skill provision for community engagement via in-service training. CE training for probationers is both classroom-based and provided via placements. The former has declining salience as experience (including initial tutor constable attachments) increases (Fielding, 1988), and the latter is notoriously variable in quality, sometimes amounting to little more than a few days posted to a department store. It is also the case that, while the training programme calls for community groups to directly input to training – through talks, providing meaningful placements in minority groups, or through mentoring schemes – few community groups have proved willing to get involved.

There are several diagnoses of how some, at least, of these issues can be addressed. To respond to poor public attendance (particularly by younger people) the Audit Commission (1999) advocated a more active approach by way of police attending at venues that people already participate in, such as local markets, fairs, carnivals, fetes and the like. Here they should strike up a conversation with those they encounter, and use interpersonal skills to steer the contact in directions that are helpful to police purposes. Another suggestion was create a ‘community event atmosphere’ in events that are police-initiated by providing refreshments, childcare facilities and even entertainment. For instance some forces have found that Open Days featuring the police dog teams, weapons displays, and rides in the force helicopter are a large
draw. Where a more formal event is tried, it can be made more appealing by preferring interactive sessions, such as small group exercises, over formal talks, and by reserving part of the time slot for 1:1 advice sessions with individual officers.

Although these are good ideas, or are at least worth a try, the fact remains that the groups police may want, and need, to reach most, are those whose engagement is hardest to achieve. Participation is worst amongst the poorest people and in the highest crime areas (Lloyd and Foster, 2009). As such, community policing can actually have the perverse effect of making social and economic inequality worse. More positively, it tells us that police must strive to promote inclusion whenever possible and not rest with the kinds of people who come forward when descending into a community and asking the first person you see to ‘please take me to your Community Leader’. Indeed, Lloyd and Foster warn that those who take it on themselves to represent a community may do so in pursuit of some narrow interest of their own, which can exacerbate divisions. At public meetings, police also need to cultivate skills of managing effusive, dominant individuals and encouraging the quieter to speak their mind as well. Where police achieve this balance real gains can be made in public perception, with the participants seeing police demonstrate their ability to balance competing interests (Skogan 1990).

Regarding minority ethnic groups (and in the recent past, particularly groups whose religion is Islam), the Audit Commission (1999) warns against simply going to organizations purporting to represent such groups. While they can be important, it is also important to reach individuals who are not affiliated to an organization; indeed, these are likely to be the majority. Socially excluded people are often in that position precisely because they do not engage with organizations and have no one to represent their interests. Lloyd and Foster (1999) suggest reaching such ‘quiet groups’ by posting letters, knocking on doors, and engaging in small talk during beat patrols.

Much of the commentary on securing community engagement amounts to encouraging police to choose the right method for a given purpose. No single method, such as police/public meetings or door-knocking campaigns, will address every purpose and some techniques will backfire if applied to issues where prejudice or emotion is a feature. There is a legitimate role for public meetings in allowing people the chance to express their concerns in a forceful way and ‘blow off steam’, and this can show local publics that the police are listening. But police must be on guard for the move from venting to name-calling or worse. Few fractions of the
public are schooled in the conventions of debate, and police must work with people in meetings to facilitate discussion such that it remains civil and productive. A promising alternative is the citizen panel, commended by the Audit Commission (1999), and proven to be effective in articulating consideration of sensitive matters without becoming inflammatory. We noted above that treating people fairly and with respect leads to a growth of trust in the police and buying-in to the legitimacy of police authority (Hough et al 2013). In such circumstances, people will come forward to report crime more readily and get involved in other ways, helping the police to respond to Home Office demands to ‘do more with less’.

The common law origin of British policing has a fundamental part in the community engagement agenda. Deep in the roots of our legal system lies an emphatic belief that policing must be by consent and that this is most readily achieved where the public knows the police, helps shape what they do, and will assist police because they see what the police are doing as being in the common interest. Lister et al. (2014) note that this legacy was threatened in the 1990s by the rise of the application to policing of a perverted form of scientific management in the form of ‘new public sector management’, in tandem with the conferring on chief officers of new budgetary powers. That particular detour was put right, in the analysis of many police researchers, by the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing, a programme which has tested-up well when subjected to stringent evaluation, but which is also delicate and can be blown off course by under-resourcing or inept application. Like numerous other criminal justice interventions, there are transferability and replication issues in delivering effective NP across sites and regions. At its best, NP can engender greater social cohesion, improve officer morale and motivation, reduce crime and disorder, and raise public perceptions that their locale is safer (Tuffin 2006). As Lister et al. (2014) note, the empirical research evaluating NP has mostly been of ‘multi-mechanism programmes’, which makes it hard to establish the discrete effect of individual components.

7. HOW MINORITY OFFICERS AND AUXILIARIES CONTRIBUTE TO COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The police/public relationship is at the heart of NP and community engagement more generally. Matching officer characteristics to the community they police has long been regarded as an important means to improve and maintain the police/public relationship. Satisfying the common law aspiration that ‘the public are the police and the police are the public’ requires
policing to be grounded in shared values and responsiveness to public concerns and priorities. In research methodology it has long been recognised that, the more sensitive or salient a topic, the more desirable it is for researcher and respondent to be matched in relevant socio-demographic characteristics (see the contributions to the ‘interviewer matching’ section of N. Fielding 2002). This is particularly so in respect of gender and ethnicity/race. Similarly, there is a widespread contemporary assumption that those dealing with the public in a range of service capacities across the public and the private sectors need to understand the perspective of service users, and that, in a diverse society, this calls for diversity amongst the staff of the organization delivering a given service. Applied to policing, the assumption is that officers of minority ethnic origin, or female officers, may more immediately relate to the perspective of members of the public who are, respectively, of minority ethnic origin, or are female. Their shared characteristic may facilitate communication and interaction in a variety of calls for service. Yet a lack of diversity in police personnel has been an identified problem for several decades. At the extreme, a lack of affinity between police and public can result in serious trouble, such as the London 2011 riots. The three principal triggers of major public disorder all relate to a lack of appropriate engagement and matching, one of them directly. Serious public disorder involving minority communities repeatedly involves three factors – frustration over street stops, heavy-handed police conduct during them, and a minority community largely policed by officers from the mainstream social group. The latter is directly related to these triggers, and there is evidence that while stop rates do not decline where ethnic minority officers conduct them in minority communities with historically-high stop rates, citizen-expressed frustration with stops is reduced (Bhugowandeen 2013). As to heavy-handed conduct, it is known that female officers attract statistically-significantly fewer public complaints for undue force than do male officers (Lonsway et al 2003).

Such problems invoke issues of procedural justice, police legitimacy, and officer integrity. Empirical research on the concept of procedural justice tells us that the public are highly responsive to the perceived fairness of police actions, and that the way that police conduct themselves in dealings with the public plays a large part in such perceptions (Black and Reiss 1967; Fielding et al. 1992; Ministry of Justice, 2013). Public confidence is linked to police legitimacy and increases cooperation in preventing and detecting crime (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003). A systematic review found that police-led interventions aiming to increase legitimacy have a significant impact on public satisfaction with police and confidence in them (Mazerolle
et al. 2013: 1) and that this leads to significant increases in public compliance and cooperation, a perception that procedural justice prevails, and consequently a sense of police legitimacy. These effects flow when police treat people with dignity and respect, explain their motives and make their trustworthiness clear, give people the opportunity to put their own views forward, and refrain from profiling people on the basis of race, gender or any other characteristic. These things are actually more important than the nature and outcome of the intervention itself. These considerations provide a clear basis for a systematic review that examines the distinctive part played in the community engagement agenda by the increased recruitment of minority officers and auxiliaries. Also part of the picture, given the civilianization agenda, is the contribution of civilian staff (in the UK, referred to as ‘police staff’) who occupy public-facing roles. A ‘public-facing role’ is one in which the staff member deals directly with members of the public, for example, as a call-handler (either 999 or 111, the non-emergency number).

8. AIMS OF THE SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Drawing on the arguments and considerations above, the present SR aims to assess that part of community engagement that involves recruiting a more diverse workforce, specifically, by the recruitment of ethnic minority officers, auxiliaries, and police staff, and by the recruitment of female officers, auxiliaries and police staff.

The SR will address the following Research Questions:

- ‘Does the recruitment, selection and promotion of minority-group officers, auxiliaries and public-facing police staff improve police/community relations?’

- ‘Does the recruitment, selection and promotion of minority-group officers, auxiliaries and public-facing police staff promote crime reduction?’

- ‘Does the recruitment, selection and promotion of minority-group officers, auxiliaries and public-facing police staff lead to any other operational benefits?’

The SR will focus on two principal minority groups that have been the focus of recruitment policy in the UK, USA and elsewhere in recent years: ethnic minorities, and females. The term
‘minorities’ is used in terms of presence in the police service; females are of course a majority of the general population and, in some US regions, ethnicities other than white now comprise the majority of the general population. It is recognised that the respects in which these two minorities are ‘different’ varies between ethnic minorities and gender minority. For example, a given ethnic minority community may have a culture with distinctive values, just as it is widely assumed that females broadly share characteristics associated with gender. We anticipate that the primary literature may venture to identify particular enculturated values that police personnel from particular ethnic minorities bring to community engagement work, such as values associated with Islam, while it may treat women as bringing qualities of empathy and talk-based skills to community engagement work.

9. LOGIC MODEL

The function of a logic model is to clarify thinking about the pathway between problem appraisal, intervention, and outcome in such a way that it identifies indicators and measures that are essential to identifying in causal terms what causes brought about what effects, and thus to enable an appraisal of ‘what works’ in a given intervention. In the case of community engagement, and as implied by the closing passage of the previous section, the nature of the interventions distinctively relating to the assumed characteristics and qualities of the police staff of ethnic minority status or female gender differ. We are thus developing distinct logic models for the two groups, with our current thinking expressed in the tables below.

There is, however, a generic logic that can be applied at a broader level. We feel this is worth stating although we expect our SR of the primary literature to primarily address logics that are specific to minority ethnic group personnel or female personnel.

In terms of linkage to crime reduction, we are developing a logic model on the following lines - Minority officers and police staff provide channels into their relevant community/group that are less accessible to mainstream officers and police staff, serving as a two way means of communication that both gathers extra information and can inform the relevant community/group about the police agenda/policy/plans, which, over time, enhances trust on both sides and provides a basis of enhanced police legitimacy, leading to wider public cooperation in crime reduction. In addition, minority officers and police staff may apply
distinctive perspectives to routine policing and to dedicated operations, as well as offering distinctive competencies based on their knowledge of minority community culture.

A similar mechanism is worth pursuing in respect of policing auxiliaries. Such volunteers increase direct participation in policing by a segment of the community and this provides policing with advocates in the community, increasing trust, with reputational benefits and benefits in terms of better understanding what the public wants, in addition to the role of volunteers in aiding regular officers in responding to calls for service and/or freeing regular officers for frontline duties. Where such auxiliary roles attract minority group members, similar benefits of communication and of understanding minority viewpoints may accrue.

We earlier noted that the effects of recruiting a diverse workforce may differ according to the proportion of ethnic minority or female personnel already in a given police force. One may also suppose that not only the context of existing workforce balance and geographical demographics of the population but also potentially the rank of the police officer may affect any impact of enhanced community engagement on crime reduction. The recruitment question therefore may be better answered by looking for studies which examined the numbers of police officers in particular localities, the types of police officers with the decided minority status, and the rank and length of service rather than just the effect of the enrolment of new police officers. In considering rank and length of service, the idea is that police forces which promote and retain female and ethnic minority-group officers may be more likely to alter overall crime rates, on the logic that they will obtain better community engagement from which crime intelligence relevant to reducing disorder, promoting crime prevention, and facilitating better-informed enforcement interventions, may result.

A further consideration is resignation prior to the contracted end of service with the force, or ‘wastage’. Both female and ethnic minority officers have above average resignation rates. For example, in London, voluntary resignation accounts for 42.38% of female officer wastage and 39.56% of Black and Minority Ethnic Group (‘BME’) wastage, compared to the overall rate of 24.03% (MOPAC 2014). However, minorities are not interchangeable. For instance, ethnic minority resigners have fewer years of service and are older than other resigners, suggesting that, relative to women, they may be less willing to put up with objectionable behaviour by peers, frustration with promotion opportunities, and conflictual relations with the public (Cooper and Ingram 2004).
While there is a government mandate to better reflect the local population diversity, focussing upon only the enrolment of new police officers may not be sufficient to capture the crime reduction effect of such policies. Studies that widen the scope beyond only enrolment of new police officers to the minority group percentages within localities, and studies that document the promotion and retention of minority group officers, will be of particular value.

Our aim in this review is systematically to synthesise the evidence available to discover what research evidence exists for the effectiveness of minority officer/auxiliary recruitment and deployment in the principal domains in which police strategies include it. By incorporating meta-analytical methods with a realist synthesis, we also aim to elicit and test working theory relating to whether and how staffing policies may reduce (or increase) crime, disorder, and Anti-Social Behaviour, and increase (or reduce) social cohesion, social capital, and the resilience of communities. Given the orientation of our SR to Realist Evaluation, we would render the implications of the above paragraphs in hypotheses such as the following:

- An increase in BME officers, auxiliaries and staff (intervention) leads to improved ability to engage with BME communities (mechanism) leads to increased confidence in the police (outcome)
- An increase in BME officers, auxiliaries and staff (intervention) leads to improved confidence amongst minority citizens and willingness to supply officers with information about crime (mechanisms) leads to increased arrest rate and reduction in crimes (outcomes)
- An increase in BME officers holding supervisory/senior ranks (intervention) leads to better retention of all BME officers and to programmes of intervention better supported by BME communities (mechanisms) leads to increased arrest rate, reduction in crimes, and increased confidence in police (outcomes)
- An increase in female officers, auxiliaries and staff (intervention) leads to increased effectiveness in dealing with certain crime types (mechanism) leads to improved conviction rate (outcome)
- An increase in female officers, auxiliaries and staff (intervention) leads to reduction of physical force in arrests (mechanism) leads to reduction in complaints about the police (outcome)
• An increase in female officers holding supervisory/senior ranks (intervention) leads to better retention of all female officers and to programmes of intervention better supported by female victims and witnesses (mechanisms) leads to increased arrest rate, reduction in crimes, and increased confidence in police (outcomes).

Satisfactory tests of these hypotheses are reliant on the literature containing an adequate empirical research base to pursue these various relationships. Based on the experience of other systematic reviews in this field, it is acknowledged that this condition may not be satisfied. However, there is value in specifying the causal chain that lies behind these hypotheses, in order to indicate as clearly as possible what an SR on this issue requires for a full understanding of the relationship between minority recruitment, engagement and policing outcomes. Several inter-related meta-analyses are implied by the present logic model that increasing the representation of minorities and females to better reflect community composition in the force area will alter police/citizen interactions and thus citizen attitudes towards police in such a way that citizens will be motivated to assist police in ways that benefit police business including crime reduction. The empirical relationships that a fully-adequate meta-analysis + realist synthesis would examine are:

1. Recruitment/retention technique effect on recruitment and retention

2. Relationship between the proportion of a police force that is comprised of minorities or women and community engagement activities

3. Relationship between community engagement activities and community attitudes such as confidence/trust in police, fear of crime, social cohesion

4. Relationship between community attitudes (such as confidence/trust in police, fear of crime, social cohesion) and recorded crime
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES [5i’s]</th>
<th>OUTPUTS/PROCESS MEASURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce ASB and low-level disorder</td>
<td>Gather information from ethnic minority &amp; other community members about ASB/disorder/crime concerns, perpetrators, context, previous interventions &amp; intereners</td>
<td>Number of formal CE* events</td>
<td>Number of ASB*/disorder reports made to police during reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of informal CE events</td>
<td>Number of crime reports made to police during reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of attendees at formal CE events</td>
<td>Number of ASB/disorder/crime tips provided to police during reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participants in informal CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal Community Engagement</td>
<td>Number of reports taken from local publics</td>
<td>Take-up of police/social agency volunteering opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Community Engagement</td>
<td>Number of reports leading to o.m./i.e. * action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce crime</td>
<td>Encourage ethnic minority public and others to participate/volunteer in co-designing interventions</td>
<td>Number of planned interventions leading to o.m./i.e. police action</td>
<td>Positive/negative change in drug arrests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of planned interventions involving partner social agency</td>
<td>Positive/negative change in drug driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage ethnic minority public and others to participate/volunteer in co-delivering interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collate police and social agency-side information on previous interventions and interveners</td>
<td>Number of citizens participating in enforcement/judicial crime prevention</td>
<td>Positive/negative change in alcohol-related disorder arrests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of citizens participating in civil crime prevention</td>
<td>Positive/negative change in DUI offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of citizens directly participating in an intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liaise with police and other social agency colleagues to plan response to ASB/disorder/crime concerns</td>
<td>Number of community participants in feedback and evaluation events</td>
<td>Positive/negative change in attitude toward local area/quality of life in locale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Planned law enforcement response</td>
<td></td>
<td>Duration/persistence of desired effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Planned order maint. response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Planned partnership response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Planned comm’y role in any above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ASB/crime prevention (soft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ASB/crime prevention (hard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Direct participation in intervention (info-giving, patrol/vigilance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES [5i’s]</td>
<td>OUTPUTS/PROCESS MEASURES</td>
<td>OUTCOME MEASURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel and represent ethnic minority community concerns to police/social agency colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Increase social cohesion | Deliver & coordinate planned response  
- Per planned options above | Increased number of local culture and sport activities  
Increased participation by community members in culture and sport activities | Positive/negative change in hate crime (as aggravating factor in other offence charges) |
| Evaluate intervention as one in an ongoing project or series  
- Present state of play to comm’y/partners  
- Take feedback from comm’y/partners  
- Condition next intervention or declare problem solved | Increased proportion of local population feeling safe/secure in community  
Reduction in drug and alcohol misuse | |
| Increase ethnic minority recruitment | Ethnic minority recruitment outreach campaign | Number of ethnic minority officers recruited | |
| Involvement of Black Police Officers Association in recruitment/selection | Increased recruitment of ethnic minority personnel (including public-facing ‘police staff’) | |
| Involvement of BPOA in promotion process | | Wastage rate of ethnic minority officers relative to mainstream officers | |
| Increase ethnic minority promotions | Increased promotion of ethnic minority personnel (including public-facing ‘police staff’) | Rate of medical retirement of ethnic minority v. mainstream officers | Rate of stress-related abstractions from strength of ethnic minority v. mainstream officers |

* CE = community engagement, ASB = anti-social behaviour, o.m. = order maintenance, l.e. = law enforcement, DUI= driving under the influence of alcohol
Table 2. Logic Model: Female Officers/auxiliaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES [5i’s]</th>
<th>OUTPUTS/PROCESS MEASURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reduce violence in police/public encounters | Train officers in communication in conflict situations  
Train officers in managing conflict situations | Number of training activities in managing conflict situations  
Number of officers participating in training in managing conflict situations | Complaints against police in police/public encounters |
| Increase effectiveness of CSA investigations | Deploy mixed gender teams in proactive and/or reactive functions | Proportion of reactive/proactive frontline teams that are mixed gender | Rate of CSA* arrests  
Rate of CSA convictions  
Rate of CSA cases discontinued |
| Increase effectiveness of domestic abuse interventions | Train female officers in specialist functions (e.g., ARV* teams) | Proportion of specialist function officers who are female | Number of DVPOs* issued  
Number of call-backs to domestic abuse premises  
Number of children taken into custody for own protection  
Number of referrals to women’s refuges  
Rate of domestic abuse arrests  
Rate of domestic abuse prosecutions |
| Increase effectiveness of sexual offence investigations | Train officers in dealing with domestic abuse | Number of domestic abuse training events  
Number of participants in domestic abuse training events | Rate of sexual offence investigations  
Rate of sexual offence convictions  
Rate of sexual offence cases discontinued |
| Recruitment of female officers/auxiliaries | Assign female officers to CSA investigation teams | Increased recruitment of female personnel (including public-facing ‘police staff’) | Number of female officers recruited |
| Increase promotions of female officers | Assign female officers to rape/sexual offence investigation teams | Increased promotion of female personnel (including public-facing ‘police staff’) | Number of female officers promoted |
| | Assign female officers to domestic abuse investigations | | Wastage rate of female officers relative to male officers |
| | Female officer recruitment outreach campaign | | Rate of medical retirement of female to male officers |
| | Involvement of female officers groups in recruitment/selection | | Rate of stress-related abstractions from strength of female v. male officers |
| | Involvement of female officers groups in promotion process | | Duration/persistence of desired effects |

* CSA = Child Support Agency, DVPOs = Domestic Violence Protection Orders, ARV= Armed Response Vehicle
10. LESSONS FROM COGNATE SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

The most recent SR on community policing, Gill et al. (2014), found little direct effect of community policing on crime reduction or crime fear, but did find statistically significant effects on perceived disorder, public satisfaction and police legitimacy. The implication for an SR on community engagement is that rather than include only those studies showing a quantified and direct crime reduction effect, it is appropriate to also include studies showing a quantified effect on perceived disorder/satisfaction/legitimacy, on the logic that these will indirectly impact on crime reduction. This would increase the evidence base and also address a gap not only in Gill et al. (2014) but in the other relevant SRs (Bennett et al. 2006, 2008 on Neighbourhood Watch, Weisburd et al. 2008 on Problem-Oriented Policing, and Mazerolle et al. 2013 on police legitimacy).

Gill et al. (2014) themselves discuss a rationale that would justify this approach. They write ‘Given that (CP) was not originally intended as simply another tool in police departments’ crime-fighting toolkit, it is not clear that we should expect a crime prevention effect … One intended role of CP was to address “quality of life” issues at the local level, but, while the interventions reviewed here had a significant effect on citizens’ perceptions of disorder, they did not substantially improve their feelings of safety. These findings may reflect the complex relationship between informal social control, fear, disorder and crime – disorder fuels fear of crime, which can lead to higher recorded crime rates as informal social controls break down (Hinkle 2005; Skogan 1990; Wilson and Kelling 1982)’.

The Gill et al. (2014) article goes on to say that ‘Given that community-oriented policing was intended as a citizen-oriented cultural shift rather than a crime control tactic, future studies and reviews might seek to ask a more nuanced question: rather than examining the direct impact of COP on crime, what crime control benefits are derived from strategies and tactics implemented in a community-oriented context … Our findings on legitimacy and citizen satisfaction provide further indication that it is too simplistic to think about the direct effect of COP on crime. COP does appear to have a direct effect on these citizen-focused outcomes, and there is evidence that improved perceptions of legitimacy increase citizen compliance and are associated with lower crime rates (Mazerolle et al. 2013; Sherman and Eck 2002; Sunshine and Tyler 2003; Tyler 1990). This suggests that COP is in need of a logic model, in which citizen
satisfaction, legitimacy, and immediate quality of life improvements (i.e. disorder reduction) might be proximal (short term) outcomes that set the stage for distal (longer term) outcomes such as fear reduction and crime control’ (emphasis added).

Mazerolle et al. (2013) put forward a prospective systematic review aiming to measure if community-orientated policing is successful in diminishing interpersonal violent crime in developing countries. They maintain that violent crime is more prevalent in third world localities due to weak justice systems, lower police legitimacy and greater acceptance of societal violence. These circumstances exact considerable economic and social costs, and speak particularly to the need to reduce interpersonal violent crime. Mazerolle et al. (2013) argue that community-orientated policing in developing countries cannot be compared with that of developed countries with a long tradition of civilian police. Police forces in developed countries typically will have experienced a period of professionalization whereas in developing countries the State may move directly from military rule to adoption of a community orientated approach. Consequentially, developing countries will lack the significant infrastructure support found in developed countries, and the public may have little experience of civilian police officers. Despite these differences, the Mazerolle et al. (2013) definition of community orientated policing as an intervention is familiar, i.e. collaboration and consultation between citizens and a local police force. However, unlike Gill et al. (2014), the scope of the interventions included is necessarily loose in the case of developing countries, with all studies of community-orientated policing activities considered, whether targeted at citizen groups or at particular places.

Weisburd et al. (2012) submitted a systematic review title to the Campbell Foundation in 2012 named ‘Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase legitimacy and citizen satisfaction in neighborhoods.’ The review went ahead and was published as Gill et al. (2014). It notes that police work has moved away from purely reactive crime fighting techniques in part due to criticisms that the police had lost touch with the communities that they serve. It also recognised that increasing community involvement by police may yield other possible benefits including reducing crime, fear and disorder, but evidence of the impact of community orientated policing remains equivocal. With this in mind, and noting variations in the application of a COP approach, it was argued that it was timely to pull the evidence together. As is apparent in Gill et al. (2014), a systematic review of the evidence still produced only very modest evidence of the effect on crime, but stronger evidence
of effects on perceived social order, social cohesion and public beliefs concerning the legitimacy of police. Out of 240 potentially eligible studies, Gill et al. (2014) identified 25 reports that met their criteria of a research design measuring quantitative pre-post changes in outcomes in treatment and comparison areas following implementation of policing strategies involving community collaboration or consultation. The term ‘reports’ appears in the previous sentence because most of the comparisons satisfying the criteria appeared in government or technical reports to grant funding agencies rather than mainstream academic literature. The 25 reports contained 65 independent tests of community-oriented policing, largely from the US literature. Thirty-seven comparisons were subjected to meta-analysis.

Effect sizes were taken by several means, with the problem associated with calculating effect size for place-based studies being addressed by use of ‘relative effect size’ (Farrington et al. 2007). Odds ratios could be calculated for at least one outcome in 37 of the 65 comparisons, covering 27 formal crime outcomes, 11 disorder outcomes, 10 fear outcomes, 17 satisfaction outcomes and 10 legitimacy outcomes. The overall odds ratio (OR) in the first meta-analysis was 1.053, giving a non-statistically significant 5% greater odds of reduced crime. In five studies property and violent crime were separately reported with no indication of the total volume of crime. Recalculating the OR by including the violent crime rather than property crime gave 10% greater odds of reduced crime, and this was statistically significant, but caution is urged due to the result’s dependence on a small number of studies. An OR of 1.355 was obtained in respect of citizen-perceived civil order in their neighbourhoods, highlighting drug dealing and gun crime, indicating a positive effect of COP. The OR for citizen-perceived feelings of safety in their locale indicated a modest and non-significant but positive effect. An OR of 1.373 for citizen satisfaction with police indicated a moderate, statistically significant positive effect. A similar result was obtained for citizen trust and confidence in police, and for perceived police legitimacy following COP interventions. Thus, the picture was mixed, and the associated cautions should not be discounted. For example, COP was often implemented alongside Problem-Oriented Policing, such that effects attributed to COP could have been confounded with POP. There was evidence of problem-solving but few studies stated whether this was by police rather than citizens beyond joint problem-definition. Moderator analysis was largely confounded by studies being either too similar or too heterogenous. Nevertheless Gill et al. (2014) were justified in saying that their SR found robust evidence of the positive effect of COP on citizen satisfaction with police, a key objective of implementing community policing, along with benign effects on perceived disorder and on police legitimacy.
Given that the Gill *et al.* (2014) review surveyed the broad field of community-oriented policing, and that the result argues for a three-stage (COP – Social Order – Crime Reduction) logic rather than a two stage logic (COP – Crime Reduction), an SR focused on the effect of minority group recruitment as a means of community engagement is timely in policy terms and addresses gaps in existing systematic reviews of community policing.

11. THE APPROACH OF THIS SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

The first objective of this systematic review is to assess the evidence on whether the recruitment of minority officers, auxiliaries and staff has been found effective in improving police/public relations, enhancing public cooperation with police, and reducing ASB, disorder and crime. The second objective is to tease out how, in what form(s), for what crime types and under what conditions the presence of minority officers/auxiliaries has been found to be effective, ineffective and/or to produce unintended negative effects.

The What Works Network has agreed dimensions for the evidence standards they employ. These dimensions are

- Relevance of study to review question
- Robustness of methodology
- Relevance of methodology to the study question
- Impact size / effect size (including longitudinal impact)
- Cost
- Replicability / Scalability
- Readiness to implement

In the present context, the first criterion, ‘relevance’, may extend to studies of other occupations in which robust research has been conducted on the impact of enhanced recruitment of minorities. The same What Works Network document offers scope to include literature that draws on qualitative research: “Standards should ensure that the broader church of evidence is included. For example, there will be evidence about potential impacts of a programme, practice or system, which might be qualitative in nature. Our standards should
not exclude this type of evidence, but should recognise limitations in the strength of recommendations which can be generated from certain studies”. It is acknowledged that such studies are likely to address issues such as implementation barriers, programme culture, and context, rather than providing systematic insights into impact per se. Here we will consider the guidance offered by CASP International Network (2010) and other relevant standards, for assessing the validity of qualitative studies.

We anticipate that the evidence base of published literature on our Systematic Review topic will be constrained. Even well-resourced and long-established policing policies, programmes and interventions lack a secure base of evidence in the form of published research studies employing a full experimental (randomised control) or quasi-experimental design. Community Engagement is an element of Community Policing. Another element is Problem-Oriented Policing. POP was subject of a Systematic Review led by David Weisburd in 2008. It found a mild, but statistically significant, positive effect of POP, but the interesting thing is that having identified over 5,500 items of possible relevance for inclusion in the SR, only 10 met the inclusion criteria. There were 45 studies without a comparison group, though, and this sample showed overwhelmingly positive effects. Nevertheless the researchers rightly urged caution in interpreting the findings. We anticipate similar issues finding adequate numbers of studies meeting our inclusion criteria. The most recent relevant systematic review is Gill et al. (2014), which addressed Community-Oriented Policing in the round. While one might suppose that this would lead to a substantial number of included studies, only 25 studies were in play after the various sifting operations. Accommodating a relatively limited evidence base is an explicit part of our methodological design for this systematic review, which emphasises techniques for intensive work with studies unable to satisfy the most robust inclusion criteria.

In order to meet the two objectives stated at the beginning of this section, we aim to marry meta-analysis with realist synthesis. Thus, in addition to asking whether minority recruitment has or has not been found to be associated with greater or lesser reductions (or increases) in crime (as would be the primary objective of a meta-analysis), we will also ask what the available evidence can tell us about which minority officer deployments and interventions have reduced which forms of ASB, crimes, or disorder, and raised social cohesion, under what conditions and how. This more granular approach is the hallmark of a realist synthesis.
The review aims, therefore, to generate evidence regarding:

a) The techniques used to recruit, deploy and retain minority officers/auxiliaries for the purposes of community engagement and their effectiveness in terms of the number or percentage of minorities and women recruited and retained;

b) The techniques used by minority officers/auxiliaries in pursuing community engagement and its several purposes, with a view to whether these differ from majority officer behavioural techniques;

c) The causal mechanisms through which deploying minority officers have been found (positively or negatively) to affect ASB, disorder, crime, and social cohesion, and whether these mechanisms vary substantively by crime type and/or specific sub-groups of the community intended to receive the intervention. For example whether there are some crime types where gender ‘matching’ facilitates the investigative process but not others, based on a causal chain such as closer matching leading to greater trust which leads to increased/more accurate reporting which in turn leads to more effective police interventions. Note that to expose rather than infer the mechanism, studies would have to include indicators such as scaled measures of trust.

d) The conditions found to be (more or less) conducive to the activation of causal mechanisms identified in (c). It is known, for instance, that prominent and regularly-expressed senior level support is effective in promoting diversity awareness. For example of a negative condition, are there circumstances in which the recruitment of minority group officers can undermine posited benefits.

e) The conditions found to be required for (or to rule out) recruitment and planned deployment of minority officers/auxiliaries of the kind identified in (a). For example, are there conditions that must be met for certain mechanisms to be activated? This aim is a standard component of moderator analysis examining whether the effects are related to coded contextual factors. It is accepted that what can be coded is often limited, making it hard to satisfy criteria for a robust statistical relationship with effects, due to limited power at the meta-analytic level.
f) Where possible, the degree to which recruitment and deployment of minority officers is cost-effective/otherwise beneficial as well as effective at reducing ASB, disorder, and crime;

g) The patterns of (positive and negative) community engagement, ASB, disorder and crime-related outcomes produced by (a)-(d).

A rationale for combining meta-analytical and realist perspectives in a systematic review

Questions (a) to (d) above are not routinely asked in systematic reviews of crime prevention interventions. Our interest in them is based on the assumption that knowledge of “what works” (or has been found to work) is insufficient for those interested in intelligently applying the findings from evidence syntheses in future crime reduction efforts, mindful of the variation in available resources dedicated to crime prevention as well as the many contexts into which crime reduction measures are implemented (Tilley, 2006; Laycock and Tilley, 1995). Reliable evidence on the statistical association between intervention and outcome must be accompanied by (tested) working theories on the causal chain(s) that links intervention to outcome.

A number of researchers regard as promising the integration of the meta-analytic methods associated with Cochrane and Campbell Collaborations (see Petrosino et al. 2001) with the principles and methods of realist evaluation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997), an approach which places greater emphasis on the causal mechanisms responsible for outcome patterns and the contextual conditions under which those mechanisms operate (or fail to do so). However, published reviews in criminal justice combining these two approaches are rare. An exception is the van der Knaap et al. (2008) systematic review of interventions to reduce violence in public and semi-public spaces. Their combined approach began with a literature search using pre-determined search strategies and ranking the identified studies using the Maryland Scientific Methods Scale (SMS, Sherman et al. 1997): level 5 (the best) denoting an Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT) and level 1 (the worst) a simple correlation analysis. Unlike many systematic reviews in crime prevention, they did not exclude studies based on their SMS rating. Following quantitative analysis to synthesise the evidence, the studies were analysed from a realist perspective seeking to identify some of the contexts and mechanisms responsible for the outcome patterns. However, the authors found that “a lot of information
[pertaining to the principles of realist evaluation] was missing…often, [there was] no explicit theory describing underpinning the intervention, and information on mechanisms and context was scarce” (van der Knaap et al. 2008:54). They nevertheless found the process helpful in eliciting and better understanding the causal mechanisms through which the reviewed interventions were expected to operate. This precedent of a criminological study combining an SR and a (modest) RE element shows the need to focus RE work on elements most critical to predicting outcomes and for efficient means to support searches for these across large numbers of studies. Reliable evidence on the statistical association between intervention and outcome must be accompanied by (tested) working theories on the causal chain that links intervention to outcome. This will involve developing a protocol of codes on the context in which intervention measures were applied; the causal mechanisms through which the intervention was deemed to work, and the intermediate outcomes that would be expected if a particular mechanism were in play.

As an element in the RE element of our own SR, there may also be value in drawing on the recent development of meta-narrative approaches to the systematic evaluation of qualitative and mixed methods research evidence. The meta-narrative approach is demonstrated in a 2013 article in *BMC Medicine* by Wong et al. The approach examines the contrasting and complementary ways in which different researchers have approached the same topic. In the work reported in the article Wong et al. (2013) convened an online Delphi panel of 33 people, summarised an evidence base, presented questions and issues from it to the panel and after three iterations the panel reached consensus on 20 key publication standards for the topic area in question (which was good practice in doing a meta-narrative review). This is promising, if a little incestuous, but the key point is the correspondence between the effort to capture the contrasting and complementary ways researchers construed the topic and the teacher/learner element of Realist Evaluation. This point of connection is in accord with guidance from the Cochrane Collaboration itself. In 2008 the Nordic branch of the Collaboration stated that qualitative studies can enhance reviews of effectiveness by offering an understanding of the experiences of ‘those providing and receiving interventions … and factors that shape the implementation of interventions’ (Higgins & Green 2011), ‘Review Manager version 5 (computer program)’, Copenhagen: Nordic Cochrane Centre, emphasis added). Such evidence may be useful but we should, of course, be as explicit about generic faults in qualitative studies as we are in quantitative studies.
In our view, attention to mechanism is as important to transferability as a ‘yes it works’ rating from a systematic review. Once systematic review or other systematic techniques tell us that a given intervention works, we should ask what the available evidence can tell us about which intervention techniques have reduced which crimes under what conditions and how. It has long been recognised that SR cannot answer how, for whom, and under what circumstances, given interventions ‘work’. Thus, Lipsey and Wilson (1993: 1201) observed that ‘meta-analysis is limited by the nature of the primary studies to which it is applied. Those studies too often report only crude comparisons between undifferentiated “black box” treatment packages and control conditions with little attention to potential interactions with client characteristics, the range of outcome variables, or temporal factors….The proper agenda for the next generation of ... both primary and meta-analytic studies is investigation into which treatment variants are most effective, the mediating causal processes through which they work, and the characteristics of recipients, providers, and settings that most influence their results.’ The interest here is in ‘the mediating causal processes’ highlighted by Lipsey and Wilson (2001).

Such considerations have an important connection with applied research in the policy environment. In the UK, the Home Office allocated £25M to research evaluating its ‘Crime Reduction Programme’. The evaluators’ preference for quasi-experimental research, pursuing statistically significant differences in crime and reconviction rates, with either before/after interventions or between intervention groups and controls, led to a neglect of contextual factors (Maguire, 2004). There was no encouragement to explore how programme effects were generated. A curtailed timescale and haphazard implementation of unproven programmes left evaluators with insufficiently reliable data and samples too small to be robust, such that nothing useful could be said about programme effectiveness.

In this context a useful point can be derived from the practice of Realist Evaluation. One of its elements is the ‘teacher/learner function’ (Tilley, 2000: 110), which is designed to sensitize research interventions to contextual factors affecting programme implementation. The theory of programme functioning is explained to participants and adjusted in light of their response, a move that also enables participants to adjust programme delivery in light of the theory (UK Army, 2011). Researchers elicit working assumptions from programme implementers and test/refine it in interaction with them. The information published about the teacher/learner function, and the Context and Mechanism more generally, is likely to be qualitative. Such
information may play a part in hybrid systematic reviews involving Realist Synthesis alongside Meta-Analysis.

A Meta-analysis + Realist Synthesis design enables an understanding of What Works that offers predictive adequacy because it is able to identify not only that an intervention is effective but the features that make it effective in particular circumstances. The challenge in taking this approach is acknowledged, as is the fact that this has long featured as a goal in meta-analysis. Early studies extensively coded contextual factors and explicitly tried to examine what works for whom under which conditions – see for example Smith and Glass (1977). If achieved, that approach is of value to those planning interventions while attending to trade-offs between the benefits of different intervention options but it is also a means to enable practical interventions to better test theories. Artefacts of information present in mixed methods studies and case studies concerning the implementation and in vitro modification of interventions may be a worthwhile resource where present (Fielding and Cisneros-Puebla, 2009).

If the teacher-learner function points towards kinds of studies particularly likely to make the Context/Method/Outcome interaction explicit, Ekblom’s (2010) ‘5Is’ model suggests what kind of information to look for in them. It is a process model loosely equivalent to the SARA heuristic (Scanning, Analysis, Response, Assessment) widely-used in problem-oriented policing, but is more detailed. Ekblom’s model addresses the criticism that in SARA ‘the knowledge about implementation issues is not described, captured or transferred to practitioners in ways that can help them select prior action to apply to their problem, replicate it and innovate as appropriate (nor … to policymakers so they can take account of the deliverability of different types of intervention when planning programmes)’ (Bullock & Ekblom 2010). 5Is stands for Intelligence (gathering and analysing information and knowledge on crime, its nature, causes and harmful consequences), Intervention (response to the requirements revealed by Intelligence by designing and planning methods to realise the intervention principles), Implementation (practical and managerial tasks required to realise the plans and designs for methods of Intervention), Involvement (actions getting other people and/or agencies to understand, accept, and undertake, share or support the tasks, roles and responsibilities of implementing preventive interventions; or to support them by alleviating constraints, boosting enablers and establishing a receptive climate), and Impact (gathering and presenting evidence of effectiveness and related information on intermediate and ultimate outcomes). The ‘Involvement’ element was noted earlier in this Protocol; see Figure 1.
The general implication of the considerations discussed above is that while we will follow the essential features of a standard SR procedure, studies that rate low on the Maryland Scale but which satisfy accepted standards for qualitative research designs will be retained and subjected to Realist Evaluation coding. Information about Context and Mechanism, and their relationship to Outcomes, will be culled from the studies, and binary coding of the presence/absence of 5Is features will be applied.

12. REVIEW METHODS

This section details the methods of this systematic review. After an overview of the strategy, in particular how the chosen methods address both meta-analysis and realist synthesis, there is a description of our criteria for inclusion of studies, means of identifying studies, search terms, data extraction and management processes, and the statistical analyses constituting the meta-analysis.

Overview of review process
Figure 2 below illustrates the flow of work on the review. Relevant databases (including the grey literature) will be searched using pre-determined search terms. Identified studies will initially be screened through reading the title and abstract, filtering out those that do not meet our inclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria for the realist synthesis differ from those for the meta-analytical branch of the review. For example, to be included in the meta-analysis, a study must report a quantitative crime-relevant or other operational benefit outcome measure. For the realist synthesis, research design inclusion criteria are relaxed to include studies that do not satisfy the higher Maryland Scale criteria. Those studies that meet the inclusion criteria for meta-analyses are then coded and relevant information extracted.
Figure 2: Flowchart of the Process to be followed in Systematic Review

The two branches of the Figure 2 focus on different but related questions. The left branch is primarily concerned with “what works?” in the context of evidence on effectiveness in terms of crime reduction. The right branch takes the same material but seeks to answer the broader question “what works, how, for whom, and under what circumstances?”

After coding, we will draw on the same set of studies to follow two analysis paths. The meta-analysis path will quantitatively examine the studies to determine the overall effect size of the retained studies, and a moderator analysis will explore any heterogeneity in effect sizes.
observed across studies and differences between sub-groups within studies. The realist path will draw on the same studies, plus additional ones. It will require a detailed reading of the chosen studies to identify the working theories put by the authors as to how the intervention was expected to reduce crime and will involve additional coding on the context in which intervention measures were applied; the causal mechanisms through which the intervention was assumed to work, and the intermediate outcomes that would be expected if a particular mechanism were in play; then meta-analyze these intermediate outcomes and the relationship between these outcomes and crime; information about implementation; and a check for outcome patterns that were not confined to net increases or decreases in crime. For instance, changes in public confidence in the police. The coding will be binary, studies that do or do not report such information. Judgement will be needed to code where Realist terms are not present but implicit.

Our preliminary work on community engagement provides an example of how gaps can be used to pursue evidence that the search process has missed. The literature on female officers and the use of force suggests that female officers apply a higher threshold before using force in encounters with the public in a private space (such as their home) where there is a potential for, or an occurrence of, violence initiated by a male citizen. They are no less likely to resolve such incidents effectively than male officers; indeed, some studies suggest that they are more effective in such situations. Moreover, the rate of citizen complaints arising from such incidents is significantly lower than for male officers. We might hypothesise from this that recruitment of female officers should, after a suitable interval, result in more effective interventions and fewer complaints in similar situations involving female citizens. If we then encounter relevant studies that report that female officers prove no more effective or less likely to attract complaints when dealing with female citizens than do male officers, we would read these studies as reporting an implementation failure – the deployment of female officers did not have the anticipated effect. However, that conclusion is not justified unless we can identify what it is about female officers dealing with potentially-violent male citizens in private space that produced the desirable effect. For example, it is plausible to argue that females have better communication skills allowing them to establish control short of force, but it is also plausible that male citizens feel ashamed about threatening female officers with violence. Now let’s say that, in pursuing the possible qualities that enable officers to establish control in such situations, we encounter research reporting that, on average, female officers have an average highest level of educational attainment above that of male officers. That research itself draws on cognitive
psychological research demonstrating that more highly educated individuals display superior levels of expressivity and are more able to take the role of the other in interpersonal communication. We would then hypothesise that studies of female officers dealing with female citizens would document similar levels of effectiveness and complaints to those documenting their dealings with male citizens. If they do, we can dismiss the ‘chivalry hypothesis’ in favour of the ‘communication skills’ hypothesis. In this way we get closer to identifying all the conditions necessary to activate the causal mechanism we believe to be responsible for the outcome. This might usefully inform future strategies that seek to implement similar crime reduction measures. In realist terms, this would relate to the conditions necessary to activate the causal mechanism believed to be responsible for producing the outcome of interest.

As the example suggests, these dual processes are not independent: findings from one branch of evidence synthesis will inform, and be informed by, those from the other. We think this will be particularly likely when testing explanations for heterogeneity in effect sizes observed across studies. Reviews generally uncover substantial differences between studies, types of interventions, time periods, population groups and so on. In other words, heterogeneity in effect sizes is the norm, which is why moderator analysis has become standard practice in attempting to locate the source of and reasons for these substantive across study sub-group differences. But the choice of variable on which moderator analyses are conducted tends to be by default and convenience, things like study location, intervention type, or time period, as opposed to the generative causal mechanisms hypothesised to be responsible for the outcome patterns observed. Authorities on the meta-analyses of medical trials (e.g. Peto et al. 1995; Rothwell, 2005a; 2005b) have long warned of the risks of post hoc atheoretical partitioning. Moreover, the variables often used may not be relevant to practitioners who look to the evidence for messages about preventing crime in their particular setting, an issue again highlighted in clinician discussions (e.g. Horowitz, 1985, 1995; Feinstein 1998; Davidoff 2009). So we are looking to the realist work to inform a theory-driven analysis and a moderator analysis that is more practically meaningful, by generating theoretically warranted analysis of sub-groups.

In selecting studies we will use the following criteria:

a) the intervention of interest must be the major technique of community engagement directed to crime prevention and/or public confidence and/or fear of crime reported by the study, such as the recruitment and retention of minority officers.
b) The study must specify the ultimate community engagement objectives that were intended as a consequence of the community engagement intervention and must specify what other operational benefits are targeted if any.

c) it must report primary research, we will not include evidence reviews.

In addition, to be included in the meta-analysis, a study must:

d) report a crime-related and/or public confidence and/or fear of crime quantitative outcome measure. Since the quantitative findings for any single study can be incorporated only once in the meta-analysis, the publication reporting the most detailed information will be the included item.

For the realist review, studies reporting information on any of the points below in addition to satisfying points a-c would also warrant inclusion:

e) substantive information relating to the implementation of the intervention, OR

f) evidence relating to crime-related and/or public confidence and/or fear of crime causal mechanisms activated by the intervention, as found, for example, in public satisfaction/fear of crime surveys OR

g) evidence relating to the conditions needed for the intervention to activate crime-related and/or public confidence and/or fear of crime causal mechanisms, OR

h) presentation of a theory of change linking the intervention and crime related and/or public confidence and/or fear of crime outcomes.

More generally:

i) Both published and unpublished studies will be included

j) There will be no restriction by date of study.

Should evidence or information gaps emerge in the process of analysing the identified studies, this will initiate a further purposive search for relevant evidence. This pursuit of cognate evidence hitherto unidentified in the search process is intended to furnish a richer collection of information relevant to reducing ASB, disorder and crime, and enhancing community engagement, through recruitment of minority officers and auxiliaries (regardless of the type of evidence - quantitative or qualitative - or research design employed), and to help build and refine underlying programme theories. Also, the police are not alone in seeking fuller engagement with minority communities and populations, and there is a considerable literature in relation to such efforts in other occupations. Rapid Evidence Assessments sponsored by the Home Office have included reference to non-police organizations where the topic of the REA warrants doing so. Searches will be conducted on this literature to identify potentially-relevant studies.
Further, studies identified in the initial searches may be silent on issues of implementation – something that would be important to practitioners seeking to implement crime prevention interventions. Other studies, which fail to meet the inclusion criteria for meta-analysis, might provide useful guidance on such matters. The realist branch of the review aims to identify such studies.

We recognise that additional searching of the sort described above will be demanding. Our goal is to marshal sufficient evidence to build, refine and test theories that underlie the intervention under review (Pawson, 2006) until the point of “theoretical saturation”, whereby consensus is reached that sufficient evidence has been gathered to answer the review question(s). We also recognise that this type of review is not linear, but describes an iterative procedure. The two branches will produce different but complementary outcomes. The realist branch aims to elicit working theories on the part played by minority recruitment in community engagement as a means to reduce ASB, disorder and crime, and build social cohesion, and to establish conditions most likely to bring such effects about. It will also provide quantitative information on the extent to which the identified studies report information pertaining to contexts (including implementation and stakeholder involvement, roles and responsibilities), causal mechanisms and outcome patterns. Complementary to this, the meta-analytical branch will report evidence on the mean effect size on crime reduction or other operational benefit attained in this form of community engagement, in particular as predicted by the realist review element.

**Criteria for considering studies for this review**

In selecting studies for this review we will use the following criteria:

a) Studies must include minority officer recruitment/deployment as a major component, or include minority staff recruitment/deployment as a major component of employer/employee/customer/client engagement where studies are derived from the literature on organizations other than the police, whether or not community engagement is explicitly identified as an aim. Studies where community engagement is not directly cited as a goal but where minority recruitment is a feature will be included.

b) Studies must take place in a jurisdiction or organizational environment cognate to that of the UK (e.g., being an OECD country), regardless of whether they relate to policing (preferred) or to some other occupational domain, and, where they concern a
field other than policing, they must relate to an occupational group (including volunteer roles closely linked to the work of the occupation’s paid employees) engaged in service to the public, whether as customer, client or in some other capacity (e.g., doctor/patient). The reason for stipulating environments cognate to the UK is that, both in respect of ethnicity and gender, community engagement involves behaviours that vary according to the culture in which they operate.

c) Studies must specify the ASB, disorder, and/or crime(s) whose prevention or reduction is expected to come about as a consequence of the recruitment/deployment of minority officers/auxiliaries, and/or clear specification of the looked-for improvement in social cohesion.

In addition, to be included in the meta-analysis branch of this review, a study must:

d) Report primary research; evidence reviews will be excluded.

e) Report an ASB, disorder and/or crime-related quantitative outcome measure, and/or a quantitative outcome measure of the form of social cohesion that was target of improvement. The quantitative findings for any single study can be incorporated only once in the meta-analysis, even if reported in multiple publications. Where this is the case, that study which reports the most detailed information will be included or, where necessary any dependency in the data will be dealt with appropriately. We note that random controlled experimental design studies are rare in criminology. Most quantitative studies are cross-sectional surveys, with few longitudinal studies.

For the realist branch of this review, studies reporting information on any of the points below in addition to satisfying points a-c would also warrant inclusion:

f) Reference to the implementation of the minority officer/auxiliary-based community engagement measure directed at ASB/disorder/crime/cohesion, OR

g) Evidence relating to ASB/disorder/crime/cohesion-related causal mechanisms activated by the minority officer/auxiliary-based community engagement measure(s), OR

h) Evidence relating to the conditions needed for the minority officer/auxiliary-based community engagement measure(s) to activate ASB/disorder/crime/cohesion-related causal mechanisms, OR
i) A theory of change linking the minority officer/auxiliary-based community engagement measure(s) and ASB/disorder/crime/cohesion-related outcomes.

More generally:

j) Published and unpublished studies will be included
k) There will be no restriction by date of study
l) Studies must be available in the English language. Available resources limit our ability to search and translate non-English studies. To ensure that any key references in other languages are identified (though not coded), relevant experts from countries where English is not the first language will be contacted. These include:

- Udo Kelle, Volkspolizie Universitat Hamburg (Germany)
- Hans-Gerd Jaschke, Berlin School of Economics and Law (Germany)
- Luis Gustavo Nardin, ISTC/CNR, Rome (Italy)
- Ali Caglar, Haccettepe University (Turkey)

**Identifying studies: databases and information sources**

Relevant studies will be identified using the following search methods:

1) A building block strategy (search of relevant online abstract databases, including grey literature and dissertation databases (see pp. 43--44)
2) A hand search of key journals
3) A keyword search of outputs from prominent government, research and professional agencies.
4) A keyword search of national policing organisations. This step will involve personnel from the UK College of Policing who will search the National Police Library catalogue to help identify relevant research. This could be particularly useful in accessing unpublished research.
5) If time permits, a hand search of conference abstracts published in 2013 and 2014 to identify ongoing studies or studies awaiting publication, namely the American Society

---

1 These journals are: Police Practice and Research: An International Journal and Policing: a Journal of Policy and Practice. Note that many of the major criminology journals are covered by the databases that will be searched in this review. The journals listed here do not routinely feature in such databases and will therefore be searched by hand.
6) Citation chasing of review bibliographies if these are found in the above searches.

To the best of our knowledge this is the first systematic review of the evidence on the recruitment/deployment of minority group officers/auxiliaries as a method of ASB/disorder/crime reduction and/or promoting social cohesion. Consequently, the convention of reviewing the bibliographies of relevant reviews is not available to us. However, we will conduct a forward search for publications that cite key articles. The finalised list will be reviewed by recognised authorities in the field, including advisors in the Department of Criminology, Society and Law at George Mason University (Fairfax VA, USA) and an information specialist at Rutgers University (Phyllis Schultz) who has extensive experience in retrieving articles from the grey literature in policing and crime prevention.

Online databases to be searched are:

1. ASSIA (Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts)
2. Criminal Justice Abstracts
3. Criminal Justice Periodicals
4. ERIC (Education Resources Information Center)
5. IBSS (International Bibliography of Social Sciences)
6. NCJRS (National Criminal Justice Reference Service)
7. Proquest theses and dissertations
8. PsycINFO
9. PsycEXTRA
10. SCOPUS
11. Social Policy and Practice
12. Web of Science
13. CINCH
14. Sociological Abstracts

We will also search the publications of a number of prominent organisations associated with police and criminal justice research:

Prominent research organisation sources are:
1. Center for Problem-Oriented Policing (Tilley Award and Goldstein Award winners)
2. Institute for Law and Justice
3. Vera Institute for Justice (policing publications)
4. RAND Corporation (public safety publications)
5. Police Foundation (UK)
6. Police Foundation (US)
7. Police Executive Research Forum
8. The Campbell Collaboration reviews and protocols
9. Urban Institute
10. European Crime Prevention Network
11. Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention

In addition, publications from prominent research agencies national policing agencies will be searched and the agencies contacted if necessary. These are:

1. UK Home Office
2. UK College of Policing (Polka)
3. UK College of Policing (National Police Library)
4. MPhil Criminology dissertations at the University of Cambridge
5. Australian Institute of Criminology
6. Swedish Police Service
7. Norwegian Ministry of Justice
8. Canadian Police College
9. Finnish Police (Polsi)
10. Danish National Police (Politi)
11. The Netherlands Police (Politie)
12. New Zealand Police
13. US National Institute of Justice

Full text versions of identified studies will be obtained through one of the following means (in order of preference):

a) Electronic copies via University of Surrey George Edwards Library service
b) Electronic copies via University College London e-journals service (UCL; as well as other electronic works accessible through other universities as part of a consortium, e.g. University of London Senate House Library, M25 consortium).

c) Electronic copies of studies available from elsewhere on the Internet.

d) Paper copies at University of Surrey.

e) Electronic/paper copies requested through University of Surrey Inter Library Loan (ILL) system, which sources most materials from the British Library.

f) Electronic copies at the Gottfredson Library at the Rutgers University School of Criminal Justice (US).

g) Electronic/paper copies requested from the authors themselves.

h) The UK College of Policing National Police Library.

Should any of the full text versions of the works collated contain insufficient information to determine their eligibility for inclusion according to our coding strategy, where practicable the corresponding author will be contacted in an attempt to retrieve this information.

**Search strategy/terms**

The overall aim of the strategy is to produce a sufficient yield of articles to address our questions (White, 2009). We aim to marshal evidence from a diverse range of relevant primary studies, including studies of relevant non-police organisations and occupations. The strategy formulation was guided by the principles outline by Hammerstrom, Wade and Jorgensen (2008). A range of sources is advised when designing a social science perspective. This necessitates modification of search terms depending on the databases searching capabilities and substantive topic. Search strings for each database will be placed in the final review appendix. In addition, to considering the literature on search strategies advice was taken from a number of contributors Lisa Thompson (Research Associate at UCL), Lynn O’Mahony (Assistant
Community engagement can take various forms and/or can be targeted at anti-social behaviour, disorder and crime and at various means of promoting social cohesion, all of which can be applied in many contexts. Therefore, the following key concepts were used as seeds to grow our search term clusters:

- Police
- Recruitment/deployment
- Minority – ethnic or female
- Community engagement
- Crime
- Anti-social behaviour
- Disorder
- Social cohesion

Search terms clusters were generated by a mixture of previous experience of searching for crime related studies, searching for synonyms in dictionaries (Oxford English, Cambridge American English, Organisation), using controlled language terms through searching ASSIA thesaurus and natural language terms. Moreover, natural language terms were developed using a text mining application (Available from http://www.nactem.ac.uk/software/termine/) on the Gill et al. (2014) article and choosing words or phrases that represented the underlying concepts most closely (Frantzi, Ananiadou, and Mima, 2000). Search terms were further refined after pilot searches. Although, initially terms were developed concerning the type of studies that would assess effect or made an evaluation these were omitted during piloting as too few studies would have resulted. We kept the search broad as also advised by Gough, Oliver, and Thomas. (2012:123).

Therefore based upon ASSIA the search term clusters are as follows:

Search clusters for intervention:
Police

(police OR policing OR law enforcement OR police officers OR constable* OR special constable OR police auxiliary* OR police volunteer OR police organisation OR police department)

Recruitment/deployment

(Recruitment OR hire OR hiring OR deployment OR manpower OR "manpower planning" OR "manpower information" OR redundancy OR wastage OR rank OR workforce OR representation OR diversity OR career OR affirmative action or applicant)

Minority

(women OR woman OR female OR females OR gender ethnic* OR “ethnic mix” OR “mixed ethnicity” OR “ethnic” OR “ethnicity” OR “black police” OR BME or "ethnic diversity" or minority)

Search clusters for outcomes:

Crime

(official crime OR crime rate OR offend* OR Re?offend* OR Crim* OR Robber* OR Burglar* OR Fraud OR Forgery OR Counterfeit* OR Theft* OR violent* OR Domestic near violence OR Sex* near offend* OR Incest OR prostituted* OR Rape OR terror*OR Homicide* OR Murder OR Manslaughter OR Infanticide OR Blackmail OR Kidnapping OR Abduction OR "Money Laundering" OR Public near disorder OR aggress* OR Riot* OR Shoplift* OR Drink OR Drunk OR Dangerous near drive* OR Vandalism OR delinquent* OR Law near breaking OR "Anti?social behavio*" OR Arson* OR Assault* OR Wounding OR "Bodily Harm" OR Unlawful OR Disorder* OR recidivism* OR convict* OR Arrest* OR Convict* OR incarcerate* OR Knife? near Crim* OR Weapon* OR shoots* OR Firearm* OR explosion* OR Drug* OR Calls for service)

Community engagement

(social cohesion OR sense of community OR community-oriented policing OR community policing community OR citizen satisfaction OR community collaboration OR community involvement OR sense of cohesion OR common good OR sense of belonging OR belongingness OR community solidarity OR resilience)
The search term strategy therefore became combinations of intervention and outcomes:

police AND recruitment AND minority AND (crime OR community engagement)

police AND recruitment AND (crime or community engagement)

police AND recruitment AND minority

recruitment AND minority AND (crime OR community engagement)

This type of search strategy is known as a building block strategy and previous successful systematic reviews (Gill et al. 2014) have also used this method. Typically, if using a building block strategy the search terms would fall into four clusters: population, intervention, comparison population and outcome which would be added together using the boolean descriptor AND. However, due to the anticipated paucity of literature we did not constrain the searches to a particular population/setting and comparison population/setting, time or location within the article.

As earlier stated as far as we are aware this is the first systematic review on this substantive topic however, if we do locate a related relevant review then we will employ citation chasing to elicit further potential relevant studies.

**Data extraction and management**

As indicated in Figure 2, the first level of screening involves examining the title and abstract of those studies returned following the initial electronic and bibliographic searches. All references will first be uploaded using EPPI 4 reviewer software (http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?alias=eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/er4). Once uploaded, studies that fail to meet the inclusion criteria for the meta-analysis component of the review will be excluded (with rates of attrition duly noted). Excluded studies will be flagged in one of two ways: 1) clearly irrelevant (i.e. animal studies as in Population Biology, editorials, proselytising and advocacy documents promoting the interest-group politics of minorities) or 2) possibly of interest. The latter studies will be revisited in the realist stream of the review (in addition to those included in the meta-analysis stream). This set of studies that are of possible relevance to the realist synthesis are likely mainly to comprise studies whose title and abstract suggest community engagement research but which do not (appear to) report an ASB/disorder/crime-relevant quantitative outcome measure, focussing instead on, say, implementation or process-related (intermediate) outcome measures. The set is also expected to contain studies of a kind
that are less amenable to quantitative (ultimate) outcome measures, such as minority officer/auxiliary recruitment aimed at rare (if serious) occurrences, such as terrorist attacks. Disagreements over inclusion of a study will be resolved within the research team, with recourse to consortium partners if necessary. Inter-rater reliability will be monitored and declared.

The next stage involves screening the full text of and extracting data from those studies that meet the inclusion criteria for meta-analysis. Entering the information into EPPI 4, reviewers will record the following information:

1. Study details (title, year, author(s), author affiliation, publication, study location(s))
2. Nature (type) of intervention(s) put in place
3. Dosage (intensity) of intervention
4. Type(s) of ASB/disorder/crime(s) examined
5. Unit of analysis (people, places, etc)
6. Research design (RCT, quasi-experimental, pre-post test)
7. Description of comparison group, place or period
8. Sample (size and any notable features)
9. Statistical test(s) used
10. Outcome measure of interest and data source (police recorded crime data, victim survey data)
11. Effect sizes (where applicable and/or reported) will initially be coded as they are reported (but see below)
12. Other interventions implemented over the study period
13. Indirect effects (displacement and/or diffusion of crime control benefits)
14. Financial costs and benefits
15. Conclusions of the author(s)

The above list details the information that will be extracted from those studies that meet the inclusion criteria for meta-analysis.

The screening criteria will be applied such that all potential studies identified receive at least preliminary coding. Even those studies that are not selected for further coding will be included, with separate databases for those meeting and not meeting the explicit criteria.
The coding criteria are shown in order in this list (with essential criteria in bold):

- **Type/s of Intervention** - defined using the dimensions outlined above - i.e.
  - Response modality
  - Targeted population
  - Intended/ Unintended outcomes
  - Implementer
- **Type of disorder/crime** (e.g. crime/ delinquency type/s examined)
- **Type of measure discussed** (recorded crime, calls to the police, arrest data)
- **Sample size** (number of studies considered in review)
- **Methods section** (including search strategy) present?
- **Type of review** (Narrative, Meta-analysis, Mixed-Method, Realist)
- **Database searched**
- **Systematic Search Researcher and date of search**
- **Inclusion criteria met** Y/N
- **Whether quantitative evidence is present** (perhaps classifying e.g. ‘effect size’)
- **Does the review contain any information on costs, cost effectiveness, cost benefit analysis**
- **Whether qualitative information is included**
- **Whether there is an explicit inclusion criteria**
- **Date/Year of publication**
- **Country/ies of origin** (i.e. author/s affiliation/s)
- **Geographical coverage** (e.g. does the review cover international evidence?)
- **Period covered** (e.g. the interval of time covered?)

In addition, reviewing for the realist stream will screen the full text of gleaned studies and extract information related to the topics below, again using an appropriate coding framework in EPPI 4. Absence of such information will be logged.

1. Causal mechanism(s) judged to be responsible for the sought-after (observed) outcomes
2. Context of intervention: nature and description of the setting in which the measure was implemented. We expect to code this sort of information in a free-text format with emerging categories being developed over time.
3. The process of and conditions under which the measure was implemented, as well as the different stakeholders involved in their individual roles and responsibilities.
4. Intermediate outcome measures that might help to understand the mechanism(s) through which an interventions brings about its effects.

**13. STATISTICAL PROCEDURES FOR META-ANALYSIS**
We expect studies to differ in methodological approach. Some will have simple post assessments, some pre and post assessments, and some pre and post assessments with at least one control area. Fewer still will have established equivalency between comparison and treatment areas or will have used random assignment to minimize bias. Studies with research designs that limit confident determinations of impact will be examined prima facie for their presence, but they will not be the focus of the meta-analysis.

Reflecting varying methodological rigour, studies will be grouped according to a hierarchy of evidence (most likely quasi-experimental designs versus RCTs) – which reflects the extent to which causal inferences will be sensible – and analyzed separately. Estimates of Effect Size (ES) will be computed within groups and comparisons made between them (see below). The statistical element of the quantitative review will focus on studies which at least meet these conditions: i) they presented raw ASB/disorder/crime counts or rates of ASB/disorder/crime, or reported a standard measure of effect size and sampling variance that is suitable for inclusion in meta-analysis; and ii) the research design comprised at least two areas: a treatment and a control. These may use random or non-random assignment to conditions (treatment and control), but few are likely to have used randomization in the design. Any such will be assessed with the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool (Higgins and Green, 2011).

We expect a range of different data and methods across primary studies. Some of the issues anticipated will be the use of multiple treatment and control areas; the availability of time series data; the use of disorder/crime counts and disorder/crime incident rates; the use of different methods for calculating effect sizes; and the computation of effect sizes for different disorder/crime types and differences in the handling of intervention effect sizes. These differences will be identified in coding and dealt with during statistical analysis (see below).

**Calculating effect sizes**

A statistical meta-analysis will estimate the effectiveness of interventions overall and for relevant sub-groups of studies. To enable synthesis, the individual effect sizes – which may be reported using different test statistics (e.g. odds ratios, mean difference scores, and so on) – will be converted to a common metric. It will be necessary to standardise by converting to the type of effect size that is most frequently used across the primary evaluations, most likely an odds or risk ratio. In other cases, we may find that outcomes are reported as F-ratios or as
standardised differences in means statistics. Where authors have not calculated an effect size but it appears possible using the available data, we aim to calculate an effect size.

With effect sizes in a common metric we will undertake a statistical meta-analysis. A random effect model will be assumed a priori rather than by performing a Q-test from a fixed effects model. Any heterogeneity in effect sizes will be dealt with by computing a mean effect size using a random effects model. In line with standard practice, when combining effect sizes to compute an overall mean effect we will weight the individual metrics using inverse variance weights. This will ensure that more reliable effect sizes are given more weight in the calculations. Along with the overall mean effect size, individual effect sizes will be presented, most likely using forest plots showing point estimates and the associated confidence intervals.

Dealing with dependency

It is likely that there will be cases where it is possible to generate more than one effect size from a single primary study. Reasons for this will vary and we could therefore deal with them according to the particular situation, as follows:

1. Data are presented for multiple treatment sites, each with independent matched controls. Where this occurs we will take the mean of the available effect sizes and use this as the overall outcome for the primary study.
2. Treatment sites are compared to more than one control site. In this case, one option is to compute two effect size measures for the study, one showing the worst case scenario and one showing the best. The overall mean effect size (computed across sites) could then be computed using data to show: a) the best case scenarios; and, b) the worst case scenarios. Forest plots summarising the effect sizes will be produced for each scenario.
3. Reductions in disorder/crime in treatment sites compared to control sites using different pre and post time periods. We will deal with this as in (2) above.

One issue with these approaches is that data are lost or averaged. Therefore, we may implement a permutation approach (see Moore and McCabe, 2006; Bowers et al. 2011; Johnson et al. 2012). Its aim is to use (most or) all of the available data and summarise the distribution for all possible scenarios (not just the best and worst). To do this, where the number of possible permutations is manageable, an overall mean effect size will be computed for each one. Where
a large number of permutations is possible, a random sample will be selected by Monte Carlo simulation. This will produce a distribution of standardised mean effect sizes, giving a fuller understanding of the likely overall impact of intervention.

**Heterogeneity and sub group analysis**

Effect sizes are likely to vary across studies. To quantify the degree of heterogeneity observed, we will calculate a Q statistic, used to determine if any observed variation in effect sizes is likely to be above and beyond that which would be expected on the basis of sampling error alone (see Lipsey and Wilson, 2001). A statistically significant Q statistic therefore implies that there are systematic variations in effect sizes that cannot be explained by sampling error. Such differences would include, for example, variation in the contexts in which an intervention has been implemented.

If, as expected, significant heterogeneity is observed in the effect sizes, a moderator analysis will be conducted to see if variation in factors associated with the reviewed studies can explain this. Some of the factors considered will be informed by our realist review of the available evidence, with the aim of ensuring that the analysis is theoretically informed. These are likely to include:

- Particular type of intervention (*e.g.* deployment of female officers in child sexual abuse investigative work)
- Type of context (*e.g.* rural force with mainstream population, large metropolitan force with high ethnic minority population)
- Type of causal mechanism (*e.g.* increase effort, increase risk)
- Date of study (attitudes towards minorities have evolved in recent decades, older studies may show different effects because the baseline is different).

In addition, we will conduct analyses to see if systematic differences in effect sizes are observed according to:

- The type of study design (*e.g.* RCT versus quasi-experimental)
- The size of study (this might reflect the geographical scale of intervention, the number of treatments applied, or the overall cost of intervention)
As part of the moderator analysis, weighted mean effect sizes will be computed for each of the identified sub-groups. We will also calculate a Q statistic for each subgroup. In the event that the theoretically informed moderator variables explain the observed variation in effect sizes, any remaining variation will be explained by sampling error alone, and the analysis will thus provide insight into (at least some of) the ingredients necessary for successful intervention.

**Publication bias**

Publication bias can compromise the reliability of the outcome of any meta-analysis (e.g. Kicinski, 2014) by bringing the risk that positive effects of intervention will be exaggerated. To determine its extent in the sample of studies, using a moderator analysis, we will compare the mean effect size observed in published studies with that for unpublished studies. Next, we will produce a funnel plot, plotting the effect sizes against their standard error. In the event of no publication bias, the individual effect sizes should be more or less symmetric around the overall mean. If there is an over-representation of studies suggesting an effect greater than the overall mean effect, indicating publication bias, Duval and Tweedie’s (2000) trim and fill method can be used to estimate true effect size.

**Outlier analysis**

Outlying individual outcomes can distort the overall mean effect size estimate. Such outliers are a threat if they have extreme values and/or come from large studies that the meta-analysis has heavily weighted. The analysis will check for the existence, and where appropriate, the influence of such outliers by visually assessing the presence of any extreme values from the forest plots. If it is apparent that potentially problematic outliers exist, mean effect sizes will be calculated both with and without the inclusion of the extreme value. This sensitivity analysis will establish whether mean effect sizes in such situations are robust and consistent or whether the outlier has a problematic influence over the results found.

**Inter-rater reliability**

Reliability of the data extraction process will be checked to assess whether subjective interpretations of the coding process have influenced the information that was extracted, particularly that relating to outcome. For at least a random sample of studies, two coders will independently code the outcome measures and other findings. These will be compared and
levels of agreement calculated. We earlier noted procedures we will follow if inter-rater reliability is low at any stage of the process or for any category.

14. TIMETABLE AND PLANS FOR UPDATING THE REVIEW

The estimated timeline for the Systematic Review includes the following benchmarks and anticipated dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search for published and unpublished studies</td>
<td>January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance assessments</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction of data from research reports</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical analysis</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of report commences</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Online Toolkit Landing Page &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of completed report</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of other publications commences</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of other publications</td>
<td>From January 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to employment contingencies, the authors will update the review after three years.
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