

Knowledge
Transfer
Partnerships

*“Creating a knowledge-base of public confidence
in the Criminal Justice System”*

A Knowledge Transfer Partnership between Newcastle University and
Northumbria Local Criminal Justice Board



Report 3: Summary of the Exploratory Qualitative Research

March 2008



Sociology

School of Geography, Politics
and Sociology
Claremont Bridge Building
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 7RU

Report Authors:

Liz Turner, Elaine Campbell, Andy Dale and Ruth Graham

For enquiries about the project contact Liz Turner – Tel: +44 (0)191
2227510 Email: liz.turner@ncl.ac.uk

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Method	3
2.1	Overview	3
2.2	Who participated?	3
	General public	3
	Practitioners	4
3.	Findings	5
3.1	Analytical framework	5
3.2	Conditions for confidence	5
	Demographics	5
	Underlying Values and Beliefs	5
	Information	6
3.3	Objects of confidence	7
3.4	Outcomes	8
3.5	Practitioner Interviews	10
4.	Conclusion	12
5.	Bibliography	13

Tables

<i>Table 1: Reasons for and against reporting crime</i>	9
---	---

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Focus Group Schedule	i
Appendix 2 – Interview Schedule (Members of the public)	ii
Appendix 3 – Interview Schedule (Practitioner – Police)	iii
Appendix 4 – Interview Schedule (Practitioner – Witness Care Officer)	iv

1. Introduction

1.1.1 In September 2006 the Northumbria Local Criminal Justice Board and Newcastle University entered into a Knowledge Transfer Partnership (KTP)¹ to create a knowledge-base of public confidence in the criminal justice system. This partnership will enable the Board to draw on the specialist expertise at the university in the areas of criminology, sociology and social research methodology, and will lead to the production of a body of knowledge to aid strategic innovation by the Board. The KTP study is co-funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Board, and will run from September 2006 to September 2009. Over the three years the Board and the University will collaborate in supervising a KTP Associate to project manage, design, execute, analyse and report the results of a critical empirical research study into public confidence in the Criminal Justice System (CJS) in the Northumbria area.

1.1.2 The research to be carried out as part of the work of this partnership will lead to the production of an alternative body of knowledge about public confidence, beyond that provided by the British Crime Survey, deepening current understandings of the phenomenon and allowing the development of new approaches to monitoring, maintaining and increasing confidence across the Northumbria area. The core activity of the partnership will be the design and execution of a mixed methodological empirical study, employing innovative interactive qualitative approaches both to inform the development of robust quantitative research instruments and to triangulate quantitative survey findings by probing and contextualising the statistical data collected.

1.1.3 This is the third report produced as part of this project. It provides a brief account of the activities carried out during the exploratory qualitative stage of research for this project, and a summary of the research findings, along with an initial analysis. Other publications arising from the project, including the first and second reports, can be viewed at <http://criminaljusticeresearch.ncl.ac.uk>.

¹ For more information on Knowledge Transfer Partnerships see www.ktponline.org.uk

2. Method

2.1 Overview

2.1.1 The exploratory qualitative research consisted of:

- Three focus groups with members of the public (See Appendix 1 for interview schedule)
- Three one to one interviews with members of the public (See Appendix 2 for interview schedule)
- Six one to one interviews with CJS practitioners (See Appendices 3 and 4 for interview schedules)
- A review of transcripts of a related research study

2.1.2 The purpose of the exploratory phase was to identify the key issues raised by members of the public in discussions about their experiences and expectations of the CJS, the way they discuss these issues, and the likely outcomes produced by their attitudes as manifested in their behaviour towards the CJS.

2.1.3 The interviews with practitioners were used to provide insight into where difficulties might arise in interactions between front-line CJS staff and members of the public, and the impact that such difficulties might have on the services front-line staff were able to provide.

2.1.4 The transcripts from a related research study were drawn upon to compensate for what was unfortunately a very low-level of BME involvement in the focus groups and interviews at this initial stage (only one person from a BME background took part). The transcripts drawn upon were from a study of BME satisfaction with the CJS². This data was analysed to ensure that BME-specific concerns about the CJS had not been missed at this exploratory stage.

2.2 Who participated?

General public

2.2.1 All of those who participated in the first two focus groups and interviews carried out with members of the public filled in a short questionnaire so that a record of demographic and other characteristics could be made. However, the third focus group had a changing composition, with people arriving and leaving during the discussion. It was not therefore possible to ensure that all of the participants filled in a questionnaire. The following summary therefore gives an overview of 18 of the members of the public who contributed to the discussions, however more than 20 people actually took part.

² Campbell and Stockdale, 2007. View report at <http://criminaljusticeresearch.ncl.ac.uk/>.

Area of residence³

2.2.2 The participants mainly lived in the Langtoft (39%) or Riverside (33%) districts. One participant lived in Rutherby Valley. Three (17%) of the participants were of no fixed abode. One participant lived outside of the research area, however he had lived in Langtoft until recently, and continued to visit the area regularly for work and leisure.

Sex

2.2.3 Seven of the participants were male (39%) and 11 were female (61%).

Race and Ethnicity

2.2.4 Using the 16+1 framework, 17 (94%) of the participants described themselves as ‘White – British’. One participant described himself as ‘Black or Black British – African’.

Age

2.2.5 The youngest participant was 17 and the eldest 83. Three of the participants were under 25 and four of the participants were over 65. The mean age of the participants was 45. Half of the participants were under 40.

Experience of victimisation

2.2.6 12 of the participants (67%) had been a victim of crime at some point in their lives. Five of the participants (28%) had been a victim within the last 12 months.

Confidence in the CJS

2.2.7 Using the general confidence measure from the British Crime Survey, Eight (44%) of the participants described themselves as fairly or very confident that the criminal justice system is effective at bringing offenders to justice. Nine (50%) of the participants said they were not very or not at all confident that the criminal justice system is effective at bringing offenders to justice. One participant did not answer this question.

Practitioners

2.2.8 Practitioner interviews were carried out with three front-line police officers (Two PCs on 24/7 shifts and one PC working as a Neighbourhood Beat Manager), and three practitioners working as Witness Care Officers within the Witness Care Units for the Crown and Magistrates Courts. Two of these practitioners were CPS employees and one was police civilian staff.

³ In order to protect some of our research participants all place names have been anonymised throughout all stages of the research process. A key to the place names is available only for internal use by the project team and Northumbria Criminal Justice Board members and staff.

3. Findings

3.1 *Analytical framework*

3.1.1 The transcripts from the focus groups and interviews with the members of the public (including the transcripts from the related study) were analysed in line with the framework developed during the course of the literature review (Turner et al, 2007)⁴. Each transcript was reviewed to identify the ‘conditions’ for confidence or a lack of confidence (e.g. demographics, underlying values and beliefs and sources of information about the criminal justice system) and the ‘objects’ to which confidence attaches (e.g. attributes, actions and outcomes of the criminal justice system). The transcripts were also examined to find examples of the way people have behaved and say they *would* behave in relation to reporting events to the police and cooperating with the criminal justice system more generally. The key issues are summarised below.

3.2 *Conditions for confidence*

Demographics

3.2.1 The demographic categories into which the respondents fell did seem to impact on the way they talked about criminal justice. Respondents themselves were sometimes self-aware about this. Key factors that appeared to make a difference were age, sex, race/ethnicity and whether or not the respondent had lived or still lived in an area that might be considered deprived and/or to have a bit of a ‘reputation’. Whether or not there is a statistical association between respondents’ demographic backgrounds and their confidence will be explored at a later date using the survey data.

Underlying Values and Beliefs

3.2.2 Respondents expressed a range of different values and beliefs in relation to the criminal justice system and society more generally. These can be categorized as:

- **Beliefs about the way things are** - (e.g. There has been a moral decline in society, judges are out of touch, ordinary people are powerless to defend themselves against offenders). These beliefs were often expressed by the respondents in the form of a factual observation on the state of society and the CJS.
- **Beliefs about what causes crime and what works in preventing it** - (e.g. Longer sentences will teach offenders not to do it again, if the police responded more quickly they would have more chance of catching the offender, social exclusion and deprivation can lead to people committing crime).

⁴ The literature review was the second report from this project and can be viewed at <http://criminaljusticeresearch.ncl.ac.uk/>.

These beliefs reflect respondents’ own ‘logic models’ of why there is crime and how it can be reduced. Again these were often stated as observations of fact.

- **Beliefs about right and wrong and the way things should be** (e.g. Repeat offenders should receive much harsher sentences, the CJS should try to reintegrate offenders into society). These are normative statements about what *should* be happening. They are statements of belief, rather than observations of fact.
- **Feelings about oneself** (e.g. believing that one is more physically vulnerable than others for example because of age or sex). There were a limited number of such expressions by respondents, however it was clear that some respondents linked their own vulnerability (or perceived lack of vulnerability) to their other behaviours and attitudes.

Information

3.2.3 Respondents apparently drew on a wide range of information sources to construct their views on the CJS. Some of these sources of information were not specifically about criminal justice, but nevertheless they contributed to the background of how people were thinking about the issues. The sources of information can be categorized as follows:

- **Personal experience of the CJS** – from professional contact, to attending community group meetings, to contact as a victim to having been in prison
- **Word of mouth** – from hearing firsthand of another’s experience to hearing stories second or third hand
- **Media** – from newspapers to magazines to radio and TV, including fictional and non-fictional portrayals (a distinction not always noted by respondents) and also the older participants recalled a particularly memorable song about a real-life murderer
- **Indicators within the physical and social environment** - for example litter, state of repair of buildings and vehicles, kids hanging around
- **Personal experiences not directly related to criminal justice** – for example the experience of having been subjected to corporal punishment as a child, or of a breach of trust which changed a person’s view of ‘human nature’
- **Official information** – for example police leaflets
- **Social contact** – for example positive social contact with young people acting as a counter-balance to other sources of information e.g. the media

3.2.4 The ‘conditions’ for confidence then appeared in the focus groups and interviews as a web of interacting factors encompassing a person’s background, the sources of information to which they are exposed and their underlying values and beliefs.

3.3 Objects of confidence

3.3.1 The ‘objects’ of confidence are what members of the public expect from the criminal justice system. Public confidence is not just confidence *in* the CJS but is confidence *that* the CJS is, does and achieves certain things. Having overall confidence *in* the CJS may be contingent on having confidence that the CJS *is*, for example not corrupt, or that it *does* for example make inquiries following a crime, or that it *achieves* for example an orderly society. These then are the ‘objects’ of confidence: the specific things *about* the CJS which people seek to be confident in, in order to have confidence in the system as a whole.

3.3.2 It is not always easy in reality (as opposed to conceptually) to separate out the way the CJS *is*, from what it *does* and what it *achieves*. The difference between attributes and actions is mostly a question of specificity. For example someone might say that they expect the criminal justice system to be ‘effective’ but they may not specify what being effective might entail. On the other hand another person might say that they expect the criminal justice system to ‘send people to prison’, this is a specific action and may form part of what the first person thought of as being ‘effective’, however without asking that first person what they think is effective we cannot be sure of this. Similarly some ‘objects’ may be actions (in the sense that they refer to something which is done) and yet still be quite vague, for example: ‘dealing with crime’. This is an action but it is unclear what it entails. Achievements of the CJS can also be specific, like ‘finding offenders guilty’, and more general like ‘making society safer’. These can however be relatively easily divided into ‘outputs’ (specific, measurable achievements, for example the proportion of offenders found guilty at court) and ‘outcomes’ (broader and less easily measurable, referring to the overall impact on society of the ‘outputs’).

3.3.3 The ‘objects’ of confidence identified from the data, can be categorized as:

- **System attributes** (e.g. ‘makes sense/commonsensical’, ‘not corrupt’, ‘in touch with current reality’)
- **Actor attributes** (e.g. ‘hard-working’, ‘sensitive’, ‘honest’)
- **Non-specific Actions** (e.g. ‘helps people’, ‘deals with crime’, ‘does not mollycoddle offenders’)
- **Specific Actions** (e.g. ‘interviews and takes statements’, ‘prosecutes offenders’, ‘sends offenders to prison’)
- **Outputs** (e.g. ‘catches offenders’, ‘reduces reoffending’)
- **Outcomes** (‘a safer society’, ‘more social cohesion’, ‘reduced stress’)

3.3.4 The data from the focus groups and interviews suggests that if respondents saw certain of their expectations being met, for example if they saw the police ‘making inquiries’ after an incident, that they may be more inclined to think that the criminal justice system was meeting their expectations in other areas, for example ‘dealing with crime’. In other words what the criminal justice system does, and is *seen to be doing* in terms of specific actions has communicative potential and effectively acts as a form of information. The image of a police officer behaving in a sensitive fashion towards a distressed victim, or of panda cars arriving swiftly following an incident, whether witnessed firsthand, heard about from a neighbour, or even read about in a magazine true-life story, may be interpreted by members of the public as evidence that the CJS is effective, however further research is required to probe on this point.

3.3.5 It is evident from the data collected that members of the public have wide ranging expectations of the criminal justice system. It is also evident that what one person expects may be incompatible with what another expects. It is clear then that not everybody’s expectations can be met all of the time. Furthermore whilst the data at this stage enables us to identify *what* respondents expect from the criminal justice system, it does not enable us to identify fully *how* they will determine whether or not these expectations are being met. Nor can we determine the impact of the criminal justice system meeting some expectations and failing to meet others. Again further research is required to explore these issues in more detail.

3.4 Outcomes

3.4.1 The exploratory research also explored the range of different behaviours in respect of cooperating and collaborating with the CJS to combat crime, for example by reporting incidents to the police (see Table 1 below which lists all of the reasons for and against reporting crime cited by respondents). Ultimately these behaviours can be seen as *outcomes* of people’s attitudes towards the CJS. Respondents were asked whether if they were a victim of crime they would report it to the police. They were also asked about their previous experiences of reporting crime and having contact with the criminal justice system. One of the key justifications for trying to increase public confidence in the CJS is that this will produce increased cooperation between the public and the CJS. The data suggest that this relationship is not straightforward. For example among the reasons given for reporting crime to the police were that it is just what you do, it is necessary to claim on the insurance and also that it is a responsibility to fellow citizens, whilst reasons given for not reporting included not having been brought up to that, preferring to get revenge and reporting being impractical at that point in time. These reasons appear to be influenced by factors other than confidence, which it may therefore be equally as important to explore.

Some respondents expressed what might be described as ‘confidence’ in some areas of CJS performance, but were still uncertain about whether they would report incidents in certain circumstances, suggesting that they might deal with it themselves, or even get revenge. The data reveal that it is not a straight forward division between being someone who reports crime and cooperates with the system and someone who doesn’t. Courses of action taken by respondents include a respondent reporting a burglary to the police but then *not* telling them that she thought her neighbour had done it, a respondent reporting an incident where he was victimised but *not* reporting other criminal behaviour of which he was aware, and respondents who would be willing to report some offences but not others depending on their judgement of the likely response. A view expressed by several respondents was that in some circumstances reporting crime is simply not worth it.

FOR REPORTING	AGAINST REPORTING
<p>To be able to confront offender in court</p> <p>Because that’s what you do</p> <p>Responsibility to others as a citizen</p> <p>If witness offence where victim is vulnerable (elderly, child, animal)</p> <p>So that the CJS can keep data</p> <p>If witness something which could be a danger to others</p> <p>To stop a minor situation from potentially escalating</p> <p>To enable CJS to link in to other supportive/protective services (e.g. social services)</p> <p>Offence is serious</p> <p>To keep the area nice</p> <p>Knowing people who have had a good response</p> <p>Knowing that the offender has done other things</p> <p>If victim has been seriously injured</p> <p>To get insurance money</p> <p>Brought up to do so</p> <p>NOTE: Reasons in red were drawn from the transcripts from a related research study into BME satisfaction with the CJS. (Campbell and Stockdale, 2007)</p>	<p>Fear of reprisals</p> <p>Thinking nothing will be done</p> <p>Nervous of being in court</p> <p>Fear of how would be dealt with as a rape victim</p> <p>Thinking the police are insensitive</p> <p>Upbringing/it’s not what you do</p> <p>Incident may be criminal but is too petty</p> <p>Impractical (if driving at the time)</p> <p>Confident to deal with it oneself within the law (e.g. tick off kids, herd cows off road)</p> <p>It’s time consuming/a waste of time/not worth the bother</p> <p>Problem has been reported before and nothing was seen to be done so will take own action (outside the law)</p> <p>Will get revenge oneself (outside the law)</p> <p>Has reported other problems before and nothing was done</p> <p>Police response is too slow</p> <p>Police don’t do anything</p> <p>Got to look after yourself as can’t rely on the police</p> <p>There’s no point as they won’t respond</p> <p>Better to get someone in the community to sort it out</p> <p>Seen that nothing happens so why bother</p> <p>It is more bother than having been a victim in the first place</p> <p>Can’t trust the police as they are racist/anti-muslim</p>

Table 1: Reasons for and against reporting crime

3.4.2 It seems therefore to be perfectly possible for members of the public to say that they are not confident in the system in many ways, and yet still to be committed to reporting crime and cooperating with the system. Equally it is possible that some members of the public have quite deeply entrenched reasons for not wanting to work with the system and report crime, and yet can express themselves as quite confident in the system in some respects. This suggests that the issue of public confidence as broadly expressed as it is in current policy may be something of a red herring in terms of achieving the instrumental aims of increasing public cooperation with the criminal justice system.

3.5 Practitioner Interviews

3.5.1 Practitioners gave a range of suggested explanations for why members of the public might not fully cooperate with the CJS to combat crime. Practitioners were also asked to describe the impact that non-cooperation had on their work. Practitioner explanations for why people might not be cooperative with the CJS roughly divide into specific issues to do with the CJS process, and more general social and attitudinal explanations.

3.5.2 Practitioners recognise that members of the public may be reluctant to attend court because, amongst other things, going to court is not convenient for them, it may be costly if they miss work, it might cause problems with care arrangements and they may fear the actual process itself. These are issues which mechanisms are in place to address, and Witness Care Officers can use these mechanisms to persuade members of the public to be cooperative and attend court to give evidence. Specific issues which it may be less easy to address are cases taking a long time to come to court (during which time the victim or witness may have moved on), fear of retaliation, and victims, mainly in domestic violence cases, who are in an intimate relationship with the offender. These specific obstructions to cooperation may be more challenging to overcome.

3.5.3 More general explanations given for non-cooperation include a lack of trust in the system, a lack of familiarity with how the system works, being from a criminal background, living in an area where cooperating with the police is not the done thing and seeing sentences as too lenient. Some of these issues clearly may be related to public confidence, others however are suggestive of the fact that cooperation with the CJS rests on more complex issues than a generalised kind of confidence. Whilst it should be remembered that these are the unproven beliefs of practitioners about how members of the public think, it can also be noted that the beliefs of practitioners appear to be at least partially supported by the data from the focus groups and interviews with members of the public.

3.5.4 Practitioners identified the following impacts of non-cooperation on the effectiveness and efficiency of the CJS:

- There will be less information available to the police meaning that it is difficult to know where to direct resources
- Police time is wasted in investigating cases that cannot succeed because witnesses will not give statements or attend court
- Offenders are not convicted due to a lack of evidence
- Court time is wasted on cases which will fail

- Police officers do not achieve an ‘outcome’ for their actions
- Resources must be used to summons and, if necessary, arrest witnesses in order to ensure that they attend court
- The CJS cannot provide a full service to the public

3.5.5 Practitioners then have their own beliefs about what causes members of the public not to cooperate and collaborate with the CJS, many of which seem to be reflected in the data collected from members of the public. Practitioners are also keenly aware of the impact that non-cooperation has on their own work. The practitioner interviews were useful to provide an insight into this everyday impact, and also to focus attention on incidents of non-cooperation which arise from specific pragmatic issues such as loss of earnings, inconvenience and care problems, rather than from a general lack of confidence in the CJS.

4. Conclusion

4.1.1 The findings from the exploratory qualitative research offer a useful basis for designing the survey questionnaire for the second stage of the empirical research. In particular the findings outlined here suggest that established approaches to measuring confidence may capture data which is potentially misleading. For example, if apparently ‘confident’ people are prepared to take the law into their own hands, whilst apparently ‘unconfident’ people say they would always report crime to the police because they see it as a duty, then there is a danger that individuals with whom the CJS clearly needs to engage, and messages which need to be imparted, may be neglected in favour of more general messages about issues such as sentencing, which have traditionally been seen as ‘driving’ confidence.

4.1.2 Our research suggests that there needs to be more emphasis in confidence research on the beneficial outcomes for society which it is hoped that increased confidence will produce, in particular the potential for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the CJS by encouraging more people to engage with the system in appropriate ways, at appropriate junctures. The link between confidence as it is currently measured and behaviour needs to be interrogated further. The next stage in the research is a postal survey. This will be designed in order to investigate the link between general confidence, anticipated service levels and likely behaviour. The purpose will be to distinguish general attitudes from specific expectations and from behaviour in order to establish whether the established conceptualisation and measurement of confidence may be concealing important issues, and to determine if alternative measurements might be deployed to greater effect.

5. Bibliography

Campbell, E and Stockdale, K (2007) *Criminal justice services and 'customer satisfaction' within black and minority ethnic communities* Report on Participant Action Research in the North East of England. Newcastle: University of Newcastle

Turner, E, Campbell, E, Dale, A and Graham, R (2007) Creating a knowledge-base of public confidence in the criminal justice system *Report 2: Literature Review* Newcastle: Newcastle University

Both reports can be viewed at: <http://criminaljusticeresearch.ncl.ac.uk/>.

Appendix 1 – Focus Group Schedule

<p>SECTION 1: EXPECTATIONS (DESIRED PERFORMANCE)</p> <p><i>First of all, I would like you to tell me what does the phrase ‘criminal justice system’ mean to you?</i></p> <p>PROBES: Which people? Which organisations? What should they be doing? Why do you say that? What is their role?</p>	<p>SECTION 2: EXPECTATIONS (DESIRED AND ANTICIPATED PERFORMANCE)</p> <p><i>If you were a victim of crime, and you reported it to the police, what would you expect to happen next?</i></p> <p>PROBES: Happen next? Why do you say that? Most important to you? And then what? If witness? How do you feel about that?</p>
<p>SECTION 3: BEHAVIOUR</p> <p><i>If you were a victim of a crime tomorrow, how many of you would DEFINITELY report it? (COUNT) OK, and those of you who are not sure if you would report it, can you tell us a bit about why you might not report it?</i></p> <p>PROBES: Why do you say that? What do people think about that? What kind of crimes do people think they might be likely to not bother reporting? Why is that? What would people definitely report? What about if you witnessed a crime? How do you feel about that?</p>	<p>SECTION 4: PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES</p> <p><i>In this last part of the discussion I would like to talk about what people think about crime and the criminal justice system. To start with I’d like to ask what, if anything, you would like to see the criminal justice system doing differently in your area?</i></p> <p>PROBES: Why do you say that? What gives you that impression? Is that in your area or does it apply everywhere? Is that a big problem? What does everyone else think? What do you think causes that problem? How do you feel about that? So, what is the system doing right, in your opinion? If these changes were to happen do you think it would make a difference to you? How?</p>

Appendix 2 – Interview Schedule (Members of the public)

SECTION 1: EXPECTATIONS (DESIRED PERFORMANCE)

First of all, I would like you to tell me what does the phrase ‘criminal justice system’ mean to you?

PROBES: Which people? Which organisations? What should they be doing? Why do you say that? What is their role?

SECTION 2: EXPECTATIONS (DESIRED AND ANTICIPATED PERFORMANCE)

If you were a victim of crime, and you reported it to the police, what would you expect to happen next?

PROBES: Happen next? Why do you say that? Most important to you? And then what? If witness? How do you feel about that?

SECTION 3: BEHAVIOUR

OK, we’ve talked a bit about what you expect from the criminal justice system. Now I’d like to talk about what you would do if you were in a position to need help from the criminal justice system. First of all, can I ask, if you were a victim of a crime tomorrow, would you report it?

PROBES: Why do you say that? Are there any kind of crimes that you think you might be likely to not bother reporting? Why is that? What would you definitely report? What about if you witnessed a crime? Would you report it then? How do you feel about that?

SECTION 4: PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES

In this last part of the discussion I would like to talk about what you think about crime and the criminal justice system. To start with I’d like to ask what, if anything, you would like to see the criminal justice system doing differently in your area?

PROBES: Why do you say that? What gives you that impression? Is that in your area or does it apply everywhere? Is that a big problem? What do you think causes that problem? How do you feel about that? So, what is the system doing right, in your opinion? If these changes were to happen do you think it would make a difference to you? How?

Appendix 3 – Interview Schedule (Practitioner – Police)

SECTION 1: CONTEXT

To get started I would like to get a bit of background information about what your day to day work involves. Can you tell me a bit about what your main responsibilities are and the sort of things you might expect to do during a normal working day?

PROBES: Can you tell me a bit about the area you cover? What is it like? What are the most common kinds of incidents that you deal with? What are the most challenging aspects of working in your area?

SECTION 3: PERCEPTIONS

Now I would like to ask you about your own perceptions, gathered during your daily work, of how people in your area think about the police and the CJS. Would you say that people in the area you cover are generally quite confident in the CJS?

PROBES: Who isn't confident? Who is? How do you know? Why do you think that is? What makes you say that? How do you feel about that? Does that have an impact on your work? What impact? Do you think people have unrealistic expectations? Can you give me an example? And how does that affect you? What help can you offer in that situation?

SECTION 2: EXPERIENCE

Next I would like to find out a bit about your experience of working with members of the public. How do you find working in close contact with members of the public?

PROBES: What are the main challenges you face? Can you give me an example? And what impact does that have on you and your work? What strategies are available to you to deal with such a situation? Did these work in this instance? Why do you think this person was behaving in this way? Did they tell you that themselves? So what makes you think that? And how did that make you feel? Does this happen frequently?

SECTION 4: NEEDS

What changes in public attitudes and behaviours do YOU think would be the most useful in terms of helping you to achieve your objectives as a police officer?

PROBES: What impact do you think that change in attitude would have? Why do you say that? Do you have anything further that you would like to add to what we have discussed today?

Appendix 4 – Interview Schedule (Practitioner – Witness Care Officer)

<p>SECTION 1: CONTEXT</p> <p><i>Can you tell me what your job title is and then a bit about what your main responsibilities are and the sort of things you might expect to do during a normal working day?</i></p> <p>PROBES: Can you tell me a bit about the area you cover? What is it like? What are the most common kinds of incidents that you deal with? What are the most challenging aspects of working in your area?</p>	<p>SECTION 2: EXPERIENCE</p> <p><i>Next I would like to find out a bit about your experience of working with members of the public. How do you find working in close contact with members of the public?</i></p> <p>PROBES: Main challenges? Can you give me an example? And what impact did that have on you and your work? What strategies are available to you to deal with such a situation? Did these work? Why do you think this person was not being helpful? Did they tell you that themselves? So what makes you think that? Can you give me any other examples? Does this happen frequently?</p>
<p>SECTION 3: PERCEPTIONS</p> <p><i>Now I would like to ask you about your own perceptions, gathered during your daily work, of how members of the public think about the CJS. Would you say that the people you come into contact with are confident in the CJS?</i></p> <p>PROBES: Who isn't confident? Who is? How do you know? Why do you think that is? What makes you say that? How do you feel about that? Does that have an impact on your work? What impact? Do you think people have unrealistic expectations? Can you give me an example? And how does that affect you? What help can you offer?</p>	<p>SECTION 4: NEEDS</p> <p><i>Finally I would like to get some idea of the kinds of things that you think would make a positive difference to the work you do. I have asked about the cooperativeness and confidence of members of the public, but what changes in public attitudes do YOU think would be the most useful in terms of helping you to achieve your objectives?</i></p> <p>PROBES: What impact do you think that change in attitude would have? Why do you say that? Do you have anything further that you would like to add to what we have discussed today?</p>