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1. Introduction

Background and aims

This report summarises the research evidence that has underpinned the development of national guidelines on neighbourhood policing. Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Service (2016) recommended that the College of Policing develop these guidelines, following concerns it had raised about the continued erosion of local policing and the need for many forces to take urgent action to maintain a proactive and preventative approach to policing.

The guidelines were developed by a committee of practitioners, subject matter experts and academics, drawing on the best available evidence (see College 2017). The main sources of evidence the College Guideline Committee considered were the findings of two rapid evidence assessments (REAs), which sought to answer the following questions:

- REA1 – what constitutes effective neighbourhood policing?
- REA2 – what acts as a facilitator or barrier to successful implementation of neighbourhood policing?

The findings of these REAs were presented by College researchers to the Guideline Committee in the form of evidence tables. These evidence tables were then reviewed by committee members, who used them to:

- identify areas where there was sufficient evidence to recommend policing practice
- determine how strongly worded each guideline should be (for example, ‘should’, ‘are advised’)
- frame the specific wording of each guideline.

The College Guideline Committee agreed six substantive guidelines under the following headings:

- engaging communities
- solving problems
- targeting activity
- promoting the right culture
- building analytical capability
- developing officers, staff and volunteers.

A seventh guideline was also agreed but addressed gaps in the evidence base.

This report presents summary findings from the two REAs that relate specifically to the six guidelines. Findings about other issues are not presented in this summary.

Methods

REAs use transparent, structured and systematic processes to search for, sift and synthesise research on a particular topic. These processes seek to reduce bias and enable others to replicate the review. An REA is not an exhaustive summary of the literature, as limits are placed on the review process in order to deliver results ‘rapidly’.

Following these general principles, College researchers drew up strategies to search for and review the research literature to help answer the two review questions (see the appendix for further details). The two strategies followed a similar process but differed in their focus and the type of evidence that was in scope.
Focus and scope

REA1 was not only concerned with exploring the effectiveness of neighbourhood policing. It also outlined what was thought to have been important when neighbourhood policing had a positive impact. The REA used a broad definition of ‘neighbourhood policing’, concentrating on initiatives that variously involved foot patrol, community engagement, problem-solving and partnership working in some combination. Other policing strategies were regarded as being in scope if they were felt to be particularly suited to integration with neighbourhood policing (for example, hot spots policing, focused deterrence policing and procedural justice). Only systematic reviews and other REAs were included in the REA. Relevant primary studies from systematic reviews were also separately included because they tended to describe implementation of the initiatives in more detail.

By contrast, REA2 was broader in that it sought to document a comprehensive range of implementation issues with neighbourhood policing. It therefore included a much wider range of methods, including quantitative, qualitative and mixed-method studies. REA2 used the same broad definition of ‘neighbourhood policing’ as before, but concentrated on the relevance of findings on implementation in the studies. It sought to:

- look at how the defining features of neighbourhood policing had been implemented
- identify what helped and hindered
- explore whether there were any special considerations in particular contexts (for example, in tackling antisocial behaviour, crime or terrorism).

As such, REA2 aimed to draw out findings that would provide the basis for practical advice to practitioners who were supporting the delivery of neighbourhood policing

Systematic searches and expert recommendations

Both REAs involved systematic searches of online literature databases, the National Police Library catalogue, the Global Policing Database and relevant websites (see the appendix for details). Tiered search terms were piloted, refined and used where possible. To limit the volume of literature to be reviewed and focus on the most relevant evidence, the searches were restricted to studies published in English between 2007 and 2017 that had been carried out in Australia, New Zealand, Europe or North America.

In addition, academics with international expertise in relevant fields were contacted with a view to them recommending relevant studies for inclusion in the REAs. The principal investigator (Paul Quinton) also suggested studies for inclusion, taking into account the interests of the Guideline Committee, the issues likely to be covered in the guidelines and the information to support their implementation. No restrictions were placed on the studies that could be recommended, though all were subsequently sifted. Further studies were also added following academic peer review.

Sifting and reviewing

The College researchers who developed the search strategy (Sarah Colover and Paul Quinton) sifted the titles and abstracts of all the identified studies using a series of inclusion and exclusion criteria. They conferred on some studies and checked each other’s excluded studies to help ensure they had used the criteria consistently.

A larger team of researchers sifted the remaining studies a second time, which involved them applying the same criteria to the full text. They then read the studies in detail and summarised them using a data extraction framework. To ensure consistency in using the criteria and framework, members of the larger team took part in training exercises that involved them sifting and extracting data from a small sample of studies and receiving
feedback. The College researchers who developed the search strategy also:

- reviewed the early work of team members
- carried out quality checks on a dip-sample of studies
- held weekly meetings with the team to discuss sifting and data extraction decisions and any emerging issues.

Figure 1 shows the number of studies that were included and excluded at each stage of the review process. Both REAs are presented together because some studies were transferred between the two due to their relevance and methods.

Figure 1. The number of studies at different stages of the review

![Diagram showing the number of studies at different stages of the review.]

1,618 studies identified → 516 duplicates excluded

1,102 abstracts screened → 823 studies excluded

279 full studies screened → 101 studies excluded

178 studies reviewed
2. Summary findings

This chapter presents the headline findings from the two REAs that underpinned the development of the guidelines and the materials to support their implementation. Findings have been presented as a series of bulleted summaries under the guideline headings. This style of reporting was adopted to make the findings accessible and enable senior leaders, supervisors and frontline practitioners to check the evidential basis for each guideline.

Overall evidence on neighbourhood policing

Systematic review evidence (Gill et al 2014) has shown that, overall and across a range of different places, neighbourhood policing has been effective at:

- reducing public perceptions of disorder
- increasing trust and confidence in the police
- increasing the perceived legitimacy of the police.

Neighbourhood policing pilots in the UK were found to reduce victimisation and have a sustained impact across a range of outcomes (Tuffin et al 2006, Quinton and Morris 2008).

Studies have highlighted the following as the effective elements of neighbourhood policing (Tuffin et al 2006, Connell et al 2008, Skogan and Steiner 2004):

- targeted foot patrol, community engagement and problem solving delivered in combination at a local level
- community and partner involvement in problem solving
- strong governance, accountability and support to maintain a focus on delivery and address known problems with implementation.

Guideline 1 – engaging communities

Evidence on effectiveness

- Overall, the police collaborating with the public for the purposes of problem solving can reduce perceived disorder as well as increase trust and perceived legitimacy in the police (Gill et al 2014). Community engagement may also have a positive impact on crime and perceptions of antisocial behaviour and disorder (Myhill 2012).

- Targeted foot patrol and community engagement when implemented with problem solving in UK ward-level pilots reduced criminal victimisation and disorder, improved feelings of safety, increased trust and improved public perceptions of policing over 12 months (Tuffin et al 2006). Most improvements were sustained over 24 months (Quinton and Morris 2008).

- Foot patrol – without community engagement, problem solving and perceived police fairness – is unlikely to lead to improvements in public trust in the police (Quinton and Morris 2008).

- Beat meetings can be used to identity local priorities for problem solving and form part of a successful neighbourhood policing strategy (Skogan and Steiner 2004, Tuffin et al 2006). While attendance at beat meetings might be highest where neighbourhood policing is most needed, some communities may be dramatically under-represented because of barriers to engagement (Skogan and Steiner 2004).
Beat meetings may also be, on their own, insufficient to effect change. Less traditional and more proactive methods of engagement that are designed to reach a broad cross section of the community (for example, planning events, open forums, door knocking) may be more effective than meetings at improving public perceptions (Tuffin et al 2006).

Newsletters about neighbourhood policing can have a significant positive impact on public confidence in the police and their perceptions of community engagement (Hohl et al 2010). Online information about crime and policing in the neighbourhood can also have a small positive impact on public perceptions of the police (Quinton 2011).

Evidence on key implementation issues

Use of tailored methods – A flexible approach to community engagement is required. The use of engagement methods needs to take account of the needs and preferences of different communities (Myhill 2012). Some groups identified by the police may not see themselves as ‘communities’ that can be mobilised for neighbourhood policing. Some groups may also be communities of interest rather than be connected by geography (Myhill 2012).

Creating sustainability – The effectiveness of community engagement may decline over time, highlighting the need to reinvigorate efforts when people start to become disengaged (Skogan and Steiner 2004, Higgins and Hales 2017, Diamond and Weiss 2009). Staff turnover can also be a challenge to maintaining long-term engagement (Singer 2004, Peaslee et al 2008, Wilson et al 2007a, Fielding 1995).

Barriers to engagement – Community engagement should be broadly representative and look to involve people from marginalised groups (Lister et al 2015). This may require identifying and taking steps to address the barriers that prevent some people from engaging with the police (for example, language, gender, concerns about immigration status, as well as historical mistrust of the police) (Skogan and Steiner 2004, Myhill 2012, Fielding 1995) and using informal methods of engagement (Hinds 2009, Murphy et al 2008). It is not always the case, however, that people from poorer and more diverse neighbourhoods that suffer from crime and disorder problems are less willing to participate (Skogan and Steiner 2004, Bullock and Sindall 2014).

Identifying problems and setting priorities – A structured process was used in a successful neighbourhood policing programme so that community engagement was focused and resulted in local problems being identified and priorities for action being set (Tuffin et al 2006). Stages of the process included:

- creating the conditions for engagement
- identifying community concerns through engagement
- defining the causes of these problems
- asking communities to choose their priorities.

Care may be required to ensure police actions are impartial and do not reflect biased or punitive community views (Mackenzie and Henry 2009).

Community ownership – Communities should feel they have some ownership of engagement processes, which may require them to be involved in their planning and development, feel empowered by the process and think that their values are respected (Myhill 2012). Engagement should also focus on developing a two-way dialogue – failure to do this may become a barrier to people engaging if it results in some people being less willing to help the police.
• **Existing networks and partnerships** – Community engagement may be made easier by drawing on existing networks of community groups (Bullock and Leeney 2013). Undertaking mapping exercises of the community can help police and stakeholders better understand their communities and the structures and groups already in place (Simmonds 2015) and ensure that any quality of life issues raised by the public are referred on (Skogan 2005).

• **Informing the public** – People who are well-informed about policing also tend to hold more positive opinions of the police (Bradford et al 2009). People are likely to be particularly interested in information about neighbourhood policing, police performance, and crime prevention advice (Quinton 2011). Specific neighbourhood policing information of interest includes:
  - team contact details
  - neighbourhood priorities
  - the actions taken by the police to deal with these issues
  - how the public could get involved.

Information should be clear and concise, locally relevant and easily identifiable as coming from the police (Wünsch and Hohl 2009, Hohl et al 2010, Quinton 2011).

**Guideline 2 – solving problems**

**Evidence on effectiveness**

• The police can reduce crime and disorder overall and in a variety of situations by using a structured problem-solving process (such as the SARA model) to understand and tackle the root causes of local problems (Weisburd et al 2010).

• Problem solving in hot spots has been shown to be more effective at reducing crime than increased police presence in hot spots (Braga et al 2012). While targeted police presence can reduce crime in the short term, problem solving can have a much larger impact in the longer term (Taylor et al 2010). Moreover, community problem solving has also been shown to be more effective than aggressive enforcement when policing disorder (Braga et al 2015).

• The public's involvement in identifying and defining the problems has been identified as a key element of successful neighbourhood policing programmes (Connell et al 2008, Tuffin et al 2006, Quinton and Morris 2008, Skogan and Steiner 2004, Mackenzie and Henry 2009) and initiatives that aim to deter high-risk offenders as a result of targeted enforcement, awareness raising and support (Braga et al 2008, Braga 2008, Papachristos et al 2007, Corsaro at al 2009).

**Evidence on key implementation issues**

• **Defining problems** – Effective problem solving requires a detailed problem specification based on multiple sources of information, so that the response can be tailored towards the causes of the problem (Read et al 2007, Buchner et al 2008, Tuffin et al 2006).

• **Assessing impact** – Problem solving has often suffered from limited assessment (Bullock and Tilley 2003a, Hassel and Lovell 2015, Brown et al 2007a). This can be a barrier to understanding the effectiveness of the actions taken to address the problem, which is important for informing future problem-solving activity and ensuring it is evidence-based (Brown et al 2007a, Lewis 2011). There is a need for regular monitoring and assessment, which does not have to be complicated or overly


- **Protecting time for problem solving** — Problem solving could have a greater chance of success if staff have realistic workloads, which may require officers to have protected time from response calls and supportive supervision (Weisburd et al 2010, Berry 2008, Skogan 1994, Brown et al 2007a, Crawford et al 2003). Officers and staff may become disengaged if they feel they have insufficient time and resources for problem solving and the process is seen as too bureaucratic and time consuming (Leigh et al 1998).

- **Officer and staff turnover** — There may be a need to address officer and staff turnover because it can take time and effort before problem solving takes hold (Cannings et al 2007, Berry 2007, Wilson et al 2007a). Even when activity is sustained, a focus on persistent, long-standing problems is required (Skogan and Steiner 2004, Cannings et al 2007).

- **Providing governance and accountability** — Problem solving, in particular, requires strong governance, accountability and incentives to encourage an organisation-wide commitment to the process (Bullock and Tilley 2003a, Read et al 2007, Criminal Justice Commission 1998, Peaslee et al 2008). Accountability mechanisms can help all parts of the wider police organisation support and carry out activities that tackle locally identified priorities (Skogan and Steiner 2004). There is also a need to address any tensions that exist between force priorities and problem solving (Skogan and Mastrofski 2006, Van Staden et al 2011, Hughes and Rowe 2007, Read et al 2007). Use of formal award schemes, like the Tilley awards, can help recognise the commitment and good work of officers and staff (Berry 2008, Leigh et al 1998). Support from supervisors and senior leaders is also needed (Simmonds 2015) but their support for implementation may require them to develop a better understanding of the approach (for example, by mentoring from analysts) (Lewis and Coulson 2010).

**Guideline 3 – targeting activity**

**Evidence on effectiveness**

- Overall, the police targeting of crime hot spots can reduce crime and has tended to result in crime reduction benefits in neighbouring areas rather than crime displacement (Braga et al 2012). Problem solving has been shown to be more effective when focused on particular crime types rather than total crime (Weisburd et al 2010).

- Multi-faceted police-led programmes focused on deterring high-risk offenders through targeted enforcement, awareness raising and providing alternative pathways, can be effective at reducing serious crime (Braga et al 2012).

- Neighbourhood policing may have had a large, positive impact on public trust in the
police in UK ward-level pilots, in part, because community involvement in problem solving meant the police were able to target the problems that mattered the most to the public (Tuffin et al 2006).

Evidence on key implementation issues

- **Analysis for targeting** – Police-led programmes to deter high-risk offenders have used analysis effectively to identify the highest-risk neighbourhoods and offenders to target and tailor strategies towards their specific needs (Papachristos et al 2007, Corsaro 2009).

- **Neighbourhood size** – If neighbourhoods are too large, it can be difficult for officers and staff to develop a good working knowledge of the area, engage with communities and set neighbourhood priorities (Chappell 2009).

- **‘Mission creep’** – There is a need to maintain a focus on delivery in the longer term, as targeted interventions often suffer from ‘mission creep’ (Bullock and Tilley 2003b) and particularly as there may also be a relationship between the intensity of programme implementation and an improvement in outcomes (Papachristos et al 2007, Quinton and Morris 2008).

- **Importance of resourcing** – Forces need to consider how they resource community engagement and problem solving (Turley et al 2012, Beck et al 2006). Previously, officers and staff have been given dedicated, permanent neighbourhood assignments to build relations and solve problems over time (Lewis 2011, Berry 2008, Bullock and Tilley 2003a, Chappell 2009, Fielding 1995).

Guideline 4 – promoting the right culture

Evidence on effectiveness

- Overall, police interventions that adopt elements of procedural justice can improve public trust in the police and increase people’s willingness to participate in policing (Mazerolle et al 2013).

- People who perceive the police to be fair are more likely to see the police as legitimate and, in turn, report crime and suspicious activity, provide information and not break the law (Jackson et al 2013, Mazerolle et al 2013).

- This relationship has been shown to extend to increased support for counter terrorism policing (Tyler et al 2010) and reduced support for using violence to solve personal goals (Bradford 2015).

- Informal public-initiated contact with the police can have a small, positive effect on trust if the experience is good. Bad experiences – regardless of whether contact is initiated by the police or the public – tend to have a large, negative effect on trust. This negative effect is likely to be exacerbated with experience of multiple police-initiated encounters (Jackson et al 2013).

- Police efforts to increase informal contact with young people have a positive impact on their willingness to help the police (Hinds 2009, Murphy et al 2008).

- Officers and staff are more likely to value the public and support procedural justice policing if they feel that their supervisors and senior leaders make fair decisions and treat them with respect and dignity (Bradford et al 2013). Experiences of injustice
may also encourage a cynical police subculture.

**Evidence on key implementation issues**

- **Risks of not sustaining implementation** – There is a need to maintain a focus on implementation because public confidence in the police is likely to decline if people think that police fairness, foot patrol, community engagement and/or problem solving is getting worse (Quinton and Morris 2008).

- **Addressing public mistrust** – More time and energy may have to be invested with vulnerable people or people who lack trust in the police to improve their perceptions (Cosgrove and Ramshaw 2015, Skogan and Steiner 2004, Skogan 2009). Historical mistrust can prevent some groups from wanting to engage with the police (Myhill 2012), but officers and staff may be able to break down barriers by demonstrating procedural justice and/or better understanding different social groups (Bullock and Johnson 2017, Renauer 2007). There is a risk, however, that people who already think the police are fair will respond better to police efforts than those who think the police are unfair (Murphy et al 2008).

- **Targeting responses** – Care is required when implementing highly targeted forms of policing to ensure they do not have a negative effect on the public’s perceptions of police fairness (Kochel and Weisburd 2017). Effort may also be required to resolve tensions between enforcement and building positive relations with some groups (Moore 2008, Liberman 2009, Lister et al 2015).

- **Implementing procedural justice** – Training in communication skills and the principles of procedural justice can have a positive impact on officer attitudes (Skogan 2015, Schaefer and Hughes 2015, Rosenbaum and Lawrence 2017) and can also change officer behaviour and improve public perceptions of procedural justice (Wheller et al 2013). The use of scripts during traffic encounters may also improve public perceptions (Sahin et al 2017) and encourage greater willingness of the public to comply with the law (Mazerolle et al 2012), though there is a risk that, in some contexts, scripts can cause harm (MacQueen and Bradford 2015).

- **Officer resistance** – There is a need to address the perception that some officers and staff think that neighbourhood policing is ‘soft’ and not ‘real policing’ (O’Neill and McCarthy 2014, Bull 2015, Dagg 2010), whereas it actually involves challenging work with communities, targeted enforcement and difficult decisions which can reduce demand (O’Neill and McCarthy 2014). Implementing changes around procedural justice require careful handling because officers and staff may feel patronised by being told how to interact with the public if they feel they have been treated unfairly by supervisors and senior leaders (MacQueen and Bradford 2017).

**Guideline 5 – building analytical capability**

**Evidence on effectiveness**

- The quality of problem solving in neighbourhood policing has been related to improved outcomes (Gill et al 2014, Tiffin et al 2006, Quinton and Morris 2008).

- Problem solving was a key feature of the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy and requirements for its successful implementation included strong analytical commitment and organisation-wide commitment (Skogan and Steiner 2004).

- ‘Shallow’ problem solving that lacks the systematic application of the SARA model
and wider organisational change may explain why, overall, neighbourhood policing has not been found to reduce crime across a range of contexts (Gill et al 2014).

- The evaluation of the National Reassurance Policing Programme showed that pilot sites were more effective when the response to problems was tailored as a result of a very detailed problem definition, based on multiple sources of information, including from communities (Tuffin et al 2006).

**Evidence on key implementation issues**

- **Importance of analytical capability**– A lack of dedicated analytical support and a shortage of skilled analysts have been identified as major barriers to problem solving (John and Maguire 2003, Bullock and Tilley 2009, Skogan and Steiner 2004, Chappell 2007, Lewis 2011). Problem-solving is more likely to be implemented successfully when officers and staff have access to analysts and analytical tools that help them gather data, carry out and understand the results of analysis and plan action to address problems (Santos 2013, Santos and Taylor 2014, Lewis 2011, Lowe and Innes 2012). It is also important with problem solving to monitor and assess the response to problems and share knowledge to support ongoing revisions to strategies (McGarrell 2010, Staniforth 2014).

- **Demand reduction** – Looking at patterns and trends in data can help officers and staff uncover and address long-term or repeat problems that generate demand, rather than continue to respond to one-off incidents and events (Willis 2011, Santos and Taylor 2014, Connell et al 2008, Braga and Schnell 2013). Such analysis should draw on multiple sources of information, including from partners, to develop a rounded view of the problem (Read et al 2007, Blaustein 2016, Leigh et al 1998).

- **Understanding partners** – There may be a need to develop the understanding of partner organisations around data sharing, for example, by clarifying their roles and responsibilities (Raine and Dunstan 2007, Van Staden et al 2011). Establishing information sharing agreements to share data with partners is also likely to be important, particularly in respect of people who are at risk or vulnerable (Turley et al 2012, Deukmedjian and Lint 2007).

**Guideline 6 – developing officers, staff and volunteers**

**Evidence on effectiveness**

- Training can have a positive impact on knowledge, attitude and behaviour. Training integrated into routine practice is likely to have more of an impact than traditional classroom training on behaviour (Wheller and Morris 2010).

**Evidence on key implementation issues**

- **Selection and supervision**– Neighbourhood policing has shown to be effective when officers and staff were selected because of their desire to be part of the programme (Bullock and Tilley 2003a). Officer and staff support for neighbourhood policing can, nevertheless, be encouraged by empowering them to make decisions, involving them in decision-making processes and providing supervision and feedback (Peaslee et al 2008).

- **Formal training** – There is a need to ensure that new and existing officers and staff receive training in community engagement and problem solving in order for neighbourhood policing to be effective (Bullock and Tilley 2003a, McGarrell 2010b,
Buchner et al 2008, Berry 2008, Criminal Justice Commission 1998, Berry 2005a, Longstaff et al 2015). Refresher training may need to be provided to ensure skill levels are maintained (Bullock and Johnson 2017, Skogan and Steiner 2004, Pekgozlu 2008). Training in communication skills (for example, chairing meetings and negotiating) may also help officers and staff engage with different community groups (Skogan 2009, James 2015, Chappell 2007). Involving partners in training delivery can introduce officers and staff to new ideas and ways of working and may help develop relationships (Peaslee et al 2008, Fontaine and Markman 2010).

- **Informal learning** – In addition to formal learning, it is important for officers and staff to develop their own knowledge of their local area in order to successfully implement neighbourhood policing (Peaslee et al 2008, Williams et al 2016, Lister et al 2015, Chappell 2007, Hope 1994, Connell et al 2008, Loveday and Smith 2015).

- **Recognition and reward** – Providing professional recognition for training can help to strengthen officer and staff commitment to neighbourhood policing (Berry 2008, Pekgozlu 2008, Trotman and Thomas 2016). Training can also be reinforced by supervisors and should be reflected in assessment and promotion processes (Pekgozlu 2008).
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Appendix. Review strategies

Online databases

Title and abstract searches of the ProQuest, EBSCO, Web of Science and Emerald Insight databases were carried out for both REAs. Where it was not possible to search title and abstract simultaneously, the abstract was searched.

REA1 search terms:

- **Tier 1 – policing**
  Police OR Policing OR Law enforcement

- **Tier 2 – neighbourhood policing**
  Visib* OR “Neighbourhood policing” OR “Neighbourhood police” OR “Neighbourhood officer” OR “Community policing” OR “Community police” OR “Community officer” OR “Beat policing” OR “Beat officer” “Community orient* policing” OR “Reassurance policing” OR “Community support officer” OR PCSO OR “Problem orient* policing” OR “Problem orient* partnership” OR POP OR “Foot patrol” OR “Community engagement” OR “Public engagement” OR “Citizen engagement” OR “Community consultation” OR “Public consultation” OR “Citizen consultation” OR “Community participation” OR “Public participation” OR “Citizen participation” OR “Community involvement” OR “Public involvement” OR “Citizen involvement” OR “Police and communities together” OR “Problem solving” OR SARA OR Co-produc* OR “Community safety partner*” OR Crime and disorder reduction partner*

- **Tier 3 – methods**
  Systematic review OR meta-analysis OR REA OR Rapid evidence assessment OR RER OR rapid evidence review OR Systematic map OR synthesis OR systematic search

REA2 search terms:

- **Tier 1 – policing**
  Police OR Policing OR Law enforcement

- **Tier 2 – neighbourhood policing**
  Visib* OR “Neighbourhood policing” OR “Neighbourhood police” OR “Neighbourhood officer” OR “Community policing” OR “Community police” OR “Community officer” OR “Beat policing” OR “Beat officer” “Community orient* policing” OR “Reassurance policing” OR “Community support officer” OR PCSO OR “Problem orient* policing” OR “Problem orient* partnership” OR POP OR “Foot patrol” OR “Community engagement” OR “Public engagement” OR “Citizen engagement” OR “Community consultation” OR “Public consultation” OR “Citizen consultation” OR “Community participation” OR “Public participation” OR “Citizen participation” OR “Community involvement” OR “Public involvement” OR “Citizen involvement” OR “Police and communities together” OR “Problem solving” OR SARA OR Co-produc* OR “Community safety partner*” OR Crime and disorder reduction partner*

- **Tier 3 – implementation**
  Usage OR delivery OR Implement* OR Enabler* OR Barrier* OR Facilitator* OR Succe* OR Fail* OR Block* OR Pilot* OR Roll* OR Embed* OR Mechanism* OR obstacle*

- **Tier 4 – methods**
  Evaluat* OR interview* OR perce* OR focus group* OR assess* OR attitude* OR
view* OR RCT OR Trial* OR Experiment* OR Ethnograph* OR Observation* OR Survey*

National Police Library catalogue

A keyword search was carried out using following terms:

- Visib* OR Neighbourhood policing OR Community policing OR Beat policing
- Community orient* policing OR Reassurance policing OR Problem orient* policing OR Foot patrol OR engagement OR consultation OR Problem solving OR partnership

Global Policing Database

An abstract search was carried out using following terms:

- Visib* OR Neighbourhood policing OR Community policing OR Beat policing
- Community orient* policing OR Reassurance policing OR Problem orient* policing OR Foot patrol OR engagement OR consultation OR Problem solving OR partnership

Website searches

The following websites were searched using key terms or hand-searching publication pages:

- Campbell Collaboration: https://campbellcollaboration.org/
- Center for Problem-Oriented Policing (US): http://www.popcenter.org/
- College of Policing (UK): http://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Pages/default.aspx
- Police Executive Research Forum (US): http://www.policeforum.org/
- The Police Foundation (UK): http://www.police-foundation.org.uk/

Where possible, a keyword search was conducted (using the terms ‘neighbourhood policing’ and ‘community policing’ as a minimum).

Expert recommendations

The following academic experts were contacted with a view to them recommending seminal studies that helped answer the review questions:

- Andrew Millie
- Andy Higgins (Guideline Committee member)
- David Weisburd
- Dennis Rosenbaum
- Jack Greene
- Karen Bullock (Guideline Committee member)
- Martin Innes (Guideline Committee member)
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- Megan O'Neill
- Nick Tilley
- Nigel Fielding
- Stephen Mastrofski
- Stuart Lister (Guideline Committee member)
- Wes Skogan.

The principal investigator (Paul Quinton) also suggested studies for inclusion, taking into account the interests of the Guideline Committee and the issues likely to be covered in the guidelines and the information to support their implementation. No restrictions were placed on the studies they could recommend (for example, in terms of publication date, location or study type). All recommended studies were sifted and included in the total studies count. Further studies were also added following academic peer review.

**Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

The criteria in table A1 were applied to the identified studies at the sifting and reviewing stages of the process. At the sifting stage, some studies were transferred between REA1 and REA2 according to their relevance and research method.

Table A1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REA1 only</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Systematic reviews, rapid evidence assessments or reviews, systematic maps, systematic searches</td>
<td>Single case studies, non-systematic literature reviews, methodological papers, opinion papers, theoretical papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REA2 only</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Qualitative studies, quantitative studies, mixed method studies</td>
<td>Outcome-only papers, methodological papers, opinion or theory papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Discussion of implementation issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome-only focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both REAs</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Any intervention focused on introducing, developing and/or maintaining neighbourhood policing</td>
<td>Non-neighbourhood policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Published journals, dissertations, theses, government reports, books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>North America, Europe, Australia and New Zealand</td>
<td>All other locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>