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Abstract

This thesis conducts a preliminary investigation into ASB cultural knowledge strength of a police force and a local authority within the same jurisdiction. ASB cultural knowledge strength is explored through ASB interpretation, themes and experiences of frontline officers and officers sitting at strategic layers within each organisation. With Police forces and Local Authorities receiving high profile criticism of ASB performance, organisational research suggests that a strong culture aligned to organisational mission and values fosters organisational effectiveness and superior operational performance. The universality of ASB culture and knowledge is examined in order to gain understanding of police and local authority organisational ASB effectiveness.

Using the newly developed reversed SACKDEN cultural knowledge framework, 15 semi structured interviews involving police and council officers at four equivalent strategic layers and 72 questionnaires across relevant frontline police and council officers were completed. The focus was to examine ASB cultural knowledge strength at four different organisational levels and across frontline officers. Through thematic analysis, strength was assessed by universality of response and density of effectiveness identifiers across questions designed around four cultural knowledge sets.

The study identified that despite a high degree of universality in organisational and personal value placed on ASB, there was a high degree of uniqueness overall in responses through strategic layers and across frontline officers of both police and local authority. This uniqueness in response to cultural knowledge questions indicates weak ASB cultural knowledge strength within the police and local authority examined in the study. The effect of low ASB symbolic referencing is seen through differences between both organisations, across strategic layers and the frontline, contributing to ASB cultural knowledge weakness. Low ASB symbolic referencing creates conditions for ASB polarisation theory. This study has further research implications regarding the importance of high ASB symbolic referencing and its effect on ASB operational performance.
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Introduction

The aim of this research is to offer new insight through preliminary investigation into the reasons why police and local authority may receive criticism relating to operational failings around anti-social behaviour (ASB). Through the use of organisational fundamentals, a police force and local authority from the same jurisdiction are assessed to explore the strength of ASB cultural knowledge and possible effects on organisational ASB performance. The aim of the research is to be explained through the following objectives.

- Review of literature to summarise and contextualise environmental and organisational conditions that crime and safety organisations operate within and the effects of these conditions on such organisations.

- Investigation and analysis of police and local authority strategic operational layers in Cornwall only in order to assess strength of ASB cultural knowledge sets.

- Assessment of the effectiveness of police and local authority strategic layer ASB cultural knowledge sets and level of ASB symbolic referencing in Cornwall only.

- Analysis and assessment of ASB cultural knowledge strength across police and local authority frontline officers in Cornwall only, with primary responsibility for dealing with ASB.

In order to account for these objectives then the following chapters have been constructed based on the overall research aims and objectives.

- Chapter 1 provides the backdrop in which to take account of researcher position within each organisation through reflexive practice and organisational position.

- Chapter 2 begins with a primarily a review of literature that looks at key environmental and organisational elements that have shaped and
developed the crime prevention and control landscape and ASB operational criticism.

- Chapter 3 moves onto the partnership requirements of organisations in addressing crime, ASB and community safety issues, with focus on organisational tensions and how they have developed amongst crime and disorder partnership organisations. This is then reduced down to examine the two most prevalent community safety partnership organisations (police and local authority) and identify the critical role of a strong organisational cultural knowledge in superior operational performance and alignment with the organisational mission and goals. This leads to the question of what is the cultural knowledge strength of police and local authority relating to ASB and its relationship with ASB performance.

- Chapter 4 looks to establish the core organisational information of Devon and Cornwall Police, Cornwall Council and ultimately the Safer Cornwall Partnership in relation to performance and delivery structures. This establishes current organisational and partnership positions relating to aims, values and mission which should be aligned with the cultural knowledge of each organisation.

- Chapter 5 accounts for the methodological approach and design of qualitative semi-structured interviews amongst strategic layers of Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council. This was to qualitatively assess cultural knowledge strength and effectiveness of strategic layers. A quantitative survey of frontline officers in Cornwall dealing with ASB was used to assess cultural knowledge strength. These data collection tools are framed within a reversed SACKDEN cultural knowledge framework which forms the basis for methodological design and analysis of ASB cultural knowledge strength and effectiveness.

- The research findings and results are accounted for in Chapter 6. These are structured in results of ASB cultural knowledge thematic analysis of organisational strategic layers, ASB cultural knowledge question set results of frontline officers and ASB cultural knowledge set effectiveness of both
organisations and also as collective ‘partner’ organisations. Results are also displayed in relation to the assessment of symbolic referencing through ‘I think/I know’ and refer back discourse analysis.

- Chapter 7 provides a combined discussion of ASB cultural knowledge set results. This informs conclusions drawn in relation to the strength of each organisation ASB cultural knowledge sets. Chapter 8 then draws conclusion about the strength of each organisations ASB cultural knowledge sets as well as offering new theory into the effects of ASB cultural knowledge / low symbolic referencing and ASB operational performance. This is then collectively finalised in an overall conclusion in relation to ASB cultural knowledge strength of Devon and Cornwall Police (Cornwall only) and Cornwall Council with suggested further research opportunities.

Chapter 1 - What route to take? Programming the reflexive sat nav

Before embarking on the research road ahead it was important to stop and consider my position as a researcher within the organisations that are the research sites of interest. Through clarification of my position within the organisations, motivation for undertaking this research subject and reflection on ontological and epistemological considerations all inform the starting point and premise of the research. As a researcher the interest in the research question to be examined is not born out of random interest or a lucky dip into a pre-generated research topic bag. This preliminary study has been developed through a specialist interest in ASB practice. It is unlikely that someone with little or no vested interest would have developed the research question or be interested in the research area.

The area of ASB is more than an area of interest as it also provides my professional practice and income. Having spent a decade as an ASB practitioner within community safety, the role has also required close working with police over a number of years. Being a member of police staff also provides restricted privileges reserved normally for police officers. Being an ASB practitioner there are also certain frustrations around the way ASB practice is adopted, especially around organisational approach, knowledge and attitude.
This leads the discussion onto the issue of bias. As a researcher and ASB practitioner experiencing an ASB problem, this has fuelled frustration giving rise to feelings likened to the labours of Sisyphus (Daly, 2009, p.133). Acknowledgement is given to the issue of adopting researcher knows best stance, which could derail any research approach. From the outset, construction and analysis of research methodology is taken with high regard to empathic neutrality (Patton, 2002, p.53). The nature of the research design is to be influenced as far as possible by the research question in the overall methodological approach.

**A foot in three camps**

Traditionally researchers are keen to classify themselves as an insider or outsider researcher to account for differing power relationships in the research setting they occupy (Pillow, 2003, p.184). Researchers also need to form relationships with research participants. Finding similarities and commonality with participants is influenced by the insider/outsider position of the researcher (Humphrey, 2007, p.18). There is a somewhat different position from the traditional insider or outsider classification that is applicable to my own research position.

In relation to my employment I am employed by Cornwall Fire and Rescue Service (who are part of Cornwall Council). However I work within Devon and Cornwall police as well and although not my employer I have status and organisational access that most employees of Devon and Cornwall Police have. So in relation to this it could be said that I would be using insider status to gain access to information from both organisations irrespective if they are my direct employer.

From a whole organisation perspective, being employed by Cornwall Fire and Rescue (who are part of Cornwall Council) could be seen to afford insider status in relation to Cornwall Council and outsider status in relation to Devon and Cornwall Police (as I am not employed by them). As a researcher the traditional insider/outsider status is difficult to fully subscribe to. In this particular instance there are unique dimensions that my research position has. This in turn causes different thinking on the research position occupied within the two organisations.
Firstly in my own organisation, Cornwall Council, one (myself) out of a total workforce of 13,060 permanently employed people is a local and national ASB expert. This also means being part of a small (30 people) community safety team located in Fire and Rescue. The assumption could be made that my research position would be an insider researcher based on being directly employed by Cornwall Council. However looking at the SCP, there are members who sit outside of community safety / Fire and Rescue service directorate (in which I am known). These members are still part of Cornwall Council but will not know me fully or my area of work. So whilst the logic leap would classify me as an insider researcher in a Cornwall Council sense, the further participants in Cornwall Council sit away from my team and directorate then it is probable that they would view me more as an unknown quantity, even if they have some awareness of my work.

There are similarities to the above in respects of my research position within Devon and Cornwall Police. Over the past ten years my role has required the forging of close working links with the police and I have a place on the highest level police tasking group in Cornwall. This has enabled me to developed strong strategic and operational links with police officers at various ranks over many years.

On initial viewing it would seem that my position is one of outsider within Devon and Cornwall Police. In a research sense that has some truth, but also there is insider status due to the close working links. This has led to myself being well known at many levels, but this does not apply to all officers. Officers who know me well may see me as a known outsider. Officers who are aware of me but have not worked with me may be slightly more cautious and see me as an aware outsider. Officers who have had no dealings with me are more than likely to class me as an unknown outsider.

What I am looking to demonstrate here is not only the research position occupied (a foot in three camps), but also the different levels of familiarity which can be seen as different levels of trust. This can then be interpreted as either known, aware or unknown insider or outsider.
What the above depicts is the different layers attributed to my position within each organisation and how the researcher/participant relationship is perceived. This is based on the participant perception of my position to them within their organisational setting and how much trust they then afford me as a researcher. This may have some bearing on the level and depth of data given based on how the participant wishes to view me as a researcher. The closer the participant sees me as a researcher to the trust centre then I believe the more in-depth their answers will be.

**Continuing the reflexive journey**

The reflexive journey is very much about looking at the windscreen, rather than through it, at the research road ahead (May & Perry, 2011, p.83). Researchers treat
reflexivity in differing ways, from an unavoidable topic (Lynch, 2000, p.26) to offering little except naval gazing and self-indulgence (Sultana, 2007, p.376). Reflexivity is more than awareness of position as a researcher within an organisation, there is a need for awareness of epistemological, theoretical and ontological stance of a researcher and effect on interpretation of a research situation. The ontological and epistemological position of a researcher and their view of human nature have influence on the choice of research methodology (Holden & Lynch, 2004, p.399).

In order to conduct preliminary analysis of cultural knowledge strength it is unsurprising to note knowledge and cultural strength are invisible. However the construction and sense of social realities needs to be understood. Discourse, conversation, writing, reading and symbols can be used to do this, enabling a critical stance applied to the social world. The social world to me is shaped through a windscreen made out of social constructionism (Cunliff, 2003, p.988) which has influenced my previous research approaches when investigating social truth.

Many a word count has been emblazoned with researcher’s planting their ontological flags in research methodology. Distinctions are unavoidable when debating philosophical perspectives concerning the nature of society and natural science (David & Sutton, 2004, p.35). Holden & Lynch (2004, p.398) see research requiring something deeper than practicalities. Positivism and empiralisim rely on the assumption that the social world can be observed through separation of researcher and social situation. There is growing criticism of objectivism and its ability to account for the complex nature of social construct and the meanings attached to such constructs (Holden & Lynch, 2004, p.407).

Making assumptions about the social world requires a cautious approach. From a subjectivist point of view researchers are unable to distance themselves from what is being observed. Also assumptions are made about the positivistic social world, where things are prescribed pre-assigned categories. Burr (2003, p.3) examples this through some music being classical and some seen as pop and that it should not be assumed there is anything in the nature of the music itself meaning it has to be classified that way. Following this how can such things as culture and knowledge be an observable or measurable act? How would you know the
influence of cultural strength on how a research subject behaves without instruction?

Individuals and groups create social phenomena through people acting on their interpretation of knowledge, with culture becoming part of each person’s nature (Vygotsky, 1978, p.6). This makes social interactions of particular interest to social constructionists with language, and its use, being a prime exponent. With social interaction taking many forms, each of these forms brings with it action. An alcoholic for example who is not entirely responsible for their behaviour by virtue of an addiction would see the appropriate social action to understand drunkenness by offering treatment, not imprisonment (Burr, 2003, p.5). This leads to construction of the world bound up less with power relations, as they have implications for what is permissible for different people to do and how they treat others.

A social constructionism view of the social world is made up of human interaction. This interaction is in a state of constant revision with social constructionism reliant on the use of micro and macro linguistic structures that form social life (Burr, 2003, p.21). Such focus gives the ability to analyse non observable phenomena through the use of discourse to assess how individuals construct their social world.

Clarification of a researcher position within the organisations, which is the subject of the research, has been discussed as has ontological and epistemological considerations that shape the research approach. The next chapter looks to account for what environmental factors shape the external operating environments of crime and safety organisations.

Chapter 2 – The shaping of the crime prevention and control landscape

ASB is not just a widely debated topic in literature, but has been shaped and crafted by a number of environmental and organisational forces that effect the crime prevention and control landscape. This chapter looks to identify some of the key influencing factors that have shaped the shift in organisational demands and how criticism around ASB operations manifests amongst organisations tasked with community safety responsibilities.
All organisations, no matter what their purpose or aims, have to exist within an external operating environment. This environment is formed and reformed by factors which are made up of political, economic, social, technological, legal and environmental elements (PESTLE) (Cheverton, 2004, p.72). With organisations needing to adapt to shifts in their external operating environments, this is no less relevant to organisations within the area of crime prevention and control. The question is what PESTLE factors have influenced the shaping and re-shaping of the crime prevention and control landscape?

In 1979 key political influences can be found through a positivistic thinking, post second-world war Conservative government, who firmly blamed Labour for 15 years of rising crime (McLaughlin, Muncie, & Hughes, 2001, p.302). Through the assumption that the public wanted more police powers and tougher sentences, the Conservatives only managed to return rising crime rates and a strained criminal justice system (Hough & Mayhew, 1985, p.51). This demonstrated how limited the effect of the criminal justice system alone had on crime (Hughes & Edwards, 2005, p.17). This acted as a trigger for Tony Blair in the early 1990’s with his tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime speeches. This afforded opportunity to introduce a balanced approach to the criminal justice system (Coates & Lawler, 2000, p.207).

Labour, through Tony Blair, looked to capitalise on the consensus that the regulation of crime needed to be redefined (McLaughlin, Muncie, & Hughes, 2001, p.302). The catalyst employed to promote this new thinking was the Morgan committee. This was assembled due to co-ordination of police and local partnerships and their failure to produce results (Gilling, 1997, p.98).

**The Morgan Influence**

In 1991 the Morgan Report (Home Office, 1991) was published with many recommendations. One of the most notable was the responsibility for crime prevention not solely resting with the police but a shared statutory responsibility with the local authority. Other than being used by the Conservatives as a smokescreen to disguise law and order problems (Hughes, 2002, p.11), the Morgan report recommended local approaches to crime control. These approaches
were underpinned by shared statutory police and local authority responsibility in the delivery of crime prevention through the concept of community safety.

The Morgan report and the concept of community safety produced little reaction at the time and became one of the best kept secret of the John Major Conservative era. By not having local authorities leading crime reduction partnerships meant the continuation of high - low policing (Brodeur, 2010, p.223). It was not until 1997 that the value of the Morgan report, and the community safety concept, was recognised with Tony Blair using it as a key building block on which to mount his election campaign.

Against a backdrop of fragmenting and subsequent joining up of traditional public services (Rounthwaite, 1994, p.51), Labour cited crime reduction and community safety as key elements of their criminal justice strategy (McLaughlin, Muncie, & Hughes, 2001, p.311). This signalled a change from the narrowness of the crime reduction concern towards more quality of life issues afforded by the community safety approach (Hughes, 2007, p.45).

**Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships**

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 placed statutory responsibility on the police and local authority to work together on crime and disorder issues, divorcing the unstructured (and somewhat acrimonious) partnership approach seen in the 1980’s and 1990’s (Skinns, 2005, p.156). A blueprint was drawn up for joint structured leadership in the reduction and prevention of crime through Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP’s), which co-opted key partners to sit around the CDRP table. What this did not avoid was the viewpoint that the majority of the 397 CDRPs across England were managed (and somewhat dominated) by police and local authority (Hughes & Rowe, 2007, p.325). This viewpoint was held even though local authorities in particular had little expertise or knowledge in partnership arrangements (Loveday, 2006, p.3).

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 underwent several amendments through the Police Reform Act, 2002 and Anti-Social Behaviour Act, 2003 in response to shifts
in the crime prevention and control landscape. The shift amongst CDRP organisations was subject to changes of a less positive kind.

Equality in power relations coupled with a shared ideology and mission are essential elements in partnership working (Gilling, 2005, p.739). However it was becoming evident that power inequalities and ideological drift were manifesting amongst CDRP partners. With most partnerships alluding to dominance of traditional policing concerns, reluctance started to emanate from organisations that saw crime reduction as being far removed from their core business (Maguire, Morgan, & Reiner, 2007, p.896). CDRP success was reliant on the police adoption of the problem solving approach, with the requirement for early intervention and acting as advocates for communities and their concerns (Goldstein, 1990, p.47). However concerns remained over a two tier system of policing, with local authorities left to deal with low level crime and disorder whilst the police dealt with real crime. This had shades of a return to high – low policing (Brodeur, 2010, p.223) through high – low CDRP partners.

With social crime prevention seen as being more effective than the traditional reactive approach to crime (Hughes & Edwards, 2005, p.18), the current coalition government is still trying to work out how to decentralise accountability through the introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC’s) (Local Government Association, 2010, p.2). From a partnership perspective this is seen as another backward step that only fragments partnerships and police accountability which should be absorbed back into local authority structures (Local Government Association, 2010, p.4) rather than being in the hands of one individual. Despite these rumblings of discord within the CDRP world, multi-agency partnerships continue to be associated with crime prevention and reduction (Liddle & Gelsthorpe, 1994, p.3). This association is no less prevalent within the field of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB).

**The ASB elephant in the room**

With the Crime and Disorder act 1998 came the formalisation of the ASB concept, along with an enthusiastic Labour government determined to demonstrate visible responses to the ASB problem. Operational concepts (neighbourhood policing) and
targets (single police confidence target) were the start of changes made to
demonstrate a more visible response to ASB. Despite this, attention was still being
deflected to the consistent message that crime was falling (Jansson, 2007, p.8). This left the ASB elephant in the room being ignored until its official recognition as being a significant problem by Her Majesties Inspectorate of Constabularies (HMIC) in 2010 (HMIC, 2010).

Whilst attempts failed to quantify the scale of the ASB problem (Prior, 2009, p.20), CDRPs continued to use the consistent fall in crime to justify their success, even though this was a contested position (Committee of Public Accounts, 2005, p.5). Attempting to deflect attention away from the ASB problem by promoting success in crime reduction, it is interesting to note that the British Crime Survey shows crime down 50% since 1995 (Home Office, 2010, p.2). With significant investment in policing, what this has achieved is questionable as confidence was falling in the police (Mirrlees-Black, 2001, p.2). It could be said that the ASB problem, not the crime problem, was eroding public confidence, with very visible ASB failings of the police and local authority being publically aired.

High profile ASB case failures like Fiona Pilkington (Walker & Jones, 2009) have raised questions of CSP’s. ASB diary books for the Pilkington family were not checked (bureaucratic local authority and ‘paper supervision’) and calls to the police being treated as isolated incidents (at the time of this case the Chief Constable for the area was also the ACPO lead on neighbourhood policing). This was further compounded by headlines stating the police had lost control of the streets (Edwards, 2010) and that councils were not doing enough to tackle ASB (Dickie, 2012).

Such ASB failing triggered official reports (HMIC, 2010) with the notion that ASB did not have the same status as crime (Travis, 2009b). Even the masters were turning on their dogs so to speak with both Alan Johnson and Teresa May finding it easier to publically criticise the police in particular, rather than promoting the joint working of the police and local authority that should have already been in place under the Morgan report. With reports showing the sights and sounds of neighbourhoods having a profound effect on people’s attitudes and mental
wellbeing (Daily Mail, 2014), police were seen to have the wrong mind set to deal with ASB (Travis, 2009a).

With victims seen to be ignored and communities left to fester (Roberts, 2010) the criticism from past and present home secretaries was pointed. However the dog was still able to bite the critical master’s hand as police performance is used by the public to evaluate government and legal institutions (Tyler, 2001, p.233). This suggests that police failures were also a sign of government failure.

Having seen the changing demands of the community safety environment and partnerships tasked to tackle such demands, operational criticism dogs the primary responsible organisations. Police and Local authority have been roundly criticised about ASB operational performance. However whilst many changes and challenges have been discussed in an operational or environmental context, the next chapter looks to explore how environmental shifts are manifesting within an organisational and partnership context.

Chapter 3 - Semi visible tensions of crime and disorder organisations

When looking at the effect that shifts in demands has on organisations it would be wrong to assume that there is a seamless shift in embracing new ways of working or encompassing new targets based on customer demand. This is no less relevant where organisations come together to address what is seen as a common issue. This chapter moves on from identification of factors contributing to changes in operational demand in a crime reduction partnership context. It looks to identify what issues are present in relation to the organisational ‘coming together’ of mainly police and local authority in a crime reduction partnership context and how tensions have developed through competing external demands and traditional functions of crime and disorder organisations.

ASB criticism levelled at police and local authorities is superficial in its nature. What is meant by this is the criticism is aimed at observable tools, roles and processes of ASB operations. Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (tools), Neighbourhood Policing (roles) and government white papers (processes) are all examples of visible ASB operations that attract critical attention due to their observable nature. These overt
operational aspects of any organisation have been represented in various forms across literature as the observable tip of the organisational iceberg (Simpson & Cacioppe, 2001, p.398; Neus & Scherf, 2005, p.218; Azim, 2008, p.245).

**Figure 3.0 A composite illustration of the organisational iceberg**

What the diagram depicts is that organisations have visible operational elements ‘above the waterline’ like processes, tools and roles. These are the aspects of police and local authority ASB failings that have attracted the attention of academics and official reports alike. It can almost be liken to a processional route that has been taken, with analytical focus on visible aspects of ASB like definition (Millie, Jacobson, McDonald, & Hough, 2005, p.1) and aesthetic influences (Millie, 2008, p.384). This has culminated in a superficial, skyward looking approach in examining the ASB problem. The pre-occupation on visible operational aspects of ASB has kept eyes looking upwards as it is easier to criticise and quantify what can be seen. However there are elements of organisations that cannot be easily quantified. Within the larger part of the organisational iceberg, known as the invisible organisation, is the unseen element of an organisation.

It has been established that the visible ASB operational elements of the police and local authority have been a focus of criticism. Within a CDRP context the core elements of shared ideologies and equal power relations are also less evident. Eyes have been focused on the visible elements of ASB operational performance issues like ideologies and power relations. These elements are not physically
visible and more difficult to quantify. What the organisational iceberg depicts it that the invisible elements of an organisation support the visible operations. With attention focussed on the visible ASB operation of the police and local authority, little, if any, attention has been focussed on the invisible elements of the police and local authority in relation to ASB.

**Semi visible tensions of CDRPs**

The creation of tensions between police and local authority has risen from the invisible regions of both organisations, with ideologies and power relationships amongst CDRP partners already disjointed. The catalyst for growth in partnership tensional development was also the key to tackling the ASB problem, partnership working itself.

The partnership approach was seen as a model integral to the growth of local crime prevention (Crawford, 1997, p.55) through increased accountability and less duplication of work (Rosenbaum, 2002, p.178). Partnerships create conditions for collaborative organisational relationships, with the aim of improving operations (Liedtka, 1996, p.21). The Crime and Disorder Act was reviewed in 2004 to address the problem of reliance on past initiatives and clear targets associated with crime and safety partnerships (Phillips, 2000, p.18). This has subsequently led to publications that look to guide practitioners in creating successful crime partnerships (National Community Safety Network, 2012).

With no single agency able to deal with the complexities of crime and community safety (Berry, Briggs, Erol, & Van Staden, 2011, p.1), close links between police and local authority were essential for effective ASB response (Loveday & McClory, 2007, p.31). It is interesting to note that whilst the local authority has a statutory responsibility for reducing crime and ASB under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the recent introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) in 2012 gives responsibility for police and crime to one individual. This is somewhat at odds with the partnership ethic behind crime and ASB reduction.

**Partnerships, the cure for Scooby Doo syndrome?**
A fundamental element of crime partnerships was left without definition (even by the Morgan report) around what does partnership actually mean? The terms partnership, multi-agency, and collaboration are all commonly used in a crime and safety context but do not have the same meaning. Multi agency work is seen as a shared piece of work not limited by depth of involvement (Liddle & Gelsthorpe, 1994, p.4). Collaboration shares a similar definition and talks of inter organisational co-operative working and alliances (Butterfoss, Goodman, & Wandersman, 1993, p.316). Partnerships on the other hand have historically been given a rather more business like definition.

The Partnership Act 1890 was introduced to govern the rights of people or corporate entities doing business in partnership. The Partnership Act 1890 defined partnerships as people carrying out common business for a profit. However as time moved on, the partnership definition somewhat softened to affiliation and relationships between organisations working towards shared goals and so creating competitive advantage (Axelrod, 2004, p.9; Boone & Kurtz, 2012, p.325). The aim of partnerships in the crime and ASB arena was to bring together organisations (not all whose core business was seen to be crime and ASB) to work towards the shared goal of crime and ASB reduction. The other aim of CDRPs was to avoid ‘Scooby Doo’ partnerships.

Scooby Doo is a cartoon dog who along with his human associates looks to investigate and solve mysteries and strange goings on. A key theme of the character is that Scooby Doo and his sidekick Shaggy are the most nervous and scared of the whole team, but inevitably are the ones left behind to face the haunted houses whilst the other members usually disappear. When talking of Scooby Doo partnerships in a CDRP context usually one or two agencies with crime and ASB reduction central to their core business are left to deal with issues whilst other agencies disappear when action is required.

When Scooby Doo (Police) creeps up to the haunted house (crime, disorder, ASB) he looks behind to see everyone else right behind him (local authority, health, probation etc). However when it comes to Scooby Doo pushing open the door of the haunted house and gets ready to take action (go inside), on looking behind again he finds that everyone has disappeared except for his somewhat hesitant,
duty bound partner Shaggy (Local Authority). What this illustrates is that agencies with a vested interest in crime and ASB issues are more likely to commit to meaningful action. Agencies that have a less vested interest in crime and ASB retreat back to what they see as their core business and watch from a distance.

Whilst the definition was lacking, the most critical element of any partnership is a shared mission and purpose (Barry, 2007, p.95), with an assumption that this would already exist within CDRPs. With partnerships seen as a new phenomenon for auditors (Mayne, Wileman, & Leeuw, 2003, p.31), positive attempts were made to demonstrate the visible operational purpose of partnerships through focussing on resources and skills (Shermer & Schmid, 2007, p.4). However criticisms of CDRPs remained as they did not produce tangible outcomes (Hughes, 2007, p.83). This coupled with lack of shared commitment and mission leaves partnership arrangements consigned to failure (Routhwaite, 1994, p.2).

Narrowing down CDRP tensions to police and local authority they are impossible to ignore (Liddle & Gelsthorpe, 1994, p.3). The issue of culture and ideologies (amongst others) are of specific concern to researchers (Hughes, 2002, p.12). Partnerships become a site of conflict when it comes to culture and power (Skinns & Hall, 2005, p.39). For example a measure of CDRP success has been based on the Basic Command Unit of the police (BCU) achieving crime targets (Loveday, 2006, p.12). This gives the police a dominant power position, with the rest of the CDRP seen helping police to achieve targets. Even with the nationalisation of local problems through ASBO targets (Police urged over ASBO targets, 2009), CDRPs were still seen as taking the work of others to claim success (Hughes, 2007, p.100).

The statutory obligation for police and local authority to work together is not enough to promote operational success (especially relating to ASB). With the police in particular being seen as resistant to compromise and change (Skogan, 2008, p.23), CDRPs have become more of a battleground than a unified partnership sharing the same mission and goals. However CDRPs are only a stage which hosts the performance. Police and local authorities bring their own script of ideologies, mission and power relations to read from. This in turn leads to some clearly identifiable areas of tension between both organisations.
Tension 1 - Crime vs Community Safety

With the concept of community safety introduced by the Morgan report in 1991, there was a shift in focus towards the criminal rather than crime (Gilling, 1997, p.33). The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 also gave recognition that levels of crime also lay outside the traditional criminal justice system, further advocating the community safety approach over crime reduction. With crime reduction viewed as core police business, it was also seen as too narrow and reliant on the traditional criminal justice system that was unable to account for social harm (Muncie, 1999, p.4). The victimology movement looked to move away from offender to victim focus which drew more attention to the limits of offender based criminology (Mawby & Walklate, 1994, p.8). This was also complemented by a shift to situational crime prevention and social causes of crime (Muncie, 2004, p.10).

With a traditional criminal justice system built around free will and personal responsibility (Ellis, Hartley, & Walsh, 2010, p.11), crime and disorder were now amalgamated under the umbrella of community safety. Not restricted to just crime, community safety looked to address disorder and quality of life issues that increase concerns over safety (Kelling & Coles, 1997, p.22). Community safety was demonstrating that crime and community did not exist in opposites and that community promotion would reduce crime (Hughes & Rowe, 2007, p.320).

With police core business seen as waging the war on crime, the community safety stance takes an opposing viewpoint. The war on crime has a notion that it is something that can be won. Community safety sees crime as a permanent condition that needs to be managed not eliminated (Feeley & Simon, 1992, p.455). This has seen crime reduction somewhat substituted, rather than adopted, by the community safety approach. More importantly in the development of tensions between police and local authority, exclusive ownership of crime was being taken away from the police (Home Office, 1991, p.3).

With the community safety approach came the inspiration for neighbourhood policing. This was immediately seen as being at odds with traditional crime reduction and safety functions of the police (Lum, 2009, p.793) as it looked to facilitate direct involvement of citizens in crime control and policing activity (Jones,
Newburn, & Smith, 1996, p.195). With police seeing high policing as the way to
deal with ‘real crime’, low policing was seen as a way of dealing with minor
incivilities (Brodeur, 2010, p.223) and not real police work (Cordner, 1995, p.3).
This has led to tensions, with neighbourhood policing being labelled by traditional
policing circles and an ineffective practice that distracts from police core business
(Moore, 1992, p.115).

Tension 2 – Identity and Broken windows policing

Policing identity has been subject to a chameleon rather than radical change over
the past 200 years as it has moved from a uniformed body of men in blue coats
(Reiner, 1988, p.141) to the evolution of SWAT styled officers and firearms use
(Reiner, 1992, p.766). The constant that has remained throughout shifts in policing
and criminal law is that fighting crime is seen by officers as good police work and
central to the policing role (Holdaway, 1989, p.58). However people began to see
crime in terms of place and moral architecture (Girling, Loader, & Sparks, 2005,
p.46). This changing demand for ‘broken windows’ community policing (Russell,
2013) was at total opposites with the reactive approach of the professional policing
model (Lumb & Breazeale, 2010, p.95).

The rebalancing of the policing crime role was becoming more and more evident
(Camber, 2013). Criminologists noted the shift in policing from a force to service
and from community to customers (McLaughin, 1992, p.479). The police customers
were now demanding more reassurance policing (Loader, 2006, p.205) making the
police managers of social order and disorder (Manning, 2003, p.53). However this
shift from the criminal to the community also predicated tensions in the balance
between criminal and civil law.

Criminal law is ‘beyond all reasonable doubt’ an entity that over 2000 years has
journeyed through demonic, classical, neo classical and neo liberal phases (Vito &
Maahs, 2012, p.12-15). Civil law is no less steeped in history and ‘on the balance of
probabilities’ tracks back to Roman times. Both types of law have distinct
differences. From a set of legislative acts (criminal law), civil law differs as it applies
to the citizen, making it somewhat at odds with criminal law (Coffee, 1991, p.1878).
Social problems around rights to housing and other wellbeing issues has seen the
civil law framework more aligned to problems in social life today (Pleasense, Buck, Balmer, O’Grady, Genn, & Smith, 2004, p.1). No more have the social problems of today been demonstrated than through the evolution of ASB.

Whilst the line has been clearly drawn between civil and criminal law in community safety terms, there has been blurring of boundaries between the use of civil standards of proof and distinction between criminal and sub criminal behaviour (Burney, 2002, p.474). What has become more apparent is that CDRP tensions between police and local authority are partly based on the de-centralisation effect of alternative community safety approaches against the traditional professional policing model. With non-police agencies co-opted into the crime and safety arena, new social ills (like ASB) have merged civil and criminal law boundaries. This has created tension around what was seen as traditional policing business.

**Tension 3 – ASB the ecologicalisation of crime?**

Rhetoric suggests that we are living in a time of deep social anxiety (Munchie & Wilson, 2004, p.161), with personal trouble becoming public issue (Pitkin, 1981, p.347). No more has social anxiety been better represented than through the development of ASB. This has led to citizens demanding police involvement in low policing ASB type incidents as well as the high policing of more serious crime (Bland, 1997, p.29). With local government recognising the link between perception of safety and ASB (Loveday & McClory, 2007, p.29), the visibility of personal trouble also occupied a high profile on government agendas (Millie, Jacobson, McDonald, & Hough, 2005, p.4).

A raft of legislation was enacted not only looking to punish the perpetrators of ASB but to also bridge the civil/criminal divide. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Police Reform Act 2002, Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 and the Police and Justice Act 2006 were all examples of legislation introduced to address the problem of ASB and the threat it posed to the aspiration of sustainable communities (Home Affairs Select Committee, 2005). Such legislation was introduced based on the fact that the traditional criminal justice system lacked any sanctions to deal with ASB (Thorpe, Fiddick, & Wood, 1998, p.19).
A combination of the welfare state and the media making the private public saw
criminal acts played out in the public arena (Sacco, 1995, p.142). When coupled
with the ASB legislative changes people who ordinarily would have been missed by
the criminal justice system were now included in it (Brown, 2004, p.208). This was
mainly due to the ASB classification, with acts prior to this escaping the criminal
justice system due to witness intimidation or evidential standards (The Labour
Party, 1996, p.3; Burney, 2000, p.11). In essence the traditional criminal justice
system was being seen as part of the problem and not the solution (Garside, 2006,
p.11). The ASB agenda was seen by some as an assault on traditional criminal
justice concepts (Crawford, 2009, p.810).

The production line of new legislation to tackle ASB was justified by Tony Blair who
saw the need for 21\textsuperscript{st} century laws to deal with 21\textsuperscript{st} century problems (Blair, 2006,
p.90). These ASB legislative changes did not go without criticism, with particular
attention on Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs). ASBOs were seen to
criminalise sub-criminal behaviour (Brown, 2004, p.205). This was contested by
New Labour who highlighted the inability of traditional criminal law to deal with
behaviour where the cumulative impact was greater than each incident in isolation
(McDonald, 2006, p.197).

Criminal justice traditionalists saw this as a circumnavigation of the criminal justice
process (Crawford, 2009, p.818), with ASB powers doing no more than to cause
confusion (Hewitt, 2007, p.357). The ASB definition was seen by as vague
confusion of criminal process (Crawford, 2008, p.753). ASB powers were also seen
as a de-jurification of decision making, with ASB powers being transferred to non-
judicial officers (local authority) dispensing a form of summary justice (Crawford,

The ASB camp defended itself against such criticism by championing the broad
flexibility of the ASB definition. With the ability to account for things like tolerance
levels, ASB was constructed as a form of behaviour just as self-evident as crime
(Brown, 2004, p.210). The ASB approach looked to focus on civil and criminal
processes, creating new areas of liabilities and reconfiguring laws (Crawford, 2009,
p.828). This new liability could then be applied to behaviour that would appear
minor if viewed in isolation (McDonald, 2006, p.210).
The fashioning of these new liabilities and the promotion of early intervention and prevention, promoted a more ecological approach to ASB. These approaches looked not only to change the behaviour of the anti-social individual, but also the behaviour of significant figures associated with the individual (Crawford, 2009, p.815). Fundamental to these changes was the use and reliance on partnerships and partnership working amongst hard (police) and soft (social services, health) partners. However with police not seeing ASB as real crime (Brown, 2004, p.208), and partnerships representing decentralisation of ASB power away from the police, the fundamental problem of tensions within CDRPs returns.

**The semi visible iceberg**

It has been established that the visible ASB operations of the police and local authority have been widely criticised. Through examination of the partnership landscape, ideological differences and organisational tensions have surfaced between police and local authority. When depicted on the organisational iceberg, this adds a totally new element to the police / local authority organisational iceberg. This element is the semi visible organisational tensional layer which has not been previously accounted for in literature.

**Figure 3.1 The organisational iceberg with CDRP tensional layer**
As previously discussed the lack of symbolic referencing in relation to shared ideologies and goals of CDRP partners (particularly police and local authority) has led to the development of tensions. A ‘three layer’ organisational iceberg now accounts for these tensions. With the visible operations being above the waterline and the invisible elements below the waterline, the tensional layer is semi visible sitting just below the waterline. Elements in the tensional layer are not part of the overt operational aspects of CDRP organisations. If these tensions were part of the visible operations, this would equate to CDRP agencies airing their differences in public. Tensions that develop rarely break the surface but are known to the organisations involved.

Whilst the identification of tensions has been discussed at some length between CDRP partners, and in particular police and local authority, clarity is still needed in relation to where the tensions actually come from. Organisations that have a shared mission and goals are unlikely to have a tensional layer (they may have team or individual tensions but not as whole organisations). Elements of organisations that have value and importance are shared through symbolic referencing (Harvey, Treadway, & Heames, 2006, p.195), with organisational definition of reality found within the culture. With this, further investigation of the invisible organisational elements is needed as culture is one of many invisible elements that could contribute to tensional development.

From the semi visible to invisible

So far the organisational environment has been looked at and the effect of new demands in the development of tensions between crime reduction partners and traditional core functions. Whilst most criticism of ASB operations has remained at a visible operational level, tensions mainly between police and local authority have manifested. However it is not enough to stop at identifying these tensions as a result of superficial criticism, but to establish where they emanate from organisationally. This means moving from the visible, through the semi visible, and into the invisible organisational elements of police and local authority in the exploration of organisational culture and knowledge and the influence on ASB organisational performance.
The largest part of the organisational iceberg is invisible. Made of many factors and elements, illustrations of the invisible organisation have consistently lacked any specific order or position of individual elements.

**Figure 3.2 The three layer organisational iceberg including invisible elements**

What has been made clear about the invisible, intangible assets of an organisation is their role in superior organisational performance (Teece, 1998, p.62). These intangible resources are more likely to produce greater competitive advantage than tangible ones (Hitt, Bierman, Chimizu, & Kochhar, 2001, p.14). The iceberg demonstrates the mass of invisible organisational elements over the visible ones. This in turn also shows how the invisible elements support the visible elements of an organisation.

**Invisible police and transparent local authority**

The invisible police organisation shields itself from external pressure to change (Worden, 1996, p.29). With cop culture seen as difficult to transform, policy reforms only produce superficial alterations (Reiner, 1992, p.137). Police identity is rooted in powerful cultural and social structures (Seleti, 2000, p.363). This deep rooted
crime orientated behaviour highlights why changing police internal routines and structures is so difficult (Greene, 2000, p.332). Frontline police officers place value on good policing work as fighting crime and arrest and chase (Holdaway, 1989, p.58). This makes changing policy or legislation alone not enough to transform policing (Marks, 2000, p.559). This could be a consideration that may offer some insight into cases such as Fiona Pilkington and criticism levelled at police.

The invisible local authority bears some similarities to the police in relation to being isolated and inward looking (Department of the Environment Transport and the Regions, 1998, p.9). The past 20 years have seen more pressure on local authorities to improve performance (Wisniewski & Olafsson, 2004, p.602). Local authorities have looked to shift from traditional to more responsive flexible working. This has continued within the shadow of continued bureaucratic burden (Boyne, Martin, & Walker, 2004, p.192). The police ideology of reactive approach to crime and safety issues (Ransley & Mazerolle, 2007, p.40) was at odds with the local authority approach. Layers of local authority bureaucracy resulted in a slow response to crime and ASB despite managers being driven to be more outward looking in service provision (Keen & Scase, 1998, p.73). In a CDRP context these opposing styles and ideologies between police and local authority are key factors in the development of tensions between the two organisations.

The police and local authority both have significant organisational histories that are etched into the organisational memory. Despite efforts to change, both organisations have elements that are deep rooted and manifest again and again despite organisational changes. With both organisations made up of individual and groups the question is how is the organisations memory shared between individuals and groups in an organisation? How is organisational memory transferred between the invisible organisational elements and how does this apply to police and local authority in an ASB context? Consideration has to be given to the relationship between culture and knowledge, which has a significant effect on individual behaviour (Simion & Radu, 2009, p.790).

Culture
Culture has been a source of debate that has spanned decades (Hofstede, 1996, p.3; Cummings & Worley, 2009, p.520; Schein, 2010, p.7; Armstrong & Taylor, 2014, p.120). Whilst subject to variation in its definition (Alvesson, 2011, p.12) the power of an organisation's culture has great influence over operations and employee job satisfaction (Chang & Lee, 2007, p.162). The invisible elements shown in the organisational iceberg are all contained within organisational culture (Johnson, Whittington, & Scholes, 2011, p.173). This in turn creates the character of the organisation which directs and guides employee behaviour, day to day working relationships and group integration (Ribiere & Sitar, 2003, p.40; Linn, 2008, p.89).

It is unsurprising to learn that organisational culture is seen as the key to organisational success and the controlling factor of behaviour (Yang, 2007, p.530). In order to enhance performance, a culture must have positive adoption of organisational objectives to be classed as ‘strong’, with lack of objective adoption the sign of a ‘weak’ culture which reduces performance (Saffold, 1988, p.548). With this link between culture and organisational effectiveness, models of organisations were extended to include organisational culture as part of their make-up.

Models like the competing values framework (Scott, Mannion, Davies, & Marshall, 2003, p.66) were introduced in an effort to identify cultural form (Denison & Spreitzer, 1991, p.5). Denison & Mishra (1995, p.216) subsequently presented a four dimensional cultural model based on adaptability, consistency, involvement and mission cultural elements. It is not the intention to relay the numerous models of cultural identification. It is important to demonstrate that culture is multi-dimensional and that cultural strength is an important factor in organisational performance.

Cultural strength is essentially how strongly the values and norms of an organisation are held (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1996, p.158). A strong culture helps an organisation run smoothly and efficiently with all activity aligned to organisational goals (Saffold, 1998, p.548). Cultural strength is also responsible for enhancing worker motivation and goal alignment (Sorensen, 2002, p.70), with a weak culture having the opposite effect. There is a word of caution exercised around strong cultures. If a strong culture does not fit an organisation's strategic context, then this
could have a negative effect on performance (Linnenluecke & Griffiths, 2010, p.362).

A strong culture having a negative effect could be associated within a CDRP context. With a strong culture of crime reduction in police and to some extent local authorities, is it in line with what is required under community safety and ASB? Whilst trying to align with the requirements of the community safety/ASB mission, failings may occur because the old culture remains the same due to its strength. The consequence is that the culture is then out of alignment with the organisational mission and goals.

The importance of culture in organisational performance is a critical factor. Culture is also seen as a knowledge resource (Jones, Cline, & Ryan, 2004, p.412). Knowledge is a vital component in an organisation's ability to create value (Ruggles, 1998, p.80). Due to its close association with culture, knowledge commands some importance as a source of competitive advantage (Argote & Ingram, 2000, p.155). This in turn directly influences organisational performance (Glomseth, Gottschalk, & Solli-Saether, 2007, p.97) impacting on goal achievement and organisational success.

**The culture of knowledge**

The area of organisational knowledge has been the subject of debate across literature (Blackler, 1995, p.1022; Inkpen & Dinur, 1998, p.454; Dienes & Perner, 1999, p.737; Lee & Yang, 2000, p.783; Osterloh & Frey, 2000, p.538; Earl, 2001, p.215; Collier, Edwards, & Shaw, 2004, p.461; Levin & Cross, 2004, p.1477). Knowledge is an important asset to any organisation (Teece, 1998, p.76). It is only when knowledge is turned into practical ‘know how’ does it enable an organisation to perform its various functions (Sanchez & Heene, 1997, p.84). Organisational culture is a critical factor in the knowledge sharing process (Gold, Malhotra & Segars, 2001, p.189).

As with any sort of resource, effective management is critical for any organisation. Knowledge is no exception. Knowledge management is seen as the process to acquire, convert, apply and protect knowledge that helps communities of people
work together to improve performance (Lin & Lee, 2006, p.75). Effective knowledge management plays a mediating role that connects organisational context and strategy. Knowledge management research has in the main been conducted in large private companies. Knowledge management in the public sector is less evident in literature (Fowler & Pryke, 2003, p.255).

**Knowledge management in the public sector**

Knowledge conversion is an important element of organisational performance (Lin & Lee, 2006, p.75). Critical factors that can affect knowledge sharing and conversion are goal clarity and cultural issues (Gold, Malhotra, & Segars, 2001, p.189; Chun & Rainey, 2005, p.529). Within the public sector there are factors that add additional complications to knowledge management. These are issues of trust, power and reward.

Employees in the public sector see knowledge associated with power (Al-Athari & Zairi, 2001, p.74). Holding onto knowledge in the public sector creates exclusivity as well as ‘silo thinking’ which hinders shared understanding of organisational phenomena (Liebowitz & Chen, 2003, p.422). Public reports for example have highlighted that police need to work from a grounded knowledge base that is aligned from the top to the bottom of the organisation (Lord Stevens of Kirkwhelpington, 2013, p.34). This represents a shift to a police service built on skills and knowledge (Lord Stevens of Kirkwhelpington, 2013, p.118).

The issue of reward is another factor that effects public sector knowledge management. The private sector is seen to reward knowledge sharing whilst in the public sector this does not always happen (Borins, 2001, p.311). A lack of incentive to share knowledge is a major barrier to knowledge sharing across different cultures (Yao, Kam, & Chan, 2007, p.62). Some cultures even stop knowledge sharing taking place with knowledge transfer methods needing to fit the culture (Davenport & Prusak, 2000, p.92).

The concluding issue in knowledge management and sharing is trust (Hock, Ling, & San, 2009, p.139). Where a co-operative culture exists, so do the conditions for trust in knowledge sharing (King, 2007, p.231). A culture that develops trust
mitigates perceived negative effects, or cost of knowledge sharing (Kankanhalli, Tan, & Wei, 2005, p.117). As long as strongly held traditions of power and reward remain in public organisations, then cultural conditions will not foster the trust required for effective knowledge sharing and management.

**Organisational cultural knowledge**

It would be easy to settle for the notion that culture and knowledge exist together within an organisation as separate entities that have inextricable links. This would not suffice as knowledge and competencies are embedded into the culture of an organisation (Johnson, Whittington, & Scholes, 2011, p.93). Such commonly held cognitions are the cultural knowledge of an organisation.

Organisational memory is shared through the minds of participants, relayed through groups and embedded within organisational process (Cross & Baird, 2000, p.69). These processes then manifest into the visible processes of an organisation (like visible ASB operations of the police and local authority). With further investigation of organisational cultural knowledge required there are two key works in this area to be drawn on. Firstly is the identification of key elements within organisational culture that relate to effectiveness (Denison, 1990). Secondly there is the identification of cultural groupings which have specific cultural knowledge levels within organisations (Sackmann, 1991).

**Culture and effectiveness**

What Denison provides is the identification of elements within culture that support organisational effectiveness. Denison tells us nothing new in relation to the importance of values and principles within organisations (p.2) although he does highlight the issue of the individualistic study of culture as opposed to use of a consistent framework (p.3) (also highlighted by Sackmann (p.23)). What Denison focuses on is the individualistic sense of culture and its effect on organisational effectiveness through the culture and effectiveness model (p.15).
What Denison shows is that key cultural elements of involvement, consistency, adaptability and mission (p.6) influence organisational effectiveness. High involvement organisations create a greater commitment to the organisation by individuals (p.7). Denison (p.7) and Sackmann (p.40) both point to high involvement cultures having more of a clan like arrangement, with cultural cognitions extra somatically shared to form cultural groups. Another internal organisational cultural element, consistency, has a positive impact on effectiveness when a shared system of values and symbols is widely understood (p.8). This also needs to be supported by high level symbolic meanings (like a clear organisational definition of what ASB is) which assists the encoding and decoding of messages in the communication process. Denison goes onto say that a shared system or organisational norms and expectations are associated with high involvement, high consistency cultures (p.9).

Mission (p.13) and adaptability are both more concerned with the external organisational environment. Whilst mission defines the social role of the organisation, clarity of goals and direction helps to structure individual behaviour (p.14). Adaptability is a cultural feature of how well an organisation is able to shift internal processes and structures in response to changes in the external environment (p.12). What Denison and the culture and effectiveness model looks to provide is a consistent ‘lens’. This enables culture to be viewed in an internal and
external capacity without focusing on internal customers or individual characteristics as deterrents of effectiveness (p.36).

**Cultural groupings and organisational cultural knowledge**

Denison focuses more on the identification of cultural elements that influence organisational effectiveness. Sackmann (1991) identifies groupings of cultural collectiveness on an organisational scale. Sackmann introduces four levels of organisational cultural knowledge within organisations through the following framework (p.39).

**Figure 3.4 The cultural knowledge map: Definitions and characteristics of different kinds of cultural knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of cultural knowledge</th>
<th>Dictionary Knowledge</th>
<th>Directory Knowledge</th>
<th>Recipe Knowledge</th>
<th>Axiomatic Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive components</td>
<td>Descriptive categories</td>
<td>Causal Analytical attributions</td>
<td>Causal Normative attribution</td>
<td>Causes, assumptions, wants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic Questions</td>
<td>‘what is’ ‘that exists’</td>
<td>‘how are things done’</td>
<td>‘should’ ‘ought to’</td>
<td>‘why things are done the way they are’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestations</td>
<td>Definitions and labels of things and events</td>
<td>Expectations about cause &amp; effect relationships, descriptive theory of action</td>
<td>Cause &amp; Effect relationships of hypothetical events prescriptive theory of action</td>
<td>Fundamental beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sackmann sees culture as the collective construct of social reality (p.34) with individual cognitions held collectively and linking into a cultural knowledge map (p.36). This map creates a basis for perception, thinking, feeling and acting across organisational social systems. Sackmann identified the four elements of organisational cultural knowledge through descriptive components (dictionary knowledge), causal analytical attributes (directory knowledge), causal normative (recipe knowledge) and why structures and strategies are chosen (axiomatic knowledge) (p.37-38).

In the quest for classification and visibility of organisational cultural knowledge, both Denison and Sackmann provide insight into individual and group elements. Denison looks at more micro individual elements present which act as a measure of organisational effectiveness (consistency, adaptability, involvement, mission). Sackmann identifies macro collective cultural groupings. However whilst Denison and Sackmann provide identification of elements, the strength of cultural knowledge can be gauged by such things as consistency amongst organisational participants (Christensen & Gordon, 1999, p.398; Innceoglu, 2002, p.26). This strength can be a negative as well as a positive, as strong cultural knowledge that is not aligned with organisational mission can act as a key rigidity and so be out of line with organisational strategy (Johnson, Whittington, & Scholes, 2011, p.93).

**Strong or weak ASB?**

The external environmental pressures and political influence on the workings of police and local authorities in relation to crime and disorder have been significant. These two organisations normally shielded from the external environment (and each other), have been pushed together through the community safety concept. This is played out through the medium of crime and safety partnerships, where crime, disorder and ASB issues attempt to be solved in partnership.

Despite the visionary theory around community safety and CDRPs, questions remained about CDRP effectiveness. Specific criticism around ASB operations of the police and local authority were made and was also aimed other CDRP partners like mental health. With high profile failures seen in cases like Fiona Pilkington, reasons beyond the obvious and visible ASB operations need to be explored. Whilst the visible operation of both organisations was attracting the attention, the
invisible elements of both organisations have gone without examination in an ASB context.

Using the traditional two layer organisational iceberg, a tensional layer was added to this model. This tensional layer relates to the police and local authority in and elements of ASB and ideologies that are not harmonised. Identity, criminal vs civil law and the ecologicalisation of crime are areas of tension. These have been hosted by partnerships, which have acted as the catalyst for tension development. With tensions being hosted by partnerships, the question remains where within both organisations do these tensions emanate from?

By looking into the invisible elements of the organisational iceberg it was found that all these elements exist within the culture of an organisation. With culture being difficult to change in police and local authority, culture is also seen as the controlling factor of human behaviour within an organisation (Yang, 2007, p.532). The initial question to ask is how much has ASB been absorbed into police and local authority culture?

With tensions relating to ASB possibly being caused by differences in ideologies or knowledge of how to get the ASB job done, culture is a critical part of knowledge sharing (Gold, Malhotra, & Segars, 2001, p.189). Knowledge management in the public sector has faced many barriers, no less the issue of trust. Where trust exists so does a co-operative team culture (King, 2007, p.231) which is essential for organisational competitive advantage (Argote & Ingram, 2000, p.155). So in relation to ASB, is operational criticism linked ASB due to it not being in the cultural heart of the police and local authority?

Further literature research revealed the importance of culture and knowledge consistency, with cultural strength acknowledged as a key element of organisational success (Saffold, 1988, p.546). In identifying what the elements of culture and knowledge are, micro cultural factors were identified (Denison, 1990) which related to elements needing to be present in a culture to make it effective. Sackmann took this to a macro organisational level by defining organisational cultural knowledge levels, or collective groupings. These micro and macro level identifiers give a visible way of structuring and measuring the invisible concepts of organisational cultural knowledge.
The question is what has this got to do with ASB and police and local authority operational performance? For organisations to be successful they need a strong culture that is aligned to organisational mission which facilitates knowledge sharing and in return superior operational performance (Sorensen, 2002, p.70). With police and local authority being co-opted together in the ASB field, the assumption is they share the same ASB aims. Both organisations deliver other services where they are not co-opted to work together. By utilising the organisational cultural knowledge elements of Sackmann and Denison, the areas and people responsible in each organisation for ASB can be examined, but examined for what?

Right from the beginning of this discussion popular rhetoric saw criticism aimed at the visible elements of police and local authority ASB operations. By utilising the organisational iceberg, successful organisations have strong culture and knowledge sharing elements aligned to the organisational missions. This organisational cultural knowledge is critical for superior performance. So the question is how strong is ASB cultural knowledge in the police and local authority through organisational cultural knowledge layers and also cross organisational? Are both organisations strategically and operationally aligned in relation to ASB cultural knowledge with shared mission and aims? Through cultural knowledge strength analysis the aim is to try to offer a preliminary insight into what the cultural knowledge strength of police and local authority is regarding anti-social behaviour.

Having identified the importance of organisational cultural knowledge strength in relation to operational performance, this is to be used as the primary research focus to assess ASB cultural knowledge strength of Devon and Cornwall Police (Cornwall only) and Cornwall Council. The next chapter looks at both organisations in relation to mission, goals, performance and structures. These are the core anchors of both organisations and provide a fixed point of which to align cultural knowledge against.

Chapter 4 – Looking at the windscreen, the methodological path ahead

Having previously established researcher position in the organisations that are the subject of this preliminary research, it is important to also examine and acknowledge the external conditions these organisations are ‘driving’ in. Much like a car journey, by examining the external conditions before setting off, the journey
can be better planned and takes account for macro and micro environmental factors that could affect the type of route taken. Acknowledging external factors has some validity especially where organisational changes may be shaped by external organisational conditions.

There are many national challenges both financial and political faced by public services today. With Whitehall slashing budgets, public bodies have been forced to re-invent themselves in order to live within their newly prescribed means. The introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC), the abolition of Primary Care Trusts and public health moving into local authorities are just a few examples of the significant changes in government policy. In addition upcoming changes to re-offending, Anti-Social Behaviour and alcohol have all been signalled prior to their impending arrival (Sorensen, 2013b, p.9).

The two organisations that are the subject of this preliminary study into the strength of ASB cultural knowledge are Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council. The reason these two organisations have been chosen is primarily that they are a police service and a local authority. This means that they will have the required core organisational cultural traits and statutory responsibility for crime and ASB. Both organisations are viable in terms of access and logistics as they are in the county of Cornwall and results will apply to Cornwall only. It should be noted that whilst poor operational performance around ASB has been discussed previously, this does not imply or suggest that Devon and Cornwall Police or Cornwall Council have poor operational ASB performance.

It is important to have an overview of broad organisational information for Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council. Both organisations operations in Cornwall are in a county where the 535,000 population are widely dispersed. Low wages, high unemployment, housing shortages and little opportunities for young people are some of the external conditions facing the population of Cornwall (Sorensen, 2013a, p.10). This presents some of the conditions both Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council have to face in the macro demographics of the county.

Organisational overview – Devon and Cornwall Police
Devon and Cornwall police is a large police force that is managing a 20% cut in its budget up to March 2015 (Her Majesties Inspectorate of Constabularies, 2012, p.3). A detailed policing model needs to be developed beyond 2015. This will counteract lack of clarity in the stretched remit of Neighbourhood Police Teams (NHPT) and a low proportion of police officers compared to other forces (Her Majesties Inspectorate of Constabularies, 2012, p.3).

With a total employee count of 5990 across Devon and Cornwall as of March 2010, this will reduce to five thousand by 2015 (Her Majesties Inspectorate of Constabularies, 2012, p.7). Across Devon and Cornwall the plan is to make 76% of the workforce frontline by 2015 (Her Majesties Inspectorate of Constabularies, 2012, p.5). The business of policing means there are many divisions and specialist teams. This ranges from PCSO’s and Neighbourhood policing teams to Major Crime Teams, CID and Special Branch officers. The Devon and Cornwall Police Annual Report (2012, p.6) sets out the organisations mission and priorities.

Table 4.0 Mission, priorities and targets Devon and Cornwall Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Building Safer Communities Together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>To be a top performing force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Honesty – Integrity – Fairness – Respect – Trust – Courage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Themes</td>
<td>Customers; Respond to the needs of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People: Lead – Empower – Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Priorities</td>
<td>Reduce crime and bring criminals to justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve satisfaction in service received by victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of times crime and ASB mentioned in report</td>
<td>Crime 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These priorities look to be realised through the setting of the following targets in Devon and Cornwall Police Local Policing Plan 2012 – 2015 (2012, p.7)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>No increase in violence with injury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% of offence cases result in a positive outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceed 88% in victims satisfied with the service they receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% of victims of ASB satisfied with the service they receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60% of people agree that the police are doing a good job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36% of people say yes to seeing an officer once a fortnight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisational Overview – Cornwall Council**

Cornwall Council is the second largest unitary council in the country. As income figures suggest (Robinson, 2013, p.2) there are multiple services provided by the organisation through six directorates (Chief Executives, Public Health and Protection, Environment Planning and Economy, Children’s Schools and Families, Adult Social Care and Resources). The council as a whole faces a 30% reduction in income and has earmarked £29 million of savings for the year 2014-15 to be realised through service cuts, workforce reduction and establishing trading arms. The organisation has also been subject to criticism around chief executive pay, political instability and damaging national media through the ‘Colin Brewer’ saga where an elected member said that disabled children should be ‘put down’ (Jarvis, 2013).

When looking for Cornwall Councils organisational aims, there are multiple plans due to the multi service nature and directorate structure. The overarching Cornwall Council business plan for 2013-14 details the following.
Table 4.1 Mission, priorities and targets of Cornwall Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Not clearly identified in the document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>To be a high performing council, using resources well to secure good public services for all and targeted support for those who need it most. To be a strong and effective community leader ensuring sound investment in a sustainable future for Cornwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Pride – Professionalism – Pace – Passion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Themes</td>
<td>Sustainable Economic Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure good health and wellbeing for everybody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Become a high performing council through our continuous improvement approach of fix, prepare, transform and excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Priorities</td>
<td>Support sustainable economic growth and prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve resilience and self-sufficiency of communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieve a balanced supply of housing that meets local need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manage council resources whilst seeking to maintain service levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of times crime and ASB mentioned in report | Crime 0 | ASB 0 |

There are no specific targets contained within the business plan which is very overarching for the whole Council and its bespoke services. In order to reduce this down, what sits underneath the business plan are the individual service plans of each directorate. Within the Public Health and Protection directorate sits Cornwall Fire and Rescue Service (CFRS) who have the community safety as part of their service. This has most relevance in respect of a crime, ASB and safety focus. The Community Safety service plan 2013-16 (Sorensen, 2013a) contains the following.
Table 4.2 Mission, priorities and targets of CRFS Community Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Working together to make Cornwall Safer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Not clearly defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Not clearly defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Themes</th>
<th>Prevent</th>
<th>Respond</th>
<th>Protect</th>
<th>Innovate</th>
<th>Perform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce number of KSI on our roads</td>
<td>Reduce numbers of killed or seriously injured in fires</td>
<td>Enable disadvantaged people to make positive life choices</td>
<td>Prevent the escalation to more serious harm</td>
<td>Reduction of dwelling and deliberate fires in high risk areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities are able to help themselves in the event of an emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent</td>
<td>Right resources in the right place at the right time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>Prepare to respond to high risk situations</td>
<td>Able to deliver critical services in the event of unexpected circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Reduction in the financial impact of fires in non-domestic premises for business owners and our service</td>
<td>Increase awareness and compliance with crime and safety</td>
<td>Legislation delivered through joint working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovate</td>
<td>Increase capacity and effectiveness of delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform</td>
<td>Through internal and external feedback we are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Community Safety service plan again details no specific targets although it is acknowledged that targets are held within individual team plans. The most relevant targets that relate to crime, safety and ASB are held within the Safer Cornwall Partnership Plan 2013-16 (Sorensen, 2013a). This is the statutory community safety partnership that includes Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council as key contributors and members.

**Safer Cornwall Partnership (SCP)**

The Safer Cornwall Partnership (SCP) is the statutory community safety partnership (CSP) which acts as the embodiment of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. Here agencies like Police, Council, Health, Probation and the voluntary sector work together on crime and disorder issues. SCP is administered by the council and in the main concerned with police issues. A plan is produced with other agencies on how the collective is going to deal with crime and disorder. The Safer Cornwall Plan 2013-16 (Sorensen, 2013a) details the following.
Table 4.3 Mission, priorities and targets of Safer Cornwall Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Working together to make Cornwall safer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Through positive partnership action make communities safer by reducing crime, disorder, anti-social behaviour and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment, reducing the harm caused by misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances, promoting public re-assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Not clearly stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Themes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce risk of victimisation</td>
<td>Improve persistent problem places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce re-offending by the most harmful offenders</td>
<td>Support recovery and integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priorities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Abuse</td>
<td>Alcohol, violence and the night time economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Re-offending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times crime/ASB mentioned in report</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These priorities look to be realised through the setting of the following targets in the Safer Cornwall Plan 2013 – 2016 (Sorensen, 2013a).
Dwelling burglary rate of 4.5 per 1,000 households

All recorded crime rate 48.7 per 1000 population

84% of domestic abuse crimes reaching court that achieve a brought to justice outcome

80% of SARC clients that receive follow up support within 72 hours of the SARC receiving notification

80% of acute serious sexual assaults attending the Sexual Assault Referral Centre

34% repeat incidents of domestic abuse (high risk victims at MARAC)

In 28% of recorded domestic abuse crimes a charge is made

54% of police recorded domestic abuse crimes that are first time reports

Violence with injury rate 5.7 per 1000 population

65% of adults not coming to attention for further ASB in the 3 months after intervention

80% of victims of anti-social behaviour surveyed who are satisfied with the service received

80% of young people not coming to attention for further ASB in the 3 months after intervention

Opiate users completing treatment successfully (% growth of 24.4)

Adult drug users completing treatment successfully (% growth of 18.2)

Rate of first time entrants to the Youth Justice System per 100,000 population aged 10 to 17 (656)

77% of offenders under probation living in suitable accommodation at the end of their order or licence

40% of offenders under probation supervision in employment at the end of their order or licence

1185 Opiate users in effective treatment

Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders after 12 months (0.67 frequency rate per young offender)

5% Young people in the Youth Justice System receiving a conviction who are sentenced to custody

1585 adult drug users in effective treatment

Delivery Structures – Safer Cornwall Partnership

Having taken an overview of the mission, priorities and targets of Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council, the focus is reduced down in order to look at the delivery structures, mission and targets. In relation to Cornwall Council the most relevant structure that deals with the crime and ASB issue specifically on behalf of the council as a whole is the SCP.
Safer Cornwall Partnership defines itself as a ‘relatively streamlined’ (Sorensen, 2013a, p.5) and looks to bring an alliance of statutory and third sector organisations together to deal with crime and disorder issues under the statutory CSP umbrella. The structural layers consist of a strategic board and management group (where all the crime and disorder area leads sit and conduct operations in accordance with the SCP partnership plan). There is also a performance element where thematic areas are set performance targets.

**Figure 4.0 Safer Cornwall Partnership Structure**

It is possible to hone in on the ASB element of the SCP structure which is the focus of this research. What follows is a diagram showing the equivalent positions and organisational layers within Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council Community Safety that sit in the ASB area of the SCP.
To deal with ASB Devon and Cornwall Police have Neighbourhood Beat Managers (NBM) and Police Community Support Officers (PCSO) on the frontline of ASB operation. Cornwall Council has ASB case workers. There are then organisational strategic layers relating to reporting lines and management of frontline staff.

It is important to note that the areas of each organisation represented above have the greatest relevance in dealing with ASB. Neighbourhood police would have the most consistent long term involvement in ASB incidents and ASB case workers deal only with ASB incidents and have no other functions.

**Performance**

There are two elements of performance to consider. There is the performance of the SCP which should be the overall performance measure in relation to crime and
ASB. However when it comes to Devon and Cornwall Police they have their own organisational performance targets. Cornwall Council uses the SCP targets as their crime and ASB performance measure.

Devon and Cornwall Police do not state in-depth any of the SCP performance measures in their plans. The performance criteria are based on individual organisations as opposed to partnership performance. It could be argued that police performance contributes to partnership performance anyway. This however raises the question of how individual organisations justify the weight of their contribution to the partnership targets? The key performance information for Devon and Cornwall police is as follows.

- Crime in 2012/13 down 6% compared to 2011/12 (Sorensen, 2013b, p.30)
- ASB reports down 22% in 2012/13 compared to 2011/12 (Sorensen, 2013b, p.30)
- 49% of people felt ASB had gone up a lot in England and Wales (Strickland et al, 2013, p.7)
- ASB remains a top concern for residents in Cornwall (Have your say survey) (Sorensen, 2013a, p.30)
- Reported ASB in February 2013 in Devon and Cornwall was 6539, in August 2013 it was at 7892 incidents (UK Crime Stats, 2013)

The SCP has its performance targets set across a wide range of agendas which are used to represent Cornwall Councils targets (see appendix B).

Having looked at internal and external factors relating to Cornwall Council and Devon and Cornwall Police the appropriate research approach and design must be accounted for in order to best answer the research question. What follows is an account of research method selection and design of both qualitative and quantitative research approaches. This will cover qualitative research design aimed at examining ASB cultural knowledge through strategic layers of each organisation as well as the quantitative analysis of ASB cultural knowledge amongst frontline ASB officers from both organisations.
Chapter 5 – Qualitative and Quantitative is it all in the mix?

With no prior literature about the strength of cultural knowledge relating to ASB in police/local authority, the research area would need to be assessed through preliminary analysis. This would look to provide insight and direction in answering the research question. These elements indicate the exploratory nature of this research, starting with a broad question and narrowing down as the research progresses (Robson, 2011, p.82). By the very nature of the ‘what is’ and ‘knowledge’ elements of the research question show a broadness of question. This requires some form of methodological framework that can reduce the question down into the identification of knowledge constructs and types.

An exploratory route is taken when the research problem is not understood (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2010, p.18), with descriptive and explanatory routes requiring structured rules and procedures to examine causal relationships. When knowledge is being examined this cannot be presented easily in a structured, statistical manner. How is it possible to define ‘what is’ in a measurement or variable when ‘what is’ is unknown? How is it possible to look at issue of culture and knowledge from a positivistic observational route when the phenomenon is not visible and the researcher is not immersed in the participant’s social construct?

The research approach to best answer the question is an inductive approach. Inductive data looks to provide preliminary insight into socially constructed phenomena through examination of discourse, interpretation, experience and effects of culture and knowledge. Criticism could be levelled at inductive approaches due to lack of conceptual frameworks, although a full account of interactions taking place in a social setting cannot be derived from a deductive, detached approach (Gill & Johnson, 2010, p.63). There has been a source of debate from some objectionists, who say that there are generic laws that govern human life so people can be studied in a scientific manner (Smith, 1983 p.7).

The qualitative – quantitative mix

Some see qualitative and quantitative research as not mutually exclusive, but occupying different ends of a continuum as opposed to being polar opposites
(Biggerstaff, 2012, p.7). The question is that if quantitative is at one end of a continuum and qualitative is at the other then what is in the middle? It is here where the third methodological movement of mixed methods research lies (Teddie & Tashakkori, 2003, p.17).

Whilst previously making clear my social constructionism view, there is the desire to design any research in a manner that will best answer the research question. Whilst some see neutrality as unachievable (Blair, 2005, p.244) the strategy for data collection has to fit with the time and resource constraints that influence the overall research approach. A qualitative / quantitative approach could be followed at this point. Investigating a non-observable phenomenon (cultural knowledge strength) would need a qualitative approach. This would enable the required depth of insight from participants in relation to their dynamic social settings. It is acknowledged though that some quantitative data collection methods, like questionnaires, can collect both quantitative (numerical scales) and qualitative (open questions) data from a large population in an efficient way.

The notion that qualitative and quantitative approaches cannot be used together is subject to increasing challenge (Onwuegbuziet & Leech, 2005, p.377; Sandelowski, Volis, & Knafl, 2009, p.209; Ridenour & Numan, 2008, p.16). With quantitative research emphasising greater replication and reliability of approach, qualitative researchers have rejected the positivistic approach. They see research as value based and impossible to separate self from what we know (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011, p.118). With the qualitative / quantitative debate being something that will always continue (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p.20), both approaches ultimately share a commitment to improve understanding and knowledge (Reichardt & Rallis, 1994, p.89; Biesta & Burbules, 2003, p.10).

Like Howe (1988, p.10), it is my belief that qualitative and quantitative approaches can be mixed. What is most important is the application of the best methods to get the best results (Mingers, 2001, p.244). It is with this in mind that I am applying a mixed methods approach to this research. Through rigor of research process, utilising such things as triangulation (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011, p.8; Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutman, & Handson, 2003, p.211), the combination of qualitative and
quantitative approaches will offset disadvantages of each single research option whilst also addressing practical constraints of the research situation.

**Qualitative research design**

The preliminary nature of the research question meant an inductive exploratory approach was taken. When designing the qualitative investigation a major influence on approach was resources and time. With a three month data gathering window it was essential the qualitative method fitted the time constraints as there was no opportunity to observe or investigate phenomena over a long period of time, discounting any form of longitudinal study.

A case study approach was also rejected as it is more suited to explanatory research, which looks to focus and explain the dynamics of a social setting at one point in time (Eisenhardt, 1989, p.534). The inductive, exploratory nature of the research question meant that grounded theory was also discounted. With grounded theory research being through the use of observation and action, it is somewhat at odds with the theory generating aims of the research (Gummesson, 2000, p.95).

Based on the time constraints and the requirement to collect data from different participants at different strategic layers semi-structured interviews were used (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, & Jackson, 2012, p.44). With ethnographic studies a traditional qualitative research approach (Patton, 2002, p.44), the very premise of the research question required involvement with participants in order to assess ASB cultural knowledge effects on the social dynamics of Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council in Cornwall.

To assess ASB cultural knowledge strength, the main method in determining this was through uniqueness or universality of response assessed through thematic discourse analysis. A framework was required to enable consistency of measurement and questions designed that were appropriate in gathering data that relates to each identified cultural knowledge grouping. This was an essential element in assessing how ASB cultural knowledge strength is constructed at different strategic layers of both organisations.
The issue of effectiveness of each cultural knowledge layer was something that needed investigation. Whilst uniqueness or universality of ASB cultural knowledge sets was a measure of strength or weakness, are some ASB cultural knowledge groupings potentially more effective than others? Denison (1990) effectiveness identifiers (EI) were seen to be an indicator of effective performance. With this in mind the research design and analysis was developed so that an indicative measure of effectiveness can be made through discourse analysis.

Consistency and effectiveness of ASB cultural knowledge are two key framing themes. Another question was in relation to assessing organisational clarity around ASB. Denison highlights that a shared system of values through high symbolic referencing (clarity) from the organisation assists in collective sense being made through the communication process (Denison, 1990, p.8). So in an ASB context clarity around ASB definitions and operations from the organisation would create greater consistency of operations and in turn performance. In the case of police officers, when faced with ambiguity and lack of clarity, they return to crime and law enforcement behaviour (Paoline, 2003, p.202).

With ASB not being the only business of Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council the level of ASB symbolic referencing was assessed. How consistent was the encoding and decoding of messages around ASB being received by members of the organisation? Within the research design a way of measuring the level of ASB symbolic referencing was used. This was in relation to what officers know, think they know and how much they referred back to the wider organisation and ‘core business’ when interpreting ASB situations.

The requirement was for a framework of ASB organisational cultural knowledge that could be analysed through discourse analysis. This was best served through a semi structured interview format. This negated some ethical issues around long term organisational access. Recapping on the previous discussion the three key framing themes that were investigated are:

- Universality or uniqueness of participants response in relation to ASB organisational cultural knowledge sets
- How effective each individual cultural knowledge set is
• How high is the ASB symbolic referencing (clarity) in each organisation

With a desire to give as much agency as possible for research participants, the question design ensured participants were not subject to a memory test around ASB. The aim was to find out individual interpretation of factors around ASB cultural knowledge on a cross sectional basis. There was also a requirement to have some sort of consistency measure for responses so they could be compared and contrasted against others for universality or uniqueness. These responses had to also be associated with identified cultural knowledge layers to examine consistency between such layers.

In order to achieve these requirements a semi structured interview format was used. The semi structured question framework for cultural knowledge provided a framework to measure the degree of uniqueness or universality of response through cultural knowledge sets. This cultural knowledge framework and measure was designed as part of the research methodology. The design of relevant question sets that can measure the strength of ASB cultural knowledge frames at different levels within Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council in Cornwall was also used.

**Cultural knowledge framework**

Before any questions were designed a cultural knowledge framework was constructed that accounted for different levels of collective macro organisational ASB cultural knowledge regarding ASB. The framework was also consistent and useable across both organisations to ensure consistency of measure. Again the work of both Sackmann (1991) and Denison (1990) are used to assist in this design.

Denison provides identifiable elements present within culture at a micro organisational level that would be indicators of organisational effectiveness. Sackmann looked to identify organisational collectivism on a macro organisational scale through four identified areas of organisational cultural knowledge. By taking the four cultural knowledge sets and also the elements present in culture that support effectiveness, a synthesised framework was constructed that was used to
assess degree of uniqueness or universality of organisational cultural knowledge sets as well as the effectiveness identifiers present in each set. This led to the synthesising of both Sackmann and Denison models, and how they are expressed, into a new framework, the SACKDEN cultural knowledge measure.

Table 5.0 Sackmann and Denison cultural knowledge and cultural effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure type</th>
<th>SACKmann cultural knowledge groupings</th>
<th>DENison Elements in culture that support effectiveness</th>
<th>Cultural knowledge identifier</th>
<th>Effectiveness identifier</th>
<th>Cultural Framework expression equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>Axiomatic / Mission</td>
<td>Why things are done the way they are</td>
<td>Clarity of goals and direction help structure behaviour</td>
<td>Business environment / values/beliefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recipe / Adaptability</td>
<td>What should be done</td>
<td>How internal structures and processes shift to match external environment</td>
<td>Rites, Rituals, Values, cause and effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Directory / Involvement</td>
<td>How things are done</td>
<td>Commitment to organisation</td>
<td>Cultural norms / rites / rituals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dictionary / Consistency</td>
<td>Definition and Labels</td>
<td>High levels of symbolic meaning</td>
<td>Hero’s and Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
does not tell us the effectiveness each one, only its presence in the organisation (which Sackmann has already identified for us!). Whilst degree of universality or uniqueness of themes in responses within each cultural knowledge level was a key measure, there were elements of Denison’s cultural effectiveness elements that were synthesised with like cultural knowledge levels. This provided a preliminary measure of effectiveness within each cultural knowledge set.

Table 5.1 Synthesis table in the construction of SACKDEN framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SACKDEN synthesis area</th>
<th>Axiomatic / Mission</th>
<th>Recipe / Adaptability</th>
<th>Directory / Involvement</th>
<th>Dictionary / Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Den micro level measurement</td>
<td>Individuals understand mission which gives purpose and meaning defining individual course of actions</td>
<td>Individuals feel organisation responds to external environment</td>
<td>That individuals are involved in shaping how things are done</td>
<td>That individuals have the same core values and beliefs that align to organisational need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals are goal directed</td>
<td>Flexibility is seen in structures and processes to respond to external and internal demands</td>
<td>That systems are felt to be implicit and involving</td>
<td>That it clear what individuals are aiming for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared definitions/function/purpose of organisation are clear amongst individuals</td>
<td>Belief that a culture exists that can influence adaption process and behaviours</td>
<td>Individuals able to act on values and traditions</td>
<td>That individuals feel that they behave and act in a manner that gets the job done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future perfect thinking is present amongst individuals based on sense of mission</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals integrated and involved as opposed to being subject to bureaucratic systems</td>
<td>What is expected of individuals performance is understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sack collective manifestations</td>
<td>Policy / Strategy / Structure consistent with goal and missions that is collectively consistent and understood by individuals</td>
<td>Collective experience and judgements influence and shape survival and success of organisation</td>
<td>Commonly held and consistent approaches to actions through team effort</td>
<td>Definitions and descriptions of organisational phenomena are collective in lexical knowledge and cultural terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SACKDEN construct provided the framework in the design of semi structured interview questions and analysis of responses. Information from the participant in relation to ASB cultural knowledge was assessed through thematic and discourse analysis. The amount, universality, uniqueness and density of micro level effectiveness identifiers present in responses was analysed for each macro cultural knowledge question set.

**Question design**

A critical factor in relation to the question design was that appropriate information is gathered that related to each area of the SACKDEN cultural knowledge framework. Equally as important was the order of which the questions were asked in relation to their cultural knowledge sets. With police and local authorities seen to have more top down structures, the assumption could be made that knowledge transfer also follows this path. With cultural knowledge strength having some dependence on alignment with the mission and goals of the organisation, the theoretical path of cultural knowledge transfer is axiomatically driven (top down prescriptive).

*Figure 5.0 Diagram to show theoretical direction of axiomatically driven knowledge transfer through strategic layers of hierarchical organisations like police and local authorities*
What the diagram demonstrates is that the more hierarchal the organisational push, the more the organisational information is forced through strategic layers. This means that the stronger organisational dictate that defines why things are the way they are, then the stronger push through different strategic layers. Whilst this could be seen as a way of creating consistency through high symbolic referencing, it could also constrain individual agency. This could see organisationally desirable answers being given as participants may feel subject to axiomatic pressure. The perception from participants could then be that any information that does not match the organisational line may result in some form of cost or disadvantage to them.

When looking at cultural knowledge sets, axiomatic knowledge is about how the organisation defines ASB through policy, practice and structures. This can be restrictive for participants who may be constrained in their answers feeling obligated to sing from the organisational hymn book. This was addressed by reversing the Sackmann cultural knowledge framework to mitigate effect of axiomatic constraints on participants.

**Figure 5.1 Diagram to show reversed organisational cultural knowledge question framework**

By reversing the Sackmann cultural knowledge framework, dictionary (definitions and labels), directory (how things are done) and recipe (what should be done)
question sets were asked before axiomatic ones. This enabled a better view of how a participant dictionary, directory and recipe ASB cultural knowledge sets aligned with the axiomatic questions and organisational mission. What this also did was to encourage more individualistic responses based on participant’s thoughts and perspectives. Starting with organisationally driven (axiomatic) questions would potentially lead to corridor answers which remain all the way through the question sets and affect the answers.

**Question construct**

The most important element in the semi structured interview question design was to gather data on the strength of each cultural knowledge set in relation to ASB. The strength of each set was determined through the amount of thematic universality or uniqueness in responses. The effectiveness was measured by the amount of micro level effectiveness identifiers (EI) present in each cultural knowledge set. Whilst the semi structured interview format enabled some control to assess cognitions through spoken language, it was assumed that participants also held a wide range of cultural knowledge. With this in mind it was important to create some issue focus questions that would narrow down issues and gave a consistent way of getting participants to differentiate issues in their cognitive structure.

**Introductory question set**

The introductory question set aimed to get participants talking about themselves and the organisation. This established rapport but also examined some general and extraneous variables about drivers / route into the job without direct questioning. This may have had some significance if length of service or career path has an effect on ASB cultural knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relationship to SACKDEN framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about you career with Devon and Cornwall Police / Cornwall Council Community Safety and how you arrived in the position you are in today?</td>
<td>Soft information on motivational elements on participants route into and through the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does your current role involve?</td>
<td>Soft information on role definition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dictionary question set (DIQS)

The DIQS looked to examine ASB knowledge at a descriptive level expressed through such things as values. However the questioning here had an issue focus asking the participant to name the two most important parts of their work and two most important changes their organisation has made in relation to ASB. By using issue focus questioning a better insight was given into what participants considered to be most important to them. This also provided a consistent measure throughout participant levels and cross organisationally of dictionary cultural knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relationship to dictionary/consistency level of the SACKDEN framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What made you join the police / Community safety?</td>
<td>Core value and belief: individual personal values and organisational commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you see as the two most important parts of police/ community safety work?</td>
<td>Core value and belief: Degree of universality expressed through individual values and how they align with organisational values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the two most important changes/innovations your organisation has made in relation to ASB in the last five years?</td>
<td>Organisational Phenomena: Conditions made for ASB goal achievement, structures that support goal achievement are collectively interpreted, collective focus on aspects considered important and emphasised by organisational members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think each of these was so important?</td>
<td>Organisational Phenomena: Alignment and checking collective clear goals and conditions that may favour achievement of organisational ASB goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directory question set (DRQS)

The directory question set looked at how ASB tasks were completed and how involved participants felt they were in formation of ASB activity within their
organisation. The aim was to see how universally cultural norms are expressed around ASB and the rituals that were performed around ASB task completion. The strength and effectiveness was assessed through presence of EI and the universality of thematic responses in this and other cultural knowledge sets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relationship to directory/involvement level of the SACKDEN framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going back to the ASB innovation/changes you mentioned, what do you think caused these changes/innovations?</td>
<td>Involvement: Examining drivers for change in relation to individual involvement and where the change drivers come from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who drives and champions change (ASB) in your organisation?</td>
<td>Involvement: Level of involvement and integration in changing and shaping how things are done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So tell me how is ASB dealt with in the day to day operations of the organisation?</td>
<td>Consistent approach: Involvement in ASB system, commonly held approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a consistent / common approach across the organisation?</td>
<td>Consistent approach: Perception of ASB consistency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recipe question set (REQS)**

The recipe question set established what should be done in relation to ASB and assesses response of the organisation to external factors. This was done by examining what participants felt the recipe is for successful ASB operations and how aligned this is with the current organisational operational set up. There was also a closed question to see if the participant felt that ASB is core business to their organisation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relationship to recipe/adaptability level of the SACKDEN framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you think ought to be done to improve how ASB is dealt with in your organisation?</td>
<td>Influence and experience: This is to establish individual perception of what needs to be improved in process and behaviours from current organisational operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that answer is what the organisations view is of what ought to be done?</td>
<td>Flexibility: This is to establish how much flex the organisational view is perceived to have against participant’s recipe for improvement / ability to influence process and behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were to conduct a tour of ASB operations in your organisation, which stops would you make and what would you avoid?</td>
<td>Experience and response to external environment: This is to gain insight on individual ASB recipe success and recipe failure so as to examine degree of universality or difference in what is perceived to be going right or wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see ASB as a job that should be dealt with by your organisation?</td>
<td>Judgement and flexibility: This is an examination of value base in relation to if ASB is seen as core business with appropriate ASB recipe in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Axiomatic question set (AXQS)**

This question set examined the shape and influence the organisation had in defining ASB practice. The questions examined the knowledge and influence of structures and processes that define why things are done the way they are. The question set looked to see how aligned and aware participants were of structures, strategies and processes set down by the organisation and their alignment with organisational mission. Also consistency of definitions, functions and purpose of the organisation was also assessed amongst participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relationship to axiomatic/mission level of the SACKDEN framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going back to the ASB change/innovation you identified earlier, do you feel those changes/innovation align with the organisation's mission?</td>
<td>Symbolic referencing: Awareness of organisational mission and awareness of structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways does the organisation define what ASB is to you and what influence does this have on operational practice?</td>
<td>Symbolic referencing: Clarity of structures/mechanisms/strategies/definition regarding ASB and alignment with operational practice to determine awareness and consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What ways does the organisation guide and support you in dealing with ASB?</td>
<td>Symbolic referencing: Why things are done the way they are in the organisation, looking a structural and policy clarity, consistency and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you do differently in relation to ASB in the organisation to improve performance/make the future better?</td>
<td>Future perfect thinking: Looking at aspirations in relation to ASB in comparison with organisational reality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative analysis methods**

As previously discussed, the language used in responses to the questions was analysed against the SACKDEN framework. This is facilitated through the use of digital recordings and transcriptions of each interview. There are many approaches to analysis of language in qualitative research (Rapley, 2010, p.274) which occur within the context of the research as opposed to a standard setting or format (Wertz et al, 2011, p.6). With linguistic structures forming social life (Burr, 2003, p.21) different cultures are seen to also have a difference in how they use and express themselves through language (Paltridge, 2012, p.5). Within the context of this research the following areas of information and analysis type were used.
Table 5.2 Table to show analysis method relating to participant response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Analysis method</th>
<th>Data required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACK cultural knowledge sets</td>
<td>Thematic analysis</td>
<td>Universality or uniqueness of responses to establish ASB cultural knowledge strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEN effectiveness identifiers</td>
<td>Key word and Synonyms analysis</td>
<td>Density of effectiveness identifier key words / synonyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic referencing</td>
<td>‘Refer back’ thematic count</td>
<td>Amount of times participant refers back to wider organisation when responding to ASB questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic referencing</td>
<td>‘I think / I know’ thematic count</td>
<td>Amount of times participant says they think / know when responding to ASB questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to ASB cultural knowledge sets universality (thematic consistency) or uniqueness (thematic inconsistency) through strategic levels is a fundamental measure. With thematic analysis not having clear guidelines, the use of SACKDEN acted as a framework to analyse themes relating to ASB cultural knowledge sets. This also went some way to rebuffing the qualitative research critique of ‘anything goes’ (Antaki, Billing, Edwards, & Potter, 2002, p.2).

Using the SACKDEN question set frame work a thematic grid was constructed using an excel spread sheet for each organisation. This listed the participant code across the top and then each question set area was listed down the side. With the grid formed each transcript relating to the individual participant was analysed and the key themes relevant to the question asked were extracted. This enabled a key thematic grid to be formed which enabled horizontal and lateral thematic comparison and so give a clear indication of thematic consistency or inconsistency which could be pinpointed to specific strategic layers. In addition the key word analysis, refer back count and ‘I think’ and ‘I know’ were also added into the thematic grid enabling synthesis of all qualitative information being examined.

In looking to identify effectiveness of ASB cultural knowledge groupings the amount of key words and their synonyms contained within participant answers at all levels was also analysed. The SACK collective manifestations were used to analyse the
key identifiers of cultural knowledge sets. The DEN micro level measurements were used to establish the key word identification table (Appendix A). The aim was to look at density of key words and also prevalent themes of the most consistent key words used amongst participants. With this conventional approach (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, p.1279) the aim was to see density and thematic patterns relating to effectiveness words spoken. The SACKDEN framework and the DEN keyword table (Appendix A) provided structure for the analysis.

Cultural difference in language can account for variation in the way things are done (Paltridge, 2012, p.5). This is an important factor in relation to consistency of ASB message decoding and encoding amongst organisational members. The level of symbolic referencing in an organisation is in effect how clearly the mission and goals of the organisation are defined and embedded within the fabric of the organisation. As discussed previously officers (police) return to core business (crime) when faced with uncertainty or lack of clarity. With primary ASB responsibility sitting with Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Fire and Rescue Service it could be said that both organisations have a core business of crime and fire.

To assess the level of ASB symbolic referencing from both organisations analysis of participant responses was undertaken on two levels. In response to questions about ASB, participant replies were examined to assess how much they refer to core businesses or the wider organisation when answering ASB questions. The more a participant ‘refers back’ in order to make sense of ASB may indicate lower symbolic referencing and greater ASB uncertainty. The refer back analysis was not applied to questions that specifically asked about the wider organisation.

ASB symbolic referencing relating to what officers says they know and what they think they know is also an indicator that may have a relationship with organisational clarity around ASB. If there is high symbolic clarity of ASB mission and goals then more ‘knowing’ would be expected within strategic layers of the organisation. Where a participant may have less clarity then they may ‘think’ they know which indicates less certainty. Significance and presence within both organisations was examined.
**Trustworthiness and authenticity**

Concern has been expressed at the goodness of qualitative research approaches (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p.39). Non-standard research methods are not intended to be replicated as they are subject to a continually constructed and re-constructed social world. Lincoln and Guba (1985, p.43) demonstrate criteria that correspond to validity methods typically employed by quantitative methods in a qualitative method format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.3 Quantitative and Qualitative corresponding validity methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semi structured question design was carefully constructed into cultural knowledge sets. This was in order to gather data on specific areas of cultural knowledge that could then be applied to the SACKDEN framework for analysis. Through ontological and epistemological reflection the best method had been designed to inform the research question. The design and use of the SACKDEN cultural knowledge question sets ensured that transferability of questions were maintained across all interviews and asked in the same order.

Consideration was given to local conditions by conducting interviews at the home workplace of participants. Also interviews were not scheduled on a Friday to avoid issues of respondent fatigue and the ‘Friday effect’. Questions were asked with the same format and emphasis as far as reasonably possible. Whilst the questions are grouped into specific sets they were designed in an open format to enhance confirmability. Interviewer bias was also considered and best efforts made to maintain empathic neutrality throughout interviews. The data in the form of responses to questions came from the participants whilst empathic neutrality was observed (Patton, 2002, p.48).
Fairness and ontological authenticity were considered in question design. The questions are relevant to participants across all strategic levels of both Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council and applicable to Cornwall only. This made questions no less exclusive to senior staff as it would be to operational staff. The questions enabled individual social interpretation and understanding of cultural knowledge issues. The educational authenticity assessed how ASB cultural knowledge is constructed across all levels of both organisations.

Participant experience of research interviews had to be positive, relevant and not detrimental. Considering time and resource constraints, participants had been reduced down to the most relevant in each organisation based on ASB strategic, management or operational responsibility. Within Cornwall Council the Community Safety service in Cornwall Fire and Rescue had the most direct remit for ASB. The Chief Fire Officer and Deputy Chief Fire Officer chair the Safer Cornwall Partnership and act as head of Community Safety respectively. The participant focus within Devon and Cornwall Police was on neighbourhood police teams in Cornwall who have the most day to day operational exposure to ASB. Neighbourhood officers were likely to have greater experience of dealing with ASB as opposed to response or patrol officers who may respond to ASB incidents but would not have in depth involvement.

Getting data from different layers of each organisation was critical in examining the ASB cultural knowledge consistency. This was achieved through strategic layer operational structures in the identification of universal or unique thematic elements of ASB cultural knowledge. With the intention of cross organisational comparison, an organisational strategic layer consistency table for both Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council had been constructed to allow for relevant level comparison by strategic layers.
Table 5.4 Organisational strategic layer consistency table for Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D+C Police (Cornwall only)</th>
<th>Intended number of participants</th>
<th>Cornwall Council</th>
<th>Intended number of participants</th>
<th>Equivalency criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Superintendent (Strategic Level 4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chief Fire Officer (Strategic Level 4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Area Command / CSP chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent / Geographic inspector (Strategic Level 3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Fire Officer / Senior Manager (Strategic Level 3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Area Strategic Management / Head of Community Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector / Strategic co-ordinator (Strategic Level 2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strategic delivery officers (Strategic Level 2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Area ops management / strategic delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Sergeant / officer (Strategic Level 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Operational Manager / officer (Strategic Level 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Operational management / frontline delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The framework was designed to make best cross organisational comparisons of strategic layers based on organisational responsibility and role equivalency. Through purposeful sampling, participants were selected based on strategic layer they occupy. The numbers of intended participants was dictated by the total number of individuals at each strategic level (eg: there is only one Chief Superintendent / Chief Fire Officer in the top strategic layer but higher numbers of operational officers at lower strategic layers).
It is acknowledged that purposive sampling may not be seen as representative of the total population. This research is a preliminary study into ASB cultural knowledge which looked to obtain deep, rich data through an amalgamation of methods to enhance credibility (for example using a quantitative survey to reach high numbers of operational officers which interviews cannot due to time and resource constraints). The influence of time and resources was the consistent factor in choice and design of the selected data collection tools.

Whilst it is difficult to conduct research without ethical arguments (Coolican, 2014, p.294), such issues looked to be addressed through the construction of the research methodology. There were no covert intentions and the parameters of interviews were clearly stated up front. Letters and consent forms were used to fully explain the research purpose, parameters of interviews and that participation was voluntary. With voluntary informed consent a follow up communication and interview schedule was constructed outlining participants right to privacy and data collected would stay inside the research aims (Zikmund, 2003, p.79). Explicit reference was made to the anonymous nature of the information and how data is stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

**Interview preparation**

Before the interview situations commenced there were several preparatory tasks that were completed. There were aimed at creating the best experience for participants and researcher. To help achieve this McManara (2009) presents eight principles of interview preparation:

1. Choose a setting with little distraction
2. Clearly explain the purpose of the interview
3. Confidentiality explained and acknowledged
4. Explain format the interview will take
5. Explain and consider length of time of interview
6. Ensure researcher contact details are given
7. As if there are any questions before commencement of interview
8. Do not count on memory recall answers
In relation to point 1 it was the participant's choice of home interview location or neutral venue. Points 2 and 6 were covered in the introductory letter and also reiterated at the start of each interview, as was point 7. In relation to point 8 a digital recorder was used as opposed to reliance on notes. Participants were fully aware of the audio recorder use and its use was agreed as part of signing the consent form. Participants were reminded of the audio recording at commencement of interview. All audio recordings were transcribed in semi intelligent transcription format enabling discourse and other analysis to take place.

**Quantitative research design**

The quantitative approach was used to gather data from a large number of frontline officers. A qualitative approach, like semi structured interviews, would have taken too long to complete and was not suited to resource and time constraints. The semi structured interviews examined the degree of thematic universality or uniqueness in relation to ASB cultural knowledge at different organisational strategic layers. The quantitative approach looked at the degree of universality or uniqueness in relation to ASB cultural knowledge 'left to right' across frontline officers in Cornwall. This gave a measure of how consistent ASB cultural knowledge is amongst frontline officers. This includes mission and goal alignment as well as interpretation and clarity around ASB.

What the above equates to is a general set of concerns as opposed to a specific hypothesis relating to ASB cultural knowledge of frontline officers who deal with ASB.

- That ASB cultural knowledge has a high degree of thematic uniqueness across frontline organisational members in Cornwall
- That a high degree of thematic uniqueness exists in interpretation and approach towards ASB amongst frontline officers in Cornwall
- That there is a low degree of thematic universality in interpretation and approach towards ASB amongst frontline officers in Cornwall
Quantitative research approach

In its broadest sense a research approach needs to address concerns raised from a ‘what things are like’ perspective (De-Vaus, 2013, p.18). Having established concerns in relation to ASB cultural knowledge, the approach moved from general concerns to specifics. The essential requirement was to use the most appropriate method to best answer the research question. This meant turning down the social constructivist ‘voice’ whilst looking to usher in a deductive quantitative research approach.

The approach required was aligned more with descriptive than explanatory research as it was more relevant to the accurate profiling of persons, events or situations and the basis for generating sound theory (Robson, 2011, p.324). The concerns expressed needed to be subjected to some form of test that measured cause and effect. This would determine the conformation or dismissal of concerns. This aligned with descriptive research as it involved the collation of such data in order to test concerns about the state of participants in the study.

With descriptive studies utilising statistics in the presentation of information (Collis & Hussey, 2009, p.221); logical relationships would have to be established between concerns and concepts. In order to move from the general to specific, a deductive approach would help in taking concerns in order to shape research design. Deductive research is more dominant in natural sciences, where laws provide the basis for explanation through highly structured methodologies. Deductive, descriptive research aligns to a more positivistic approach. This is where social realities are observed, creating law like generalisations akin to those in the natural sciences (Remenyi, Williams, Money, & Swartz, 1998, p.32).

Positivistic beliefs are centred on human behaviour being independent, with logical reasoning adopted by objectivity. This is seen to replace hunches or intuition found in qualitative research methods (Collis & Hussey, 2009, p.56). By employing a research approach allowing researcher independence from the social situation meant that my own presence would have no effect on the research site (Remenyi, Williams, Money, & Swartz, 1998, p.33). Whilst descriptive deductive studies are seen unable to account for the interactions and complexities of a social setting,
interpretivism is seen as having no clear methods for information analysis (Robson, 2011, p.93). This again is at opposites with the deductive descriptive approach which looks to use replication to check validity through detached observation (Gill & Johnson, 2010, p.13).

**Research method**

As with the qualitative research element, time and resource constraints had a determining factor on the research method chosen. With several data collection methods available like experimental studies, structured observations, questionnaires and structured interviews, the most appropriate approach was used that best answered the research question within research constraints.

Experimental studies were seen as positivist methodology (Collis & Hussey, 2009, p.74) with high levels of objectivity and generalisability. This approach was rejected for this study. With confounding variables more difficult to control due to the nature of a natural setting, the population needs to be subject to some kind of experimental condition. When looking at ASB cultural knowledge it is impossible to manipulate independent variables to observe the effect on cultural knowledge. Cultural knowledge is not physically observable and so effects of manipulation cannot be seen. This was also why structured observations were rejected.

In considering structured interviews the standard format of questions had the advantage of uniformity of approach, better facilitating replication across all interview participants. Also considered was the issue of researcher characteristics and socially desirable answers. This may cause the social situation not to be accurately reflected by participants. This coupled with the amount of time large numbers of interviews would take led to this method being rejected.

The short time frame of the research eliminated the use of a longitudinal study (Adams & Schvandevelt, 1991, p.116). A cross sectional approach would allow large amounts of data could be gathered in an economical way by adopting self-completed questionnaire. With no interviewer effect in relation to their completion, self-completed questionnaires gave greater objectivity with answers used for statistical analysis. Questions were structured to examine ASB cultural knowledge
sets as well as ASB interpretation. With descriptive surveys being ideal to measure opinion and behaviours (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009, p.1) consideration was given to the issue of low response rates to questionnaires and amount of questions asked.

**Research design**

Before moving onto the physical design of a self-completed questionnaire the concerns expressed about ASB cultural knowledge were reduced into simpler components. The concerns were.

- That ASB cultural knowledge has a high degree of thematic uniqueness across frontline organisational members in Cornwall
- That a high degree of thematic uniqueness exists in interpretation and approach towards ASB amongst frontline officers in Cornwall
- That there is a low degree of thematic universality in interpretation and approach towards ASB amongst frontline officers in Cornwall

To test these concerns the above was reduced into a singular theory which would either be confirmed or rejected by the data gathered. The data would also be triangulated with the qualitative data to provide more information about the overall research. The reduction of concerns into a single theory also allowed for the research to be completed within the resource constraints.

The theory was that ASB cultural knowledge amongst frontline officers has a high degree of thematic uniqueness. This creates inconsistency with organisational goals and mission. The following hypothesis gives a starting point in variable identification and gives focus to question design.

\[ H_0 \quad \text{That ASB cultural knowledge has high thematic universality across frontline officers in Cornwall} \]

\[ H_1 \quad \text{That ASB cultural knowledge has low thematic universality across frontline officers in Cornwall} \]
Reliability and validity factors

Within any questionnaire design, considerable thought had gone into making it a reliable and valid data collection method. With that in mind a tailored question set design was used to improve data quality (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009, p.16). Regard was given to the issue of inter-observer validity as some researcher interpretation (for example which collected data relates to each ASB cultural knowledge set) needed to be made, which another researcher may not interpret in the same way. With this particular research being a preliminary investigation that has never previously been done, no precedents had been set.

The SACKDEN reversed cultural knowledge framework enabled pre-classification of questions into cultural knowledge sets. This gives clarity of what data was required from each question and which questions link to which cultural knowledge set. The SACKDEN framework provided greater consistency towards question response and so increases consistency of interpretation through the reduction of subjective interpretations.

With issues as observer bias or participant error being examples of threats to reliability (Robson, 2002, p.87), giving respondent’s sufficient time to complete the questionnaire would reduce participant error. A tick/circle box response to questions was used. This re-enforced confidence and trust in responses by making the questionnaire easy to complete with increased anonymity for respondents (due to no handwriting). Additionally a consistent design and layout of question sets with a neutral voice would address participant bias issues. The questions were designed so as not to give the feel of a knowledge test. This could have promoted socially desirable answers if participants felt that there was a right and wrong answer and in turn may disadvantage the participant in some form.

The questionnaire surveyed frontline officers in Cornwall who had consistent dealing with ASB as part of their operational duties. There were however significant differences in the number of frontline neighbourhood police officers/PCSOs in Cornwall against the number of ASB staff in Cornwall Council. For the purposes of generalisability all respondents were classified as frontline officers. PCSOs,
Neighbourhood Police Officers and Cornwall Council ASB officers used the same ASB system and had the same access to ASB tools and powers.

Continuing on validity issues, attention was also paid to the critical concern of response rates to questionnaires (Baruch & Holtom, 2008, p.1140). If there are not enough responses, then the opinions of those who responded can be accounted for but it cannot be concluded that it is the opinion of the whole population for both organisations. With assumptions made of minimum and acceptable response rates there are no specific rules governing this, other than the more the better (Dennis, 2003, p.280). Bryman (2012, p.235) offers some comfort in this area by saying that a great deal of published research achieves low response rates (below 30%). It is critical to recognise and acknowledge the implications of a low response rate within the research content. Patton (2002, p.245) backs this up by seeing validity as more to do with the data collected rather than the size of the sample.

The aim was for as high a response rate as possible. In order to improve response rates a postal questionnaire was not used. Whist an electronic survey seemed like a viable option, due to the security of IT systems within Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council it was difficult to arrange within the timescales of the research.

Due to the shift work nature of the population to be surveyed, a personal post and return system (drop and pick method) was used. The questionnaires were posted into each officer’s personal ‘skippet’ area which is an area for paperwork and correspondence. This meant that the participant would not have to invest time in searching for an online survey for example. The questionnaire was delivered direct to the participants own work area. The questionnaire was in an envelope marked confidential and had a covering letter explaining the research purpose and confidentiality of response. Voluntary participation was also emphasised to try and avoid any coercive connotations. The University of Portsmouth logo was used on the questionnaires to promote a neutral stance and give credibility to the questionnaire.

The method of return was for the participant to be given four weeks to complete the questionnaire from the date of the covering letter. The letter explained that once
completed the sealed envelope should be returned into the collection bin located in the relevant police station / council building. This enabled easier collection and encouraged more responses by making it easy for the participant to return the survey with little cost in time to them.

The questionnaire design and method of distribution all had the aim of improving the response rate to the questionnaire. By making the questionnaire clear, consistent, not too long with easy access and return, it was anticipated that this would enhance responses from the sample population. Acknowledgement was also given towards the fact that both Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council were facing huge resource and financial challenges. These conditions create an uncertain environment in which participants had to operate in. By designing the questionnaire with care as opposed to making it long and onerous, it had the intention of keeping participants motivated to reply in light of an uncertain organisational environment.

Sample
The target population and sample of the questionnaire is summarised as:

Table 5.5 Summary of research population and sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Operational Officers from Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample frame</td>
<td>Frontline Operational officers from Devon and Cornwall Police (Cornwall Only) and Cornwall Council with primary role function to deal with ASB (Cornwall only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Method</td>
<td>Non Probability convenience sampling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst the population was seen as frontline ASB staff, the sample that was being surveyed is Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council. The research focus was on Cornwall only and results will not apply to Devon. By doing this it made the research a bigger study in a smaller environment and is consummate with resources available. The segments of each organisation to be investigated were based on primary role function to deal with ASB. The sample frame investigated was frontline ASB officers within Cornwall.
The sampling method used was non-probability convenience sampling due to the selection of the above officers over others. Being a lone researcher with stringent resource limitations did not deterred from the selection of the most sensible sampling approach that is eminently do-able in the study of two sizeable, socially complex organisations (Robson, 2011, p.48). With probability sampling frequently avoided due to heavy resource demands (Bryman, 2012, p.202) non-probability sampling was suited to smaller scale surveys such as this (Robson, 2011, p.274). Also there was no intention of making statistical generalisations beyond the questionnaire sample in this preliminary investigation.

In the face of a large study as a lone researcher only covering Cornwall, strict random sampling frames through police and council organisations were not viable due amount of resource and size of the organisations. However convenience sampling has prominence in forming the basis for social research, which suits preliminary analysis (Bryman, 2012, p.202). Also as a researcher access had been negotiated to information that was too good to let go in providing justification for future research.

It is acknowledged that with convenience sampling inferences are limited to the selected sample and not the whole population. In mitigation the majority of the total population of both organisations do not have to deal with ASB. This does not mean that they will have no opinion on the subject. In the context of this research it is my judgement that preliminary investigation into ASB cultural knowledge was better addressed by being specific to those who have a primary frontline ASB function, as they will be the most likely holders of such knowledge.

By specifically targeting ASB frontline officers in Cornwall through convenience sampling, homogenous groupings of ASB background, experience and position through officers working together was a positive (Robson, 2011, p.295). With consistency of ASB cultural knowledge being a key measure amongst different organisational groupings, specifically selecting ASB frontline officer grouping had best fit with the research aims of establishing ASB cultural knowledge consistency (strength) amongst strategic and operational groupings.
Due to being a lone researcher only able to cover Cornwall, the sample was targeted in order to get the best data to answer the research question. Whilst convenience samples are not generalisable across the whole population, it does not mean it should not be used. In fact by being clear and explicit about my use of convenience sampling, which is not to be used to represent statistical generalisation, would not cause misrepresentation which has been a prevalent issue amongst research (Robson, 2011, p.275).

The total sample and response rates to the questionnaire are broken down as follows.

Table 5.6 Questionnaire response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Total number of frontline ASB officers in sample</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devon and Cornwall Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon BCU</td>
<td>256**</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall BCU</td>
<td>144*</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon and Cornwall Local authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon council employed ASB officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Council employed ASB officers</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined frontline total Cornwall</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*numbers subject to fluctuation due to police re-organisation
^does not include Plymouth BCU
**numbers subject to fluctuation due to council re-organisation

The above shows that from two large organisations with over 20,000 employees, a full sample of council ASB officers in Cornwall had been obtained, even though numbers are small. Also almost half of all relevant police officers in Cornwall had responded to the questionnaire. With the results not being applied to Devon, focusing the research on Cornwall gave more weight as it was a bigger study in a smaller environment.

Nearly 50% of all identified officers in Cornwall responded making this research far more useful to Cornwall. As a lone researcher, resource limitations have dictated
the sampling approach being the most do-able with emphasis on the importance of data collected rather than the sample size (Patton, 2002, p.245). A large amount of published research has response rates below 30% (Bryman, 2012, p.235).

The intention of the questionnaire was to obtain combined understanding of ASB cultural knowledge across frontline ASB officers in Cornwall only, not to separate and compare frontline officers into their respective organisational camps. The premise of the research lead to police and council being selected as organisations due to their statutory responsibility to work together on crime, disorder and ASB issues under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. ASB frontline operations should theoretically have a degree of collectivity, with homogenised mission, aims, values and operational approaches towards ASB. Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council share the same ASB process, locations (police stations) and legislation, so there was a degree of operational collectiveness which supports combined frontline analysis.

The premise of the quantitative research was to offer preliminary insight into collective ASB cultural knowledge strength of police and council ASB officers in Cornwall. Also it looked to establish collective opinion as a ‘group’ as opposed to a comparative between the two organisational frontlines. Additionally low numbers of specific ASB officers from Cornwall Council (4) would have presented issues around obtaining valid results if separated out due to volatility of low numbers.

**Ethics**

Whist survey type research is not face to face with participants, behaviour of researchers can still have effect on social norms like coercive questionnaire design. From the outset the intention was not to force questionnaire completion through any hierarchical or rank involvement within each organisation. Explicit reference was made to participation being entirely voluntary. In relation to data analysis there was no regard given to selectiveness about data or misrepresentation of statistical accuracy (Zikmund, 2000, p.77). Prior to the research commencing ethical approval was sought from Portsmouth University.
The survey of frontline ASB staff was an anonymous survey that was a tick/circle response type so as to minimise writing and promote completion. The method of return was a deposit in a secure box at the work location of the participants. The survey did not identify name to ensure anonymity. Regard was given to my consistent operational relationship with frontline officers. By using a survey instead of interview my position as a researcher was more distance from respondents. This looked to mitigate bias or socially acceptable answers due to any influence my presence may have had on participants.

**Questionnaire design**

The design, validity and ethical consideration have been instrumental in shaping the physical questionnaire design. The purpose of the questionnaire was to gather data on the four areas of ASB cultural knowledge using the SACKDEN cultural knowledge framework. This looked to establish universality or uniqueness of ASB cultural knowledge amongst frontline officers. The overall question sets took the following format based on the reversed SACKDEN framework.

- **QSET0** Length of service
- **QSET1** Dictionary Cultural Knowledge
- **QSET2** Directory/Recipe Cultural Knowledge
- **QSET3** Axiomatic Cultural Knowledge

With the questions looking to define ASB organisational cultural knowledge in respects of consistency, the question sets were designed to explore data that was relevant to each section of the framework. This ensured that the relevant cultural knowledge area was being measured and irrelevant questions excluded (which also assists in reducing the length of the questionnaire). The same reversed organisational cultural knowledge framework was applied so that organisationally weighted questions were asked last. The questions were also subject to codification, with likert scale responses mixed in to gain data on attitudes and opinions.
QSET0: Length of service

This first question set is the nominal measurement of participant characteristics in relation to service length. As this is nominal there is no value attached but used to look at categorisation of respondents. This facilitates any universality/uniqueness in ASB cultural knowledge and it’s correlation with the dependent variable of service length. A linear tick box format was used as opposed to a top to bottom format so as not to imply that possible responses at the top were more important than ones at the bottom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service length in years</th>
<th>Under 2</th>
<th>2 to 5</th>
<th>More than 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QSET1: Dictionary

The dictionary question set looked to gain data on what was done in the organisation in relation to ASB. The laterally designed questions looked to examine how standard incident types were interpreted by respondents. Some of the incident types had a greater ASB weighting, some were more crime weighted and some a mix of both. This was to see how individual respondents defined the same 'issues' to examine thematic universality or uniqueness across officers in interpretation of incidents and what is considered crime or ASB. This also had relevance to organisational clarity and symbolic referencing around ASB.
The next set of questions explored how much value individuals placed on things like their role and the importance of ASB in their organisation. The likert questions looked to have a balance of positive and negative statements with a consistent order of response categories to avoid confusion.

What two things do you feel are the most important elements of your work?

Community Safety
Tackling Crime
Anti-Social Behaviour
Dealing with victims
Crime / ASB prevention
Other (please specify) ..........................
Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following

**Dealing with ASB is equally as important as dealing with crime**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Interval value question that measures importance and value of ASB vs Crime)*

**My organisation has made important changes in how ASB is dealt with**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Interval value question in relation to if the individual sees organisational importance attached to ASB)*

**My organisation does not make it clear how ASB should be dealt with**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Interval label question to see how much the organisation defines ASB through such things as procedures for example)*

**QSET2 Directory/Recipe**

This question set looked to establish how participants deal with a particular incident by looking at the type of action they would take in a situation. This was to examine
how participants view the way things should be dealt as well as any ritualistic type behaviours in a task completion context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>ASB warning</th>
<th>Criminal Sanction</th>
<th>Refer to other section</th>
<th>No action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour dispute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Nuisance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions looked at how much organisational influence there was on task completion relating to ASB.

**Where do you feel your knowledge of dealing with anti-social behaviour comes from?**

- On the job
- Colleagues
- Management
- Organisational training
- Self Taught
- Other (please specify)
Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following

**My organisation drives change in relation to how we deal with ASB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interval directory action by organisation or more feeling of individual action*

**ASB is dealt with the same way across all areas of my organisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interval directory opinion of universality of task completion / knowledge application*

**Dealing with ASB is not the job of my organisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recipe interval what should be done is ASB part of the organisations business*
All officers deal with ASB in the same way

(Question interval universality of do all officers do what should be done)

QSET3 Axiomatic

The question set design looked to gather data on how much the organisation creates ASB presence through guidance and policy in the shaping of ASB operational activity. The vertical sharing of organisational axioms would indicate greater alignment with organisational ASB objectives.

How aware are you of your organisation's mission statement in relation to ASB?

Very Aware ☐ Not Aware ☐
I think I know ☐ No mission statement ☐
Not Sure ☐ for ASB ☐

(To assess overall awareness of organisational mission statement)

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following.

My organisation is clear in its guidance and procedures for dealing with ASB

(Question interval axiomatic awareness of structural and process provision and consistency)
Changes made by organisation in relation to ASB have made real improvements

(Axiomatic aspirations of individual are met through organisational change and drive in why things are the way they are)

My organisation guides and supports me in how to deal with ASB

(Axiomatic influence on individual as a direct influence on individual action)

Which organisation does more to tackle ASB?

Police □ Cornwall Council □ Equal partnership □

(To assess individual organisational view of where weight of action lies in relation to ASB)

The qualitative and quantitative data collection methods are both based on the SACKDEN cultural knowledge framework which looked to provide a consistent measure of ASB cultural knowledge for both research approaches.

Quantitative analysis methods

Overall the analysis of data from the questionnaires was subject to univariate and bivariate analysis. Univariate analysis in this instance was through the use of charts, such as bar and pie, to illustrate the size of different response categories.
Also question category response consistency was also examined. This was especially critical where a respondent identifies a particular incident as a crime for example. Logical consistency would dictate that that a respondent would use a criminal sanction to deal with incident they see as a crime, however this was not assumed.

The main bivariate analysis was focused on the likert scale responses. Whilst it could be said the variables are ordinal, it is also argued that they can be treated as interval / ratio variables (Bryman, 2012, p.335). In order to establish if there are any relationships between likert scale variables, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used. If for example respondents feel that the organisation is clear on its guidance and procedures around ASB, how strong was the relationship with respondents feeling the organisation guiding and supporting in how to deal with ASB? Also how much variation in a variable is due to another variable was expressed through using a coefficient of determination drawn from the Pearson’s data.

Finally it was acknowledged that the sample selection has been purposeful based on relevance to ASB in Cornwall. Both Cornwall Council and Devon and Cornwall Police are large multi-functional organisations with departments and functions that have no dealings with ASB. However due to the purposive sampling of the population being investigated, it is acknowledged that any ASB inference can only be applied to the population being sampled and not the organisations as a whole. Also any results were applicable to Cornwall only with Devon not included.

Having extensively accounted for the research approach, design, methodology and analysis, results of the ASB cultural knowledge findings follow in the next chapter. These findings are structured in line with the four cultural knowledge sets of the SACKDEN cultural knowledge framework, covering both organisations strategic layers as well as the collective frontline officer response. Key findings will be presented relating to ASB cultural knowledge strength. Also strategic layer cultural knowledge effectiveness results are also presented alongside assessment of symbolic referencing analysis.
Chapter 6 Research findings and results

As discussed in the previous section the data collection methods have comprised of qualitative semi structured interviews at four strategic layers of both Devon and Cornwall Police (Cornwall only) and Cornwall Council. A quantitative questionnaire was distributed across the operational frontline in relation to ASB. Each data collection approach had been designed to gather data on both cultural knowledge and effectiveness identifiers at strategic layers within both organisations. The overall aim is obtain preliminary data to inform thematic universality (strength) or uniqueness (weakness) of organisational cultural knowledge regarding ASB.

The results of the research will be structured in the following manner:

- Axiomatic results of Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall council strategic layers and frontline officers in Cornwall only
- Recipe results of Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall council strategic layers and frontline officers in Cornwall only
- Directory results of Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall council strategic layers and frontline officers in Cornwall only
- Dictionary results of Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall council strategic layers and frontline officers in Cornwall only
- Effectiveness identifier (EI) key word results
- Symbolic referencing through ‘refer back’ and ‘I think/I know’ results

As previously discussed the SACKDEN cultural knowledge framework is the key anchor in research design and analysis of responses. The SACK element is used to identify collective ASB cultural knowledge areas. The DEN element is used to establish density of EI key words (Appendix A) appropriate to each of the collective cultural knowledge sets (strategic layers only). ASB symbolic referencing is examined through identifying ‘I think’ and ‘I know’ use in participant responses (strategic layers only) and also the amount of times participants ‘refer back’ to crime/fire or wider the wider organisation when answering ASB questions (strategic layers only).

The analytical methods used in the interpretation of data collected are as follows.
Thematic analysis and comparison of strategic layers cultural knowledge responses to questions

Assessment of thematic universality or uniqueness of responses through thematic comparison within each organisation and collectively

Analysis and thematic identification of EI primary key words and synonyms in responses to each cultural knowledge question set

Symbolic reference analysis through analysis of organisational clarity relating to ASB based on amount of 'I think' or 'I know' responses to questions

Symbolic referencing analysis through the amount of times respondents refer back to either crime/fire or the wider organisation when answering ASB questions

Univariate analysis using charts to illustrate the size of different response categories and what size responses are of the total sample relating to question responses (frontline responses)

Bivariate analysis focused on the likert scale responses to establish relationships between likert scale variables using Pearson Correlation Coefficient and Coefficient of Determination (frontline responses)

The results from analysed data will be compared and contrasted within and across both organisations based on their joint ASB responsibility under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

Participant classification

The participants in the research were made up of purposely selected participants at equivalent strategic layers of both Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall council. The strategic layers were given a number to identify the level of the strategic layer.
In relation to Level 2 respondents of Devon and Cornwall Police it is noted that there are four participants in this category. The original intention was to have three respondents at this level to match numbers with Cornwall Council. A participant who was not selected at this level asked to be part of the research and so was included. Whilst the ‘extra voice’ would have little effect on thematic results, consideration is given to results where quantity analysis is undertaken. Should there be significant inconsistency in any quantity analysis between Level 2 of Cornwall Council and Level 2 of Devon and Cornwall Police then this issue will be a consideration.

The quantitative survey of frontline ASB officers of both organisations is taken from a combined Cornwall only Neighbourhood Police / ASB case worker population of 148. 68 out of 144 police frontline ASB officers responded (47%) and 4 out of 4 council ASB officers (100%) This gave a total of 72 responses making the overall combined return rate of 49%. It has already been acknowledged that the sample has been selected due to primary responsibility for ASB operations on a daily basis. This preliminary study can only make inference and significance to the population surveyed and not across the organisations as a whole. However the intention of the research is to provide future research avenues based on the preliminary findings of this research.

Table 6.0 Participant strategic layers equivalency table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D+C Police Cornwall</th>
<th>Cornwall Council</th>
<th>Equivalency criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4 respondent x 1 (Chief Superintendent)</td>
<td>Level 4 respondent x 1 (Chief Fire Officer)</td>
<td>Area Command / CSP chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 respondent x 2 (Superintendent / Geographic inspector)</td>
<td>Level 3 respondent x 2 (Deputy Chief Fire Officer / Senior Manager)</td>
<td>Area Strategic Management / Head of Community Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 respondent x 4 (Inspector /strategic co-ordinator)</td>
<td>Level 2 respondent x 3 (Strategic Delivery officers)</td>
<td>Area ops management and strategic delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 respondent x 1 (Neighbourhood Sergeant / officer)</td>
<td>Level 1 respondent x 1 (Operational Manager / Officer)</td>
<td>Area operational management and delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Axiomatic question set (AXQS) results strategic layers

This question set examines the shape and influence the organisation has in defining ASB practice. This was done by focusing questions to examine the knowledge and influence of structures and processes that shape why things are done the way they are. The question looks to examine how aligned and aware participants are of structures, strategies and processes set down by the organisation and alignment with organisational mission. The question set is looking for thematic consistency of definitions, functions and purpose of the organisation in participant responses. In response to question set AXQS the overall thematic findings for all strategic layers in both organisations are summarised below.

Table 6.1 Table to show thematic findings from AXQS question set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Do changes align with orgs mission (mission awareness)</th>
<th>Defining ASB and guide and support with ASB (symbolic referencing)</th>
<th>What would you do differently (ASB aspirations)</th>
<th>Who does the most work? (org commitment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Council</td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: All but one participant at level 2 thinks changes align with mission. Only level 3 and 4 state actual mission.</td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: All respond no definition except level 4 who thinks there is a broad definition. All suggest no guidance from top.</td>
<td><strong>Strong Unique</strong>: Mixed across levels between more resources and more awareness of ASB</td>
<td><strong>Moderate Universal</strong>: Most participants respond equal - two in level 2 and 3 think Council, level 4 thinks police.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+C Police</td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: All say aligns with mission except level 4. Half of level 1 and 2 state the actual mission</td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: All but one level 2 participant says no definition and no guidance or support from the top.</td>
<td><strong>Strong Unique</strong>: Mixed aspirations with two at level 1 and 2 mention training/guidance</td>
<td><strong>Moderate unique</strong>: Level 1 and 4 think equal Level 2 and 3 think police.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission awareness and alignment

Important ASB changes were almost universally seen by participants as being in line with the mission of each organisation. When it came to using wording that described or defined the organisational published mission statement there was a less universal theme.

‘….. well our mission, vision, values etc. but, you know, we’re aiming to be, currently this is the statement, to be the best urban, rural and coastal police force’
Level 3 police respondent

‘Yeah, I think so because they’ve got their own – I mean we’ve obviously got the service plan and the organisation has got their own objectives and I think everything fits into it. We’ve got the strategic assessment that’s come up and obviously identified what issues need looking at and I think from those changes, it’s kind of, those changes have been made to feed into the strategic assessment and the service plan which then feeds into the wider organisations own plan really?’
Level 1 council respondent

All participants at level 3 and 4 from Cornwall Council specified the mission statement of the organisation. When it came to mission statement identification half of level 1 and 2 police respondents gave the actual mission statement. All level 1 and 2 council participants and level 3 and 4 police participants did not identify the mission statement in response to this question.

ASB symbolic referencing through organisational guidance and support

The universal theme from participants in both organisations was that there was no ASB definition from their respective organisations.

‘ASB can be a million different things can’t it? There may be a definition somewhere but I’ve never seen it - I mean it’s an interesting point really because I’ve never actually really thought about that like that before.’
Level 1 police respondent

‘I don’t think there’s a clear definition, I think we probably all have our own view so maybe a clear definition would help.’
Level 4 police respondent

‘…but I’m just hoping that down at the tactical and operation levels we have a far more defined view on it (ASB) to think that is an issue, we’re getting this
intelligence coming up through, we need to deal with that because that could escalate whereas that, alright it’s a bit of a problem but, you know, it’s one individual’s made a complaint, is it an issue?’

Level 4 council respondent

Only a level 2 police participant was aware of a clear ASB definition by the organisation through knowledge of a policy:

‘There is a clear definition and we’ve probably even got a policy document on it – in fact let me have a look. There’s probably one of those - Yeah, there is one.’

Level 2 police respondent

When it comes to ASB guidance and support from the organisation through structural and policy support, the universal theme is that this is lacking in both organisations or that individuals are not aware that guidance exists.

‘…..there’s no operating handbook around ASB. There’s no, there’s nothing that says these are the things that need to be done’

Level 4 police respondent

‘Well my two people who I always go to if something comes up are either (name) as the partnership officer who is a great resource or (name) so that’s where I draw on’

Level 4 council respondent

‘Share point is the force intranet system and so good practice, op dates, everything else is put on there. We get weekly updates on there, in relation to messages - It goes out to everybody. Everybody will get the message, whether everybody chooses to read the message is another matter.’

Level 2 police respondent

‘I wouldn’t kind of say we get anything; I wouldn’t say we need to get anything from other parts of the organisation on our role.’

Level 1 council respondent

ASB aspirations for improvement (future perfect thinking)

This question set returned a degree of thematic uniqueness in relation to aspirational improvements for ASB performance. Partnerships (level 2 and 4) and training (level 1 and 2) were mentioned by police participants. Resources (Level 1 and 2) and internal organisational awareness (Level 3 and 4) were mentioned by council respondents. These however were not thematically consistent enough across participants to have a degree of thematic universality.
‘I think probably the first thing would be education through the organisation about actually what anti-social behaviour is.’
Level 3 council respondent

‘I would like to be more better trained, you know. Where’s my ASB manual? I know you have one. Where’s my ASB manual? Where have I got my skills from?’
Level 2 police respondent

‘I think to me the answer is in the partnership working, the partnership side and we have got a lot of effort going into the partnership working at the moment, that’s, to my mind, that would help enormously’.
Level 2 police respondent

‘I think that a way to make it to improve things would be to have more ASB case workers, so no doubt about that.’
Level 2 council respondent

Organisational commitment to ASB

Council participants have a more thematic universal response, with the ASB work being equally shared between police and council, with some deviation towards the council at level 2 and 3. Police responses were less universally themed and split between police doing the most work (level 2 and 3) and an equal partnership (level 1 and 4).

‘……so it’s a difficult one to work this out; I’d probably go they’re equally good at what they do, fifty/fifty shared ownership.’
Level 2 council respondent

‘it’s an equal partnership - I think it depends on which part of the county you’re looking at and I think some places, you know, I would think the balance is slightly different’
Level 4 police respondent

‘…….the Council probably do more work, deal with anti-social behaviour over the police.’
Level 3 council respondent

‘if you look pound for pound for resources I think it would be us - Only because we’ve got so many more neighbourhood officers both sworn and PCSOs out in the local communities trying to tackle the problem. How effective they are is another matter but there are – pound for pound we’ve got more people out on the ground doing it than anybody else (police)’
Level 2 police respondent
Axiomatic question set (QSET3) results frontline officers in Cornwall

The question set design looked to obtain data on how much the organisation has presence. This is through such things as guidance and policy in the shaping of ASB operational activity in line with organisational aims. The vertical sharing of organisational axioms should indicate greater alignment with organisational ASB objectives.

**Figure 6.0 Awareness of mission statement**

Overall 17% of respondents indicated they were very aware of the organisational mission statement that relates to ASB with almost double (32%) of respondents indicating they were not sure of the mission statement that relates to ASB. 14% of respondents said they were not aware or indicated there was no mission statement that related to ASB.

**Figure 6.1 ASB changes by organisation have made real improvements**

When looking at how mission is interpreted into direction and goal clarity through respondents seeing ASB improvements through changes by the organisation, 60%
of respondents were neutral or disagreed that ASB changes by the organisation had made real improvements against 40% who agreed. The effect of seeing organisational changes making real improvement has a positive impact on other organisational change and clarity questions.

Table 6.2 Changes made by the organisation in relation to ASB have made real improvements r-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSET3</th>
<th>QSET</th>
<th>r-test</th>
<th>r-2</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes made by the organisation in relation to ASB have made real improvements</td>
<td>My organisation has made important changes in how ASB is dealt with (QSET1)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Strong positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes made by the organisation in relation to ASB have made real improvements</td>
<td>My organisation drives change in relation to how we deal with ASB (QSET2)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Strong positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes made by the organisation in relation to ASB have made real improvements</td>
<td>ASB is dealt with the same way across all areas of my organisation (QSET2)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Moderate positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who see the organisation making important ASB changes accounts for 35% of the positive variance in relation to ASB changes and positive improvement. This variance is also the same for those who see the organisation driving ASB change (35%). There is a moderate positive relationship in comparison, with 10% of positive variance relating to ASB changes and positive improvements attributed to those who see ASB being dealt with the same way across the organisation.

Figure 6.2 Who does more in tackling ASB
When asked where respondents thought the weight of ASB action came from, 49% saw it as an equal partnership between police and council. 46% thought police and 5% thought council as individual organisations did the most.

Shared ASB definition and direction from organisation

Figure 6.3 Organisation is clear in guidance and procedures for ASB

Overall 47% of respondents thought the organisational ASB guidance and procedures were clear. 53% returned a neutral or negative response to this question. Overall out of 64 respondents who disagreed/strongly disagreed that all officers dealt with ASB in the same way (QSET2), 53% (34) agreed/strongly agreed that the organisation was clear on its guidance and procedures for ASB. Additionally of the 64 respondents who disagreed/strongly disagreed that all officers dealt with ASB the same way (QSET2), 50% were not aware or not sure of the mission statement that related to ASB.

The organisation being clear on its guidance and procedures for ASB has some effect on other consistency and clarity questions relating to ASB in other question set areas.
Table 6.3 Organisation is clear on guidance and procedures for dealing with ASB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSET3</th>
<th>QSET</th>
<th>r-test</th>
<th>r-2</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation is clear on its guidance and</td>
<td>ASB is dealt with the same way across the</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Moderate positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures for dealing with ASB</td>
<td>organisation (QSET2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation is clear on its guidance and</td>
<td>My organisation does not make it clear</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Strong negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures for dealing with ASB</td>
<td>how ASB should be dealt with (QSET1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation is clear on its guidance and</td>
<td>My organisation drives change in relation</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Strong positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures for dealing with ASB</td>
<td>to how we deal with ASB (QSET2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that the more the organisation is thought to be clear on its ASB guidance and processes then it is 29% more likely that respondents will see the organisation driving ASB change and 10% more likely that ASB is seen as being dealt with the same way across the organisation. Also it would be 31% less likely that respondent will see the organisation as not being clear in how ASB should be dealt with.

Figure 6.4 Organisation guides and supports in dealing with ASB

Respondents were split 50/50 between agreeing/strongly agreeing that the organisation guides and supports them in how to deal with ASB and those who returned a neutral or negative response.
Below is the effect of organisational guides and supports on variations other variables that relate to ASB interpretation, organisational ASB guidance and changes.

**Table 6.4 My organisation guides and supports me in how I deal with ASB r-test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSET3</th>
<th>QSET</th>
<th>r-test</th>
<th>r-2</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organisation guides and supports me in how to deal with ASB</td>
<td>ASB is important as dealing with crime (QSET1)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Moderate positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation guides and supports me in how to deal with ASB</td>
<td>My organisation has made important changes in how ASB is dealt with (QSET1)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Strong positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation guides and supports me in how to deal with ASB</td>
<td>My organisation does not make it clear how ASB should be dealt with (QSET 1)</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Strong negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that the more the organisation is thought to guide and support in dealing with ASB then it is 20% more likely that respondents will see the organisation having made important ASB changes. It would also be 10% more likely that ASB is seen as important as crime and 22% less likely that respondent would see the organisation as not being clear in how ASB should be dealt with.

**Recipe question set (REQS) results strategic layers**

The recipe question set is looking to establish what should be done in relation to ASB and assess flexibility in response of the organisation to internal and external factors. A thematic assessment examines what participants see as successful ASB operations and how much influence the individual and collective ASB experience has in shaping how things are done by the organisation. A closed question examines participant feelings of if ASB belongs as a core element of the organisation.
Table 6.5 Table to show thematic findings from REQS question set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>How to improve how ASB is dealt with (influence and experience)</th>
<th>Is this organisation view (influence and flexibility)</th>
<th>Good and bad ASB operations (experience and response to external environment)</th>
<th>Should organisation deal with ASB (judgement and flexibility)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Council</td>
<td><strong>Strong Unique</strong>: Level 1 would improve internal practices, level 2 and 3 engagement across the org. Level 4 intelligence.</td>
<td><strong>Very Strong Universal</strong>: All thought org wouldn’t agree or depended on who you spoke to</td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: All would stop at operational staff/areas. <strong>Strong Unique</strong>: Level 1 and 4 wouldn’t stop at other operational areas. Level 2 and 3 management/strategic level.</td>
<td><strong>Very Strong Universal</strong>: All said yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+C Police</td>
<td><strong>Strong Unique</strong>: across levels. Themes of partnership working and increased resources.</td>
<td><strong>Moderate Unique</strong>: Level 1 and 4 don’t think org would agree - Level 2 and 3 think org would agree</td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: All mention they would stop at operational areas. <strong>Strong Unique</strong>: when it comes to not stopping some say operational process Level 4 says intelligence.</td>
<td><strong>Moderate Unique</strong>: Level 2 and 3 say ASB is a responsibility. Level 1 and 4 responsibility is to work with partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASB improvements and influence of experience**

Overall there was mixture of responses across all levels in each organisation around what could be done to improve ASB practice. Cornwall Council strategic layers did have a thematic of improvements being internal ones, albeit of mixed
types. Police respondents had cited higher level changes such as partnership working and resources.

‘I think we need to probably raise the awareness of anti-social behaviour across, across our whole county, across the whole directorate as well as just sort of the fire service.’
Level 3 council respondent

‘……if we had more coppers we’d kill it (ASB) no problem at all’
Level 2 police respondent

‘…..perhaps needs to be something built into the strategic board where there is somebody who is only dealing with the issues and priorities of the, the Safer Cornwall Partnership and is focussed solely on those issues, rather than it being an add-on to their job.’
Level 2 council respondent

‘……..the amount of investment in ASB at the moment I think is less - yeah, resource investment – they want to do it but I don’t think we’re putting the same amount of resources to it (ASB), that we used to’
Level 2 police respondent

Both level 4 respondents in each organisation had universality in their responses about ASB intelligence and research being something that needs improving.

‘I think there are opportunities to increase our research capability - where is our clear reduction plan around domestic abuse/anti-social behaviour/whatever to make a difference there; so what actually works in reducing crime and anti-social behaviour? - what do we need to do differently because we can carry on doing the same thing and get the same results but let’s try and understand a little bit more about the complex picture behind all of these sets of offending’
Level 4 police respondent

‘I’m not sure that our intelligence, although it’s bloody good, I’m not sure our intelligence is quick enough to inform resourcing on a more proactive way. We seem to look at stuff, indeed a lot of crime stuff over months and years and then deploy resources on that. I’m not aware, again, because it’s very much on an operational level, how fleet of foot we are about deploying resources and have we got all the resources in the right place and have we – do we make the best use of the resources we’ve got?’
Level 4 council respondent

**Influence and flexibility of organisation**

The overall universal theme amongst council respondents and level 1 and 4 police respondents was that what needed to be done to improve how ASB is dealt with
would not be the view of the organisations, or at best depended on individual perspective rather than the organisation collectively. This theme continued into level 1 and 4 police respondents who saw competing interests of individual managers as an issue in relation to the organisations view. However level 2 and 3 police respondents (except 1 level 2) thought that the improvements they through were needed in relation to ASB would be the organisations view.

‘Probably corporately they would say yes but then it’s down to managers at the end of the day isn’t it?’
Level 2 council respondent

‘Yeah, got no doubt. We can do some things as an individual organisation that’d certainly improve the way we deal with anti-social behaviour, particularly from the victim’s point of view and my organisation would certainly support more partnership work’
Level 2 police respondent

‘If I’m honest no, not in all areas. I think in some areas they might but I think culturally we’ve still got a way to go’
Level 4 council respondent

‘I don’t know - ASB should be our number one priority because that’s what most people, in my experience, when I’m out talking to communities would say, of course it should. But is the organisational appetite for that? It would depend who you were speaking to I think…’
Level 4 police respondent

Experience and response to external ASB environment

When responding to what participants saw as good ASB practice from the organisation there was universality from police and council respondents in citing operational areas in one format or another.

‘Right, OK, the ones to show them I think would be, as I talked about earlier, the range of different issues starting at the, diversionary prevention so we’re be going to a youth service, and we’d be looking at some of the good work that goes on with the youth services, with, working with BF Adventure and the Phoenix project and looking at some of the, interventions that happen that try to change people’s behaviour to prevent them being anti-social; that would be – that’s the ultimate aim.’
Level 3 council respondent
‘……meet all my PCSOs, definitely. And I know what I actually first started talking about cuts, I did actually say I could probably lose a few officers before I lose my PCSOs because to me, they are a real key to ASB. A, because of the early interventions which the bobbies aren’t getting to, they are doing those early interventions, they are doing the engagement, with the people who are involved in ASB.’
Level 2 police respondent

When it came to identifying what respondents saw as ineffective ASB operations and practice, police respondents had a less universal response, with an underlying theme of operational processes around ASB. Tasking, reporting, role clarity and decision making were given as examples. The level 4 police respondent was the only variant in response, identifying intelligence. Level 1 and 4 council respondents mention other organisations operational areas as ineffective ASB practice (like courts) as opposed to their own. This was split from level 2 and 3 respondents who saw strategic management and management areas as an ineffective element of ASB practice.

‘……I wouldn’t like you to see their paperwork sometimes because unfortunately, if there was to be a Pilkington, they would want to see the interventions and I have to nag them all the time about the ASB spreadsheet…..’
Level 2 police respondent

‘……ASB and referral to appropriate agencies. It would be less of a place and more of a process that I don’t think we do very well.’
Level 1 police respondent

‘I think probably where I wouldn’t stop the bus is anything to do with court and enforcement action………….Yeah, only because I don’t there’s any kind of – there doesn’t seem to be, even though we’ve been doing it, there just doesn’t seem to be a procedure from everyone. Not procedure, it’s quite cloudy when people come to do enforcement action’
Level 1 council respondent

‘So I think – I mean they wouldn’t want to stop at a strategic group meeting would they? I’m just trying to think of something that wouldn’t really be worthwhile. I can’t think of anything off the top of my head other than the strategic group meeting……. Purely because I don’t think, to them, it would be worth their effort.’
Level 2 council respondent
Judgement and flexibility

When assessing if ASB is seen as a valid part of organisational core business there was total universality amongst council respondents that ASB should be dealt with by the organisation. Additionally there was a secondary theme that the organisation was the key in bringing everyone together. The police respondents were split between agreeing it was a responsibility of the organisation (level 2 and 3) and it not being the organisations sole responsibility, and that the organisational ASB responsibility was to work with partners (level 1 and 4).

‘…it should be, but with partners I would say - that joined up approach, with partners - absolutely, it should be the business of the police and others….’
Level 4 police respondent

‘……..well let’s go back from a statutory perspective – because of our undertaking strategy under the police and crime act and what have you, all those other issues, we as a local authority have got a duty to reduce crime and disorder, end of story.’
Level 4 council respondent

‘Yeah I think it should be, because we kind of bring everyone together. Police yeah they do give a lot of evidence towards the files and gather a lot of it. I think with our kind of contact and expertise about the legislation, we need kind of someone to advise and prepare for kind of, not just enforcement, but for multi-agency meetings and to actually chair them and to actually be a lead on, bringing everyone together on ASB issues yeah.’
Level 1 council respondent

Recipe question set (QSET2) results frontline officers in Cornwall

The recipe questions contained within QSET2 are to look at frontline respondent judgement of ASB and what ‘recipe’ they use to deal with certain situations. This is to look at how participant’s view the way things should be dealt with and look any ritualistic type behaviours and how things are done in a task completion context.

Each frontline respondent was asked to indicate how they would deal with eight incident types. Each incident had a weighting towards a criminal act, anti-social behaviour or a mix of both.
When faced with a clearly identifiable criminal offence a high proportion of respondents would use a criminal sanction to deal with such an offence. The below table summarises the crime weighted incidents classed as crime by respondents in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident type</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>% use Criminal Sanction</th>
<th>% use ASB sanction</th>
<th>% use other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>Criminal Act</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Criminal Act</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>Criminal Act</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td>Criminal Act</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Both *</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Drinking</td>
<td>Both *</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour Dispute</td>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* classed as both due to wording contained in legal ASB definition or no clear single category of criminal offence type

** 1% respondents did not indicate action type on survey and left blank
QSET1 against the same respondent using a crime sanction for the same incident type in QSET2.

Table 6.7 Crime incident type / criminal sanction table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident type</th>
<th>Total respondents who identified as Crime</th>
<th>Total respondents who identified as crime and would use criminal sanction</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A high percentage of respondents who classify the above crime weighted incident types as crime would also use criminal sanctions to deal with the incident. Far lower numbers of respondents classified public order as crime (18% of all respondents) and have the second lowest percentage of criminal sanction use compared to the other categories in the above table.

The table below summarises incidents weighted as both, and subsequently classed as both by respondents in QSET1. This is measured against the same respondent using a non-crime sanction for incident type in QSET2.

Table 6.8 Both incident type / non-criminal sanction table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident type</th>
<th>Total respondents who identified as both</th>
<th>Total respondents who identified as both and use non-criminal sanction</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Drinking</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where offence type has a weighting to both criminal/anti-social then respondents who identified street drinking as both were more likely to use a non-criminal sanction than those identifying harassment as both. 30 out of 49 respondents (61%) who classified harassment as both would use criminal sanctions to deal with
the incident compared to 11% of those who classified street drinking as both and would deal with the offence through criminal sanctions.

Table 6.9 ASB incident type / ASB sanction table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident type</th>
<th>Total respondents who identified as ASB</th>
<th>Total respondents who identified as ASB and use ASB sanction</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour Dispute</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it comes to ASB offence type respondents who classified the incident type as ASB were more likely to use an ASB sanction to deal with an ASB incident. However 19 out of 61 (31%) respondents who classify noise as ASB would not use an ASB sanction but would refer or take no action.

Figure 6.6 All officers deal with ASB in the same way

69% of respondents did not think that officers dealt with ASB in the same way. However where frontline officers feel that officers deal with ASB the same way then there are positive impacts on the clarity of ASB guidance and procedures and ASB changes making improvements.
Table 6.10 All officers deal with ASB in the same way r-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSET2</th>
<th>QSET</th>
<th>r-test</th>
<th>r-2</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All officers deal with ASB in the same way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My organisation is clear on its guidance and procedures for dealing with ASB (QSET3)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>Moderate positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes made by my organisation in relation to ASB have made real improvements (QSET3)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>Weak positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.7 ASB is not the job of the organisation

Although the majority of respondents (94%) believed their organisation should deal with ASB, 28% of those respondents (19 out of 68) also believe their organisation does not make it clear how it should be dealt with. All the respondents (72) believed their organisation should deal with ASB. 53% thought that ASB was their job as well as having clear guidance on how to deal with ASB.

Directory question set (DRQS) results strategic layers

The directory question set is looking at how ASB tasks are completed and how involved participants feel in formation of ASB activity within their organisation. The aim is to see how universally cultural norms are expressed around ASB and the rituals that are performed in relation to ASB task completion.
Table 6.11 Table to show the thematic findings from the DRQS question set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>What caused changes and drives change (involvement in shaping how things are done)</th>
<th>Day to day ASB working (involvement and task completion)</th>
<th>Consistent across org? (commonly held approach)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Council</td>
<td><strong>Strong Unique</strong>: External changes like government to internal high level changes like unitary authority. <strong>Moderate unique</strong>: Change driven from operational staff (level 1+2), top down and government (3+4)</td>
<td><strong>Very Strong Universal</strong>: All mention operational staff. <strong>Weak universal</strong> in identifying ASB escalation process</td>
<td><strong>Strong Unique</strong>: across all levels between consistent and not consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+C Police</td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: All said external factors caused changes (budget, communities) except level 4 who said internal relationships and partnerships. <strong>Strong Universal</strong>: Majority say top down drives change with only 2 respondents mentioning operational staff</td>
<td><strong>Strong Unique</strong>: 50% talk of operational staff but don’t identify ASB process. 50% talk of ASB escalation process but mention staff less. This is mixed across strategic levels</td>
<td><strong>Moderate Unique</strong>: Level 3 + 4 saw consistency across organisation. Level 1 + 2 mostly inconsistent with difference in people cited as a reason.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Involvement in shaping how things are done**

When examining what had caused the most important ASB changes within the organisation, there was thematic universality across police strategic layers and thematic uniqueness within the council. All police respondents, except level 4 who said internal strategic relationships, saw some form of external factor that had caused important ASB changes. The council response was more unique across strategic layers with a mix of external changes and internal changes being seen a key drivers for ASB changes. Only level 4 and one level 3 respondent mentioned the unitary authority as the cause of ASB changes.
'Well I guess the well the unitary, for a start, was, I guess, budget driven and politically driven.'
Level 3 council respondent

‘Probably just feedback from individual officers and members of the public possibly frustrated with the service that was already provided and being fed through officers to management feeling that there needed to be a change, umm, and if there wasn’t a change then things weren’t going to improve; that was the only way to get things to improve.’
Level 1 council respondent

‘HMIC I would suggest - Pretty much the Pilkington case……….’
Level 2 police respondent

‘……….government dictate isn’t it? Policies that came out of the government about setting up neighbourhood, I think – it wasn’t something that we willingly went to or looked to, we were told you’re going to become neighbourhood police teams, this is the model, crack on with it.’
Level 2 police respondent

When it came to identifying where change was driven from, the police response was universal at almost all strategic layers. **ASB change in the organisation is driven from the top down**, with operational staff driving ASB change mentioned by only two respondents. Council strategic layers are split with universality at levels 1 and 2 who see change driven from operational staff. Level 3 and 4 respondents see change driven from the top of the organisation down.

‘The ACC - being a hierarchical organisation, obviously comes down from the Chief Constable, the Deputy Chief Constable and the various tiers and levels of groups they work with, we will include the Police and Crime Commissioner’
Level 2 police respondent

‘…..business plans that drive work within the certain geographic areas. So, for example, Cornwall’s got its own business plan which is linked to the chief’s plan which is linked to the strategic assessments……’
Level 3 police respondent

‘Well I think it’s driven from the top, I think the initial champion of change came from the top and I think that was probably heightened by my role as chair of the safer community partnership so it gave me a broader aspect, and chairing that there’s a real drive’
Level 4 council respondent

‘Well I think it comes from the customers. I think really, because it’s the kind of feedback that they’re giving us that comes to ASB officers and I think it’s
just fed up through, we’re not going to know that there needs to be change unless we’ve had that feedback from members of the public really’
Level 1 council respondent

‘They come from the people that are in a position to actually, deliver them. They come from those ASB case workers, they come from the ASB case work manager, they come from, the community safety manager, the community safety officers who come up with ideas and they’re put into effect by the middle management....’
Level 2 council respondent

Involvement, task completion and consistency

When examining task completion and knowledge acquisition through day to day operations in relation to ASB, there is thematic universality amongst council respondents. They identified that ASB operations are carried out through frontline operational staff. When it comes to process or structural identifications there is universality in that other than a level 2 and 3 respondents who mention the ASB escalation process, there is no reference to exact policies or structures that facilitate day to day operations. There is thematic uniqueness in response across all levels about the approach identified being consistent and not consistent. Level 3 and level 1 respondent are weighted to there being a consistent approach whilst level 2 and 4 see the ASB approach across the organisation as inconsistent.

‘Probably not. I’m not that close to it to be able to give an informed decision but probably not. I am aware that when we, I’ve had discussions with the senior police team, the senior Cornwall police team, there do seem to be issues’
Level 4 council respondent

‘You know bigger pool of people - bigger impact. You either need a bigger pool of people or we need to cross-train people which, we’ve started to do and that’s one of the solid reasons why I think the joined up approach with the fire and rescue’s good because there are resources out there that we can utilise. So, yeah.’
Level 3 council respondent

Police respondents were unique across strategic layers about the day to day ASB operational approach. The split theme saw half of the total respondents mixed across strategic layers citing operational staff but no detail of ASB process. The other half were clearer about ASB process with staff mentioned less. This has
resulted in a unique response with no common detail about operational ASB process.

‘Well I’ve got to be honest I’m a bit distant from it to a certain. You’re almost better off asking the sector inspector that question more than myself because I don’t see it day in day out. But my interpretation of it would be, that the neighbourhood beat managers and NTLs have got a good grip on what’s happening in their area and if they pick up an ASB problem solving issue…’
Level 3 police respondent

‘It depends on where you go; it’d be different….’
Level 2 respondent

When looking at consistency of approach universality is more towards it being not consistent. Only level 4, one level 3 and one level 2 thought there was a consistent ASB approach with all other respondents saying there is not a consistent approach.

‘I can only speak for my areas, yeah but it’ll be those – it’s a hierarchical structure - And clearly we’ve got policies and working practices which govern – as every organisation – which govern how we do things and we’ll refer to those…..’
Level 2 police respondent

‘Unfortunately I don’t see a consistent approach it depends on the relationship that neighbourhood teams have with the ASB case workers, and even at that local level that’s down to the neighbourhood team sergeant recognising the value of it…’
Level 2 police respondent

Directory question set (QSET2) results frontline officers in Cornwall

When starting to look at consistency, respondents were asked where they obtained ASB knowledge and experience. 14% of respondents felt they got their ASB knowledge from organisational training. This left 86% of respondents getting their ASB knowledge from peers, learning on the job or self-teaching. 83% of respondents were either taught on the job (42%), by colleagues (20%), by self (17%) or by management (4%).
Following this 37% of respondents agreed that the organisation drives change in how ASB is dealt with. 49% returned a neutral answer and 14% disagreed.

Where the organisation is seen to be driving change in relation to ASB there are positive effects in the area of change, improvement and support by the organisation.
Table 6.12 My organisation drives change in relation to how we deal with ASB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSET2</th>
<th>QSET</th>
<th>r-test</th>
<th>r-2</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organisation drives change in relation to how we deal with ASB</td>
<td>Changes made by organisation in relation to ASB have made real improvements (QSET3)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Strong Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation drives change in relation to how we deal with ASB</td>
<td>My organisation has made important changes in how ASB is dealt with (QSET1)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Strong Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation drives change in relation to how we deal with ASB</td>
<td>My organisation guides and supports me in how to deal with ASB (QSET3)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Strong Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that the more the organisation is thought to drive change in how ASB is dealt with then it is 23% more likely that respondents will see the organisation making made important ASB changes. It would also be 35% more likely that the changes will be seen to make real improvements and 37% more likely that respondent would see the organisation as guiding and supporting in dealing with ASB.

When looking at ASB consistency, 58% of frontline respondents did not think ASB was dealt with the same way across the organisation. 54% of all respondents who thought dealing with ASB is as important as dealing with crime also thought ASB are dealt with differently across the organisation.

Figure 6.10 ASB is dealt with the same way across the organisation
Respondents who see ASB as being dealt with the same way by the organisation has a positive effect on the organisation when it comes to be seen to be clear on ASB guidance and making positive changes in relation to ASB.

Table 6.13 ASB is dealt with the same way across all areas of my organisation r-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSET2</th>
<th>QSET</th>
<th>r-test</th>
<th>r-2</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB is dealt with the same way across all areas of my organisation</td>
<td>My organisation is clear on its guidance and procedures for dealing with ASB (QSET3)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Moderate positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB is dealt with the same way across all areas of my organisation</td>
<td>Changes made by my organisation in relation to ASB have made real improvements (QSET3)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>Moderate positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dictionary question set (DIQS) results strategic layers

The DIQS question set looks to examine ASB knowledge at a descriptive level expressed through such things as values, belief and interpretation of important organisational phenomena. The questioning here has an issue focus, asking the participant to name the two most important parts of their work and two most important changes their organisation has made in relation to ASB.
Table 6.14 Table to show thematic findings from DIQS question set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Reason for joining organisation (core values and belief)</th>
<th>Most important aspect of work (core values and belief)</th>
<th>Most important changes to ASB (organisational phenomena and performance)</th>
<th>Why change so important (organisational phenomena and aims)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Council</td>
<td>Moderate Unique. Themes Level 1 and 2 mention personal morals links to strategic priorities. Level 3 and 4 mention interest and enjoyment</td>
<td>Very Strong Universal: All levels link to strategic priorities.</td>
<td>Moderate Unique: Level 1 and 2 operational changes like ASB team. Level 3 and 4 higher level or organisational changes like budgets.</td>
<td>Strong Unique: Mixed themes of increased efficiency, consistency and better resource use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+C Police</td>
<td>Strong Universal: all levels did not mention personal morals, mostly interest and fun. Only level 4 had reason for joining aligned to mission</td>
<td>Very Strong Universal: reducing crime and keeping public safe</td>
<td>Strong Universal: Partnership working mentioned by all but one.</td>
<td>Strong Universal: All mention something about increasing accountability and responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core values and belief

When examining council respondents about their core values and beliefs in relation to reasons for working in the organisation, there was a unique thematic response. Level 3 and 4 respondents described their reasons as being excitement, attractive package and promotion in joining the organisation and/or involvement in community safety. Level 1 and 2 respondents talk of interest in crime and disorder, wanting to make a difference and improve partnership working.

The police respondents were more universal in their answers, however not in a positive way. All levels were universal in that there was no mention of personal
morals as a reason for joining the organisation as interest and fun. The level 4 respondent had a reason for joining that had some alignment to the organisational mission.

‘You know, it wouldn’t even have been on my landscape so it’s been a sort if, you know, you kind of come into it and then your passion for keeping people safe and, you know, helping people and making the community a safer place really. That kind of passion’s at the heart of all I do and it’s still there now, as raw as it was 20 years ago’

Level 4 police respondent

‘But I just, I thought it was an attractive package and a good service to join and that’s when I joined but I certainly have seen it evolve over, what, 20 odd years now, 25 years so - yeah.’

Level 3 council respondent

‘Just sort of sounded like fun to me – picking on baddies - there’s an element of wanting to pick on bad people which is a bit weird, but I think it motivates a lot of coppers…’

Level 2 police respondent

‘Yeah I think it was about the…… I felt I could make a difference and I’d been able to…… in the past be able to do that and I thought that is a job that suited me and that I could fulfil the requirements of.’

Level 2 council respondent

Police respondents were asked to identify the most important aspects of police work to establish individual value alignment with organisational values. A universal theme was present of reducing crime and keeping the public safe. This aligns with strategic priorities and mission.

‘I think the most important things for me are protecting the public - reducing crime I think those two sort of broad headings, but there would be a lot to sort of under pick underneath those to headings but those are the two key things for me’

Level 4 police respondent

‘Oh hell! I suppose it’s broadly, fighting crime and making the public feel safe. I think broadly…..’

Level 2 police respondent

When asking council respondents to identify the most important aspects of community safety work all strategic levels were universal in making a link to strategic priorities of the organisation like ASB, Drugs and Alcohol or Domestic abuse.
‘...the first one is DV because of the serious consequences of it. I mean if you look at the sort of serious harm that can come from it and the cost implications and we know its 106, is it 106 million pounds a year, something along those lines. And then second I would anti-social behaviour so I would say if we’re going to rank them, anti-social behaviour is second – that is my personal view’
Level 2 council respondent

‘I would say the anti-social behaviour and the drugs and alcohol, I would say are the two’
Level 3 council respondent

Organisational phenomena, performance and aims

In looking at focus and consistency of definition relating to important ASB changes the council as an organisation has made, the overall theme was unique. The theme changed as the strategic level changed. Level 3 and 4 were universally themed in identifying some form of high level change such as budgets or restructuring.

‘Well I think the biggest change or innovation for me, based on my experience of working in Devon across five districts and a county is the one unitary and the joined up approach. I mean I think most of the staff employed in that sort of community safety world would recognise that but, you know - I mean I didn't work here when it was six districts and a county but I guarantee if it was anything like Devon it was quite fragmented.’
Level 3 council respondent

At level 1 and 2 whilst again overall unique in response, there was universal mention of operational changes that were most important in relation to ASB although it was not elaborated on if these were changes by operational staff or by the organisation.

‘I feel that we probably work a lot closer with the police, through working in police stations now and having that contact, not being in a council building, so obviously the contact with the police. If I’m looking at ASB then probably the body cameras and the wireless CCTV that we’ve been able to actually purchase stuff that has been able to evidence ASB and not only evidence that but that’s actually brought us closer to the police I believe because of the partnership working’
Level 1 council respondent

‘Well from Cornwall’s perspective it has to be the anti-social behaviour team and probably everyone else has said the same to be honest because it’s given a clear focus and a coordinated point for, not only the police but registered social landlords and other key partners to be able to tap in and say
these are the issues and I know that work is successful in early interventions and so on
Level 2 council respondent

Police respondents were thematically universal in their focus and consistency of definition relating to important ASB changes the organisation has made. All but one level 3 respondent mentioned partnership working (shared boundaries) as an important organisational change relating to ASB.

‘….in relation to ASB, I think increasing our partnership workings, so being aligned with anti-social behaviour teams.’
Level 4 police respondent

‘Well I think the biggest change or innovation for me, based on my experience of working in Devon across five districts and a county is the one unitary and the joined up approach. I mean I think most of the staff employed in that sort of community safety world would recognise that but, you know - I mean I didn't work here when it was six districts and a county but I guarantee if it was anything like Devon it was quite fragmented.’
Level 3 police respondent

‘….partnership working; that’s got to be the – one of the biggest changes that the organisation’s made so that’s involving our partners and I suppose…’
Level 2 police respondent

‘…I think probably, well, without a shadow of a doubt the ASB, is better served being dealt with as it is now so I think probably the link-up between the council and the police and the greater crossover of, you know, information and activity really has probably been the best thing really.’
Level 1 police respondent

In looking at why these changes were seen as important, whilst consistency and partnership working were an underlying theme, this was not universally expressed. Council respondents were on the whole unique. Increasing resources to ASB for example was identified by a level 3 and a level 2 respondent.

‘I think cross-skilling, it obviously makes, educates the watch in regards to what anti-social behaviour is because it affects everyone doesn’t it? It can potentially affect everyone and I think as a service we’ve got the resources to try and improve and tackle anti-social behaviour’
Level 3 council respondent

‘Well, I think it's important for communities because you get - you get consistency of service linked risk across the whole of the area and I think that's really important’
Level 3 council respondent
‘……because we were able to find solutions to our problems rather than trying to work as one and being stuck at a dead end and not having any resolutions to the problems that we were coming across. We were able to work in partnership and actually find different tools to resolve, not just enforcement action, but kind of like, just the wider community issues rather than just being one person looking at one issue; we were able to bring everyone together and deal with all the issues at once, getting it done quicker’
Level 1 council respondent

In contrast police respondents were thematically universal. All mentioned something relating to increased accountability (shared boundaries) and responsibility.

‘Well I think in the end – more accountability through that. So we, as the police, have a set of performance indicators which I spend a lot of time servicing and working towards, but equally, there’s a set of partnership indicators, you know, and I need to spend as much time on the partnership ones for the good of the people of Cornwall as the organisational ones for Devon and Cornwall Police….’
Level 4 police respondent

‘OK. Well the reason that we’ve got that then is that we are, it goes really right back to what I was saying around delivering a public service and being accountable for the work that we’re doing. So if you’ve got – if you’re not – if you haven’t got key performance indicators or people that are actually sort of doing that job and the public expect us to do so, how can we say whether we’re doing it well or not?’
Level 3 police respondent

‘So there’s all sorts of performance issues around that, gives you a handle for me personally, my interest is anti-social behaviour but it gives you an opportunity to push various things forward because it (an ASB control strategy) just ups the level of importance within the organisation.’
Level 2 police respondent

Dictionary question set (QSET1) results frontline officers in Cornwall

This question set is looking to gain data on what is done in the organisation relating to ASB. The laterally designed questions firstly look to examine how consistently standard incident types are interpreted by respondents. Incidents are weighted to have ASB, crime or a both weighting. This is to see how consistently individual respondents define the same issues to examine universality or uniqueness across officers in interpretation of incidents and what is considered crime or ASB.
Figure 6.11 Incident classification type frontline officers

The above chart shows how 8 incident types were interpreted by frontline respondents.

Table 6.15 Incident type classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident type</th>
<th>Pre-determined Weighting</th>
<th>% identify as Criminal</th>
<th>% identify as ASB</th>
<th>% identify as both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>Criminal Act</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Criminal Act</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>Criminal Act</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td>Criminal Act</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Both *</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Drinking</td>
<td>Both*</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour Dispute</td>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* classed as both due to wording contained in legal ASB definition or no clear single category of criminal offence type
All categories have the highest amount of respondents identifying groupings according to their pre-determined weighting. In the public order category 79% of respondents identified it as both crime and ASB as opposed to a criminal act. Also 31% of respondents identified shoplifting as both, with 66% identifying it as a criminal act. Street drinking was identified as ASB or both along with neighbour dispute and noise, although neighbour dispute (74%) and noise (85%) had higher proportions identifying them as ASB.

**Figure 6.12 What is felt most important part of work**

Crime and ASB prevention is seen by 30% of respondents as the most important part of their work with satisfaction / confidence accounting for 1% of responses. Tackling crime was seen by respondents as being slightly less important than dealing with anti-social behaviour (12% and 14% respectively), with community safety being seen as more important than both (19%).

**Figure 6.13 ASB is as important as dealing with crime**
89% of respondents (64 out of 72) felt that ASB was as important as dealing with crime although 61% (39 out of 64) of those respondents also felt ASB was dealt with differently across the organisation. Those who saw crime and ASB as equally important had some positive effect on ASB guidance, change and core business elements of the organisation.

Table 6.16 Dealing with ASB is equally as important as dealing with crime r-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSET1</th>
<th>QSET</th>
<th>r-test</th>
<th>r-2</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with ASB is equally as important as dealing with crime</td>
<td>Dealing with ASB is not the job of my organisation (QSET2)</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with ASB is equally as important as dealing with crime</td>
<td>My organisation guides and supports me in how to deal with ASB (QSET3)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>Moderate positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with ASB is equally as important as dealing with crime</td>
<td>My organisation drives change in relation to how we deal with ASB (QSET2)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>Weak positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who see ASB equally as important as dealing with crime are 9.6% more likely to see the organisation guiding and supporting in relation to ASB. Also they were 5.8% more likely to feel the organisation drives ASB changes.

Figure 6.14 Organisation has made important ASB changes

When looking at aim related questions about the organisation, 65% of all respondents strongly agreed/agreed that the organisation has made important changes relating to how ASB is dealt with. This again has a positive effect on how
organisational ASB changes, drive and guidance are seen by those seeing the organisation making important ASB changes.

Table 6.17 My organisation has made important changes in how ASB is dealt with r-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSET1</th>
<th>QSET</th>
<th>r-test</th>
<th>r-2</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organisation has made important changes in how ASB is dealt with</td>
<td>Changes made by my organisation in relation to ASB have made real improvements (QSET3)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Strong positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation has made important changes in how ASB is dealt with</td>
<td>My organisation guides and supports me in how to deal with ASB (QSET3)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Strong positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation has made important changes in how ASB is dealt with</td>
<td>My organisation drives change in relation to how we deal with ASB (QSET2)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Strong positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who see their organisation making important changes in how ASB is dealt with are 35% more likely to see ASB changes making real improvements. Also respondents are 20% more likely to feel guided and supported by the organisation and 23% more likely to feel that the organisation drives ASB change.

Figure 6.15 Organisation does not make it clear how ASB should be dealt with
54% of respondents felt that the organisation made it clear how ASB should be dealt with. This left 46% of respondents who felt the organisation did not make it clear how ASB should be dealt with or did not agree or disagree. Of the 39 respondents who felt the organisation made it clear how ASB should be dealt with, 23 out of the 39 (59%) did not think ASB was dealt with the same way across the organisation.

Respondents who see their organisation not being clear on how to deal with ASB would be 31% less likely to feel the organisation is clear on its ASB guidance and 22% less likely to feel that the organisation guides and supports them in how to deal with ASB.

Table 6.18 My organisation does not make it clear on how ASB should be dealt with r-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSET1</th>
<th>QSET</th>
<th>r-test</th>
<th>r-2</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organisation does not make it clear on how ASB should be dealt with</td>
<td>My organisation is clear in its guidance and procedures for dealing with ASB (QSET3)</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Strong negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation does not make it clear on how ASB should be dealt with</td>
<td>My organisation guides and supports me in how to deal with ASB (QSET3)</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Strong negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation does not make it clear on how ASB should be dealt with</td>
<td>Changes made by my organisation in relation to ASB have made real improvements (QSET3)</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Moderate negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural knowledge set effectiveness identifiers (EI) Cornwall Council**

Analysis was undertaken of key and sub word presence in relation to each question in cultural knowledge sets amongst strategic layer respondents. This was to establish the amount of words that are associated with DEN organisational effectiveness identifiers (appendix A) represented in the SACKDEN cultural knowledge framework. All of the words in the primary or synonym group associated
with the effectiveness identifier were identified and counted with the two or three most numerous words associated with DEN effectiveness identifiers highlighted.

Table 6.19 EI key word analysis across strategic layers Cornwall Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cornwall Council</th>
<th>Most common DEN associated word Axiomatic</th>
<th>Most common DEN associated word Recipe</th>
<th>Most common DEN associated word Directory</th>
<th>Most common DEN associated word Dictionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 4</strong></td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Environment – Structure – Demand</td>
<td>Individuals – Organisation – Staff</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Involved – Staff</td>
<td>Aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
<td>Structure - Goals</td>
<td>Structure – Environment</td>
<td>Staff – Management – Consistency</td>
<td>Behave – Aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td>No overall common EI word</td>
<td>Demand – Process</td>
<td>Staff – Management</td>
<td>Behave – Aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td>Function - Structure</td>
<td>Process – Environment</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Behave – Aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td>Mission – Policy – Function - Goal</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Individual – Involving – Staff</td>
<td>Behave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td>Policy - Structure</td>
<td>Process and Environment</td>
<td>Management – Team- Involving</td>
<td>Behave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most common DEN words across all levels</strong></td>
<td>Mainly mission and structure</td>
<td>Mainly process and environment</td>
<td>Mainly involving, staff, management</td>
<td>Mainly behave and aims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the dictionary question set level 1 and 4 contained respondents with the least EI key words (5 each) compared to level 2 and 3 respondents who had between (11) and (25) EI key words. Collectively the most common EI key words was around behave and aims except for level 4 where the most prevalent key word was around values. Level 1 continued to have the lowest EI key word count in the directory question set (9) with the highest at (36) key words from a level 2 respondent. When it comes to the axiomatic question set, level 2 contained the respondent with the most EI key words (23) and the lowest (5) alongside level 4 (6).
The distribution of the total EI key words at each level across question sets had the highest percentage (41% and 45%) at levels 1 and 4 in the recipe question set and the lowest (10% and 9%) in the dictionary set. Level 1 and 2 had greater distribution of EI key words in axiomatic (31% and 17%) where level 3 and 4 had a lower percentage distribution in this area (19% and 11%). Level 2 and 3 had similar distribution patterns of EI key words through all cultural knowledge sets with directory accounting for 35% of key word distribution for both level 2 and 3.

Cultural knowledge set effectiveness identifiers (EI) Devon and Cornwall Police
Table 6.20 EI key word analysis across strategic layers Devon and Cornwall Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D+C Police</th>
<th>Most common DEN associated word</th>
<th>Most common DEN associated word</th>
<th>Most common DEN associated word Directory</th>
<th>Most common DEN associated word Dictionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Environment / Structure / Demand</td>
<td>Management / Staff</td>
<td>Behave / Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Structure / Function</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Individual / Organisation</td>
<td>Behave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Individuals / Organisation / staff</td>
<td>Aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Respond / Environment / Structure</td>
<td>Organisation / Traditions</td>
<td>Aims / Behave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Mission / Function</td>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Organisation / Staff</td>
<td>Aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Structure / Policy</td>
<td>Respond / Flexibility / Demand</td>
<td>Individual / Management</td>
<td>Behave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Respond / Demand</td>
<td>Consistent Management / Staff</td>
<td>Aims / Behave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Environment / Demand</td>
<td>Organisation / Involving / Staff</td>
<td>Beliefs / Aims / Behave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most common DEN words across all levels</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Environment / Demand / Respond</td>
<td>Organisation / Staff</td>
<td>Behave / Aims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The axiomatic question set had the highest EI key words at 18 (Level 2). There is a mixed response across strategic levels, with structure being mainly, but not consistently, used as the EI key word. Also levels 1 and 4 respondents used structure as the most prevalent key word. In the recipe set level 2 respondents returned the highest (30) and lowest (6) EI key words. The mixed response continued where environment, demand and respond were the most prevalent, but not universally consistent, EI key words.
The directory question saw level 2 respondents counting for the highest (36) and lowest (12) EI key words. Whilst most of the level 1, 2 and 3 respondents mainly used staff, organisation and individual as the most prevalent EI key words, level 4 used strategic as a consistent EI key word. Level 1 respondent returned the most EI key word (31) in the dictionary question set. Word types were again mixed across all levels with the most prevalent, but not consistent, being aims and behave.

**Figure 6.21 Average EI word distribution per strategic level Devon and Cornwall police**

Level 1 and 4 respondents had the lowest percentage distribution of EI key words in the axiomatic question set (9% and 10%). Level 4 (36%) and 2 (26%) had the highest amount of EI words distributed in the recipe question set, with level 4 having almost double the percentage of words distributed in this question set compared to level 1 (19%). The directory question set saw all levels having a percentage EI key word distribution in the 30% bracket. This was except for level 3 with a 42% EI key word distribution, which was the highest percentage distribution of key words across all levels in all question sets. The dictionary question set also saw a high percentage distribution in the dictionary question set with 31% of all EI words spoken at level 1.
Collective organisational EI key word analysis

Overall the council and police were very similar in the average amount of EI key words spoken across the four cultural knowledge areas. The highest collective average was in the directory set (21 and 23.5 average) and the lowest collective average was in the axiomatic set (12 average). The collective average at each strategic layer of the combined organisations shows a mixed pattern.

Figure 6.22 Collective EI average police and council

![Bar chart showing collective EI average police and council](image)

Police had more of a mix of EI key words that were spoken the most while the council had more differences across levels in the number of identifiers spoken. The police and council have universality in the same types of EI key words spoken most in the dictionary question set. The police talked more about organisation than the council and the council talked more about involving management than the police in the directory question set. In the recipe question set the council talk more about process and the police about demand and respond, with the council talking more of mission than the police in the axiomatic question set.

The combined strategic layers of the collective organisations, level 1, 2 and 3 mainly use behave and aims key words in the dictionary question set, with level 4 using performance and values as well. Level 1 had the highest average amount of EI key words spoken in the dictionary question set. In the recipe and axiomatic question set Level 4 uses more EI key words in the recipe question set, but is also
the only level to use the EI key word structure. Level 4 also used the least amount of EI key words in the axiomatic question set compared to other levels. All levels have a focus on structure except level 2 who also focus on function and level 4 on mission in addition to structure.

**Collective organisational I think/I know and refer back analysis**

It was found that ‘I think’ was said significantly more times across all levels in both organisations than ‘I know’.

**Table 6.21 Average number of I think / I know council and police**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average number ‘I think’</th>
<th>Average number ‘I know’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amount of ‘I think’ rises as a collective average from levels 2 up to 4 with level 4 saying I think the most. Contrastingly level 1 says I know the least.

**Figure 6.23 Collective I think / I know average police and council**
Symbolic referencing refer back analysis

Analysis was undertaken to look at the number of times respondents referred back to the general wider organisational or community safety / fire amongst council respondents and crime / police amongst police questions to ASB questions.

Figure 6.24 Collective organisations average of refer back at each strategic layer

Figure 6.25 Strategic layer number of refer back police and council
Individually only level 1 respondent of the council did not refer back to the wider organisation/ community safety / fire when answering questions on ASB. Level 2 respondents of the council gave the highest amount of refer backs when answering ASB questions. Except for level 1 the police on average referred back less than the council at levels 2, 3 and 4. As collective organisations the average refer back rose as you went up through the levels from 1 to 4 with level 4 having the highest average refer back as collective organisations.

With the results displayed and accounted for the next chapter looks to discuss the key results of each cultural knowledge area of both organisations without drawing conclusions at this stage. The key issues displayed by the results are contextualised and amalgamated to form primary information about what the results convey in an ASB organisational cultural knowledge strength context.

**Chapter 7 - Discussion**

The discussion of results and analysis of the ASB cultural knowledge are structured in to cultural knowledge sets to assist in clarity of discussion. This will enable focused discussion on the four cultural knowledge areas in relation to ASB. Firstly the overall mission and aims of each organisation are summarised.
Table 7.0 Mission, vision, values, themes and priorities of Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cornwall Council</th>
<th>Devon and Cornwall Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
<td>Working together to make Cornwall safer</td>
<td>Building safer communities together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
<td>Through positive partnership action make communities safer by reducing crime, disorder, anti-social behaviour and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment, reducing the harm caused by misuse, alcohol and other substances, promoting public re-assurance</td>
<td>To be a top performing force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td>Not clearly stated</td>
<td>Honesty – Integrity – Fairness – Respect – Trust - Courage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Themes**       | Reduce Risk of victimisation  
Reduce re-offending  
Improve persistent problem places  
Support recovery and integration | Customers: Respond to the needs of the community  
Performance: To be effective and efficient  
People: Lead – Empower-Value  
Communication: Everyone is kept informed |
| **Priorities**   | Anti-Social Behaviour  
Domestic Abuse  
Re-offending  
Alcohol and the night time economy | Reduce crime and bring criminals to justice  
Maintain Visibility  
Protect people from harm  
Improve satisfaction in service received by victims |

Whilst a comparison did not form part of the investigation, it is important to consider the mission, values and beliefs of an organisation. Additionally in the context of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, an awareness and comparison helps to see how much togetherness there is in relation to the mission, values and beliefs.

Both of the mission statements are very similar relating to safer and together. When looking at ASB and its effect on the individual and feelings of safety (Daily Mail, 2014), there is a very strong connection. Also the together has a tri-functional purpose, implying together with people in communities, together with partners and together as an organisation. This again, in an ASB context, has a strong affiliation with the partnership approach that is used in tackling ASB (Morgan Report, 1991). Whilst the overall mission statements are quite broad there is a strong association with ASB. With both ‘together’ and ‘safer’ as core beliefs you would expect to see running through the organisation in relation to ASB.
Moving onto the vision there is a distinct split between an externally focused vision, that does not mention or refer to the organisation (linking with specific themes), and one which does. Cornwall Council continues the together and safer theme with specific reference to some of the Section 17 wording of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. Devon and Cornwall police have a more generic organisationally focused vision that does not have the external specificity of Cornwall Council.

Whilst Cornwall Council (SCP) values were not explicit, Devon and Cornwall Police values have a very military type feel to them. They appear to be more hard crime focused values that require things like courage. ASB requires more soft focus on things like ‘understanding’ or ‘empathy’ which are core elements of practical ASB case working. The values more or less translate directly into the themes, with Cornwall Council again specifying incident types, although mentions ASB explicitly as one of the priority themes. Devon and Cornwall Police specifically mention reducing crime as a priority theme as well as protection from harm and improved satisfaction of victims (although the frontline responses did not see victim satisfaction as the most important part of their role). These could again be linked to ASB although crime is clearly stated whilst anti-social behaviour is not.

**Axiomatic / Mission**

The axiomatic results of all researched areas are summarised below.

**SACK:** Policy/Strategy/Structure consistent with goal and mission that is collectively consistent and understood by individuals

**DEN:** Understanding mission, goal directed, shared definitions/function/purpose/future perfect thinking. Also Den synonyms to count EI words in this question set are in appendix A.
Table 7.1 Overall SACKDEN and EI results axiomatic cultural knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sack collective manifestations</th>
<th>Cornwall Council (SCP)</th>
<th>D+C police</th>
<th>The Frontline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASB mission awareness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: All but one person on level 2 thinks changes align with mission. Only level 3 and 4 state actual mission.</td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: All say aligns with mission except level 4. Only half of level 1 and 2 state mission</td>
<td>17% very aware of mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASB symbolic referencing by organisation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: All say no definition except level 4 who thinks there is a broad definition. <strong>Very Strong Universal</strong>: all suggest no guidance from top of org.</td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: All but one on level 1 says no definition and no guidance or support from the top.</td>
<td>47% agree ASB guidance, procedure and support clear form org on ASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASB aspirations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strong Unique</strong>: Mixed across levels between more resources and more awareness.</td>
<td><strong>Strong Unique</strong>: mixed aspirations. Only two at level 1 and 2 mention training/guidance.</td>
<td>60% neutral / disagree that ASB changes by org have made real improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational commitment to ASB</strong></td>
<td><strong>Moderate Universal</strong>: most say equal - two in level 2 and 3 think Council, level 4 thinks police.</td>
<td><strong>Moderate Unique</strong>: 2 groups Level 1 and 4 think equal work. Levels 2 and 3 think police do more work.</td>
<td>46% police does most ASB work 49% equal partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average / most common EI word in question set</strong></td>
<td>12 – mission / structure</td>
<td>12 - structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Den – identifiers that support effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Understanding mission, goal directed, shared definitions/function/purpose/future perfect thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the axiomatic ASB cultural knowledge set, goal and mission clarity should be consistently understood by individuals and supported through organisational policy, structure and strategy. This is a critical cultural strength measure of the fundamental ASB beliefs and values of the organisations. If the culture and character of the organisation are not consistent in a strategic context then a negative effect would result (Cameron & Quinn, 2011, p.85).

ASB mission awareness has a high degree of universality within both organisations. Important ASB changes made by the organisation are seen to align with the organisational mission. With cultural strength reliant on strongly held organisational values at all levels (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1996, p.158) this would indicate high symbolic meaning of the core axioms of both organisations. Thematic uniqueness in responses relating to important ASB changes align with mission would indicate possible low symbolic referencing of organisational axioms (where mission and goals are not clear and not supported through policy, structure and strategy). With primary EI identifier words of mission and structure being on average the most commonly used, this would also seem to support the high symbolic referencing of organisational mission in the axiomatic question set.

This thematic universality is not continued however when it comes to strategic layer respondents who actually knew and identified the mission statement. There was a high degree of thematic uniqueness through the strategic layers of both organisations. What is more notable is that within Cornwall Council the highest two strategic levels stated the actual mission statement, whilst the lower two strategic levels did not. Cornwall Council Level 4 strategic layer also had the lowest EI distribution in the axiomatic cultural knowledge set.

There was almost mission mirror opposite in Devon and Cornwall Police, with level 1 and 2 strategic layers mostly identifying the mission statement whilst level 3 and 4 did not. Theoretically expectation would be that the top of the organisation would know the mission and pass it through the organisational layers. ASB mission transference seems to have an issue flowing from the top down in Cornwall Council. More concerning is that mission transference has an issue flowing from
the bottom up of Devon and Cornwall Police. The question here is where is the mission actually referenced from?

This mission dispersal permeates into the frontline responses. Where only 17% of respondents said they knew the mission statement, 83% of frontline ASB officers thinking or not knowing the mission statement represents low symbolic referencing. Additionally the number of EI words on average within the axiomatic question set was 12, the lowest average of all four cultural knowledge question sets. What has been seen so far is a theme of uniqueness in mission awareness, with uneven dispersal between strategic layers and low mission awareness on the ASB frontline.

The uniqueness in relation to the axiomatic / mission question set continues when it comes to symbolic referencing in how the organisation defines what ASB is to the employees. With culture directing and guiding working relationships (Ribiere & Sitar, 2003, p.40), shared definitions need to be clear amongst individuals. This clarity should be through structures and strategy set by the organisation. The results show that there is universal theme in no definition or clarity of what ASB is within both organisations. This almost gives the feel that everyone is looking around for answers through the strategic layers with no ASB guidance from the top. Subsequently in some cases the top is looking for ASB guidance from below! This may have some bearing on the unique themed response to ASB aspirations and what to do to for the best to improve ASB operations, signalling inconsistency of future perfect thinking. This possibly indicates that the problem is not clearly understood, which could relate to low symbolic referencing of ASB mission and goals.

Consistent and collective understandings are critical for enhancing worker motivation and goal alignment (Sorensen, 2002, p.70). Frontline responses about organisational guidance in other cultural knowledge question sets, clarity of procedures and uniqueness in ASB operational consistency raise questions around the knowledge and knowhow of ASB functions in both organisations. There are virtually 50-50 splits in those who agree and those who are neutral or disagree that the organisation is clear on its ASB guidance, procedures and supports frontline
officers in dealing with ASB. If guidance and support was so clear why is only half of the frontline getting it?

Respondents in this research who thought the organisation was clear on its ASB guidance and procedures had some positive bearing on clarity, consistency and organisational drive in relation to ASB. This indicates that where some cultural strength lies, so do some performance benefits. Respondents who felt the organisation was clear on ASB guidance and procedures had a moderate positive influence on the officers also feeling that ASB is dealt with the same way across the organisation. Also there is a strong negative effect on officers not seeing the organisation being clear on how ASB should be dealt with when they see the organisation as being clear on ASB guidance and procedure. There is also a strong positive influence when respondents feel the organisation is clear on how ASB should be dealt on the organisation driving ASB change.

Positive thematic indicators from respondents who felt the organisation guided and supported them in relation to how ASB is dealt with were present. This is a moderate to strong positive influence on being clearer on how ASB should be dealt with, ASB seen as being as important as crime and the organisation makes important ASB changes This is important in relation to the safer and together elements of both organisations mission statements, especially where fighting crime is seen as core police business (Holdaway, 1989, p.58). This highlights that whilst there is uniqueness in many axiomatic areas, the frontline respondents who believe they are guided and supported by the organisation in relation to ASB (even though in reality they actually may not be) has a positive effect on clarity and importance of ASB.

An indicator associated with lack of organisational ASB guidance and support could be seen (QSET2), where 14% of frontline officers responding to the research felt they gained their ASB knowledge through organisational sources with 83% getting their ASB knowledge from less structured sources like on the job or from colleagues. There is a positive effect that clear organisational ASB guidance and support can have on frontline officers in organisational perception and more consistent ASB functionality. This is not supported, according to the frontline, by
consistent organisational ASB knowledge assistance but instead ASB knowledge is gained in a more ad-hoc manner.

Shared and consistent understandings are core elements of the axiomatic / mission cultural knowledge set. With culture shaping the character of the organisation, guiding day to day working relationships (Ribiere & Sitar, 2003, p.40) there is thematic uniqueness in relation to ASB knowledge. Unstructured knowledge acquisition is dominant across the frontline. This is especially pertinent when organisational cultural knowledge forms the basis for thinking, feeling and acting across an organisation (Sackmann, 1991, p.36). If knowledge acquisition in ASB functionality is inconsistent then what are the consequences for cultural knowledge strength and collective axiomatic understandings?

Whilst on understanding and organisational core business, the refer back results of the axiomatic question set examined to what extent, when faced with uncertainty, officers reference back to organisational core business or what they know. This would take the form of respondents in strategic layers referring to the wider organisation rather than specifically ASB. An example would be if the police referred back to wider crime a lot rather than specifically ASB (questions that were asked specifically about the wider organisation were not included) when answering ASB questions.

The council referred back more than police at levels 4 to 2. The highest average refer back was also present at each of these levels. Level 1 council did not refer back at all but the equivalent police layer did. Collectively across both organisations the higher up the strategic layers you went the higher average refer back. This could be a significant factor especially when looking at ASB, with the police referring back to crime and council referring back to wider organisational or traditional area of work (eg: level 4 is the Chief Fire Officer) in making sense of ASB mission clarity and goals. The I think and I know analysis across all levels of both organisation showed that I think is said more than I know. Level 4 participants overall said I think more than any other levels and I know is said the least at level 1.

Whilst a lot of the discussion has been around consistency, collectivity and high-low symbolic referencing, there is an interesting dynamic relating to organisational
commitment towards ASB. In the strategic middle layer, level 2 and 3 of both organisations, the council respondents mainly think the council does the most work and police respondents think police do most work in relation to ASB. The layers around 2 and 3 (with the exception of level 4 of the council) mainly see ASB as an equal partnership. The interest here lies in that the very top and bottom organisational strategic layers of both organisations indicate the together of dealing with ASB as an equal organisational effort. The middle layers of both organisations see their own organisation as doing the most in relation to ASB. Is it that the organisational middle is bypassed or that there are some key ASB rigidities relating to each organisation in the strategic middle? Is it an indicator of where the value (and operational effectiveness) of partnerships lie in relation to ASB?

The frontline respondents see the police doing the most / equal partnership in relation to ASB. Only 5% of respondents cite the council as doing the most. Due to the smaller number of frontline council ASB officers compared to police this cannot be relied upon. With the majority of respondents being police based 49% of all respondents on the frontline saw ASB as an equal partnership between both organisations. This may demonstrate that the belief in ASB partnership has as a stronger presence, but still only accounts for half of the frontline respondents view.

**Recipe / Adaptability**

The below table summarises the axiomatic results of all researched areas.

**SACK:** Collective experience and judgements influence and shape survival and success of the organisation

**DEN:** Organisation responds to external environment with flexibility in structures and process that is believed to be influenced by culture. Also Den synonyms to count EI words in this question set are in appendix A.
Table 7.2 Overall SACKDEN and EI recipe cultural knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sack collective manifestations</th>
<th>Collective experience and judgements influence and shape survival and success of the organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improving ASB</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Council</td>
<td><strong>Moderate unique:</strong> Level 1 improve internal practises, level 2 and 3 engagement across the org. Level 4 intelligence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+C police</td>
<td><strong>Strong unique.</strong> Across levels - key themes partnership working and increased resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Frontline</td>
<td>69% do not think all officers deal with ASB the same way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this orgs view?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td><strong>Universal:</strong> All thought org wouldn’t agree or depends on who you spoke to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Unique:</td>
<td><strong>Level 1 and 4 don’t think would agree. Level 2 and 3 think would agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>37% agree the organisation is diving change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stops and not stops</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong universal:</td>
<td><strong>All would stop at operational staff/areas.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong unique:</td>
<td><strong>1 and 4 wouldn’t stop at other operational areas. 2 and 3 not stop at management/strategic level.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong universal:</td>
<td><strong>All would stop at operational areas.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong unique:</td>
<td><strong>not stopping - some mention operational process. Level 4 states intelligence.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14% gain their ASB knowledge from organisational sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Should ASB be dealt with in org</strong></td>
<td><strong>Very strong universal:</strong> All said yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average / most common EI words in question set</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 / Mainly process / environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6% agreed / neutral that ASB is not the job of their organisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Den – identifiers that support effectiveness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organisation responds to external environment with flexibility in structures and process that is believed to be influenced by culture</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the recipe/adaptability cultural knowledge area there’s a move from the more rigid axioms of the organisations into the ASB organisational character (Ribiere & Sitar, 2003, p.40). This character is a critical component in knowledge sharing (Gold, 2001, p.189). There are universal themes across both organisations that ASB should be dealt with by the organisations. This shows strong, universal organisational commitment towards dealing with ASB which would link back to the safer and together elements of the mission. With a small 6% exception in the frontline respondents, only the top 2 strategic layers of Devon and Cornwall Police do not place dealing with ASB as the sole responsibility of the police. Responsibility is seen to be working with partners on the ASB issue. That said ASB commitment from both organisations is thematically universal.

With strong organisational commitment there is expectation that this would run through into ASB recipe knowledge. However with the axiomatic knowledge set being far from universal, the potential knock on effect can be seen in the rest of the recipe question set. A feature of recipe cultural knowledge is what should be done through prescriptive theory of action (Sackmann, 1991, p.39). When looking at the strategic layers of both organisations, there is a unique response in relation to what should be done to improve ASB operations. Both organisations cite internal and higher level changes, but Devon and Cornwall Police are more themed around resourcing and partnership working linking more closely to operational aspects. What this may indicate is the knock on effects of low-symbolic referencing and inconsistency in organisational ASB guidance and process.

This notion could be further supported by 69% of frontline respondents who think officers do not deal with ASB in the same way. This not only raises questions about ASB operational consistency and dispersed knowledge sharing, but indicates that the organisations may not be at the forefront of ASB knowledge creation. This could theoretically lead to dispersal and uniqueness in the collective operational constructs of ASB social reality. This would create uniqueness amongst organisational member viewpoints on what to do for the best to improve ASB operations.
There is a universal theme throughout both organisational strategic layers when looking at what was positive and negative about organisational ASB operations with strategic layers viewing frontline operations as a positive ASB aspect. The ASB improvements cited in the strategic layers of both organisations were mainly high level, but ASB operations of both organisations (although operations of other organisations were seen as negative) were seen as positive. So the doing (however unstructured) is positive and the systems of support (the how the doing is shaped and supported) is subject to less universal positivity.

The EI primary and sub word use has greatest density at level 4, 2 and 1 of both organisations, with environment being one of the main words used in the EI primary and sub word set. With organisational response and structural flex to the external environment being a key element of culture that supports effectiveness, this is a positive indicator. With the dispersed way ASB knowledge is gained on the frontline, the uniqueness in what should be done to improve ASB operations coupled with the dual organisational thematic that the organisation in the main would not agree with the ASB improvements, indicates a high degree of dispersal in ASB recipe knowledge.

With a high density EI word identification count it is almost like strategic layers talk about the doing but no-one knows how to actually do it. In the absence of axiomatic guidance, the frontline could be seen to be doing what they think individually rather than collectively. There is also an element of the traditional core business and hang ups in relation to common recipe EI words being used. The use of process from the council, signals back to the criticism of traditional local authority thinking and lack of response (Boyne, Martin & Walker, 2004, p.192). The demand/response EI words from police referring back to the core business of policing and traditional policing mind-set (Greene, 2000, p.332).
### Directory / Involvement

#### Table 7.3 Overall SACKDEN and EI directory cultural knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sack collective manifestations</th>
<th>Cornwall Council (SCP)</th>
<th>D+C police</th>
<th>The Frontline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What caused changes and what drives changes in org</td>
<td><strong>Strong unique</strong>: Mix of external government/high level changes. <strong>Moderate Unique</strong>: Level 1 and 2 changes driven from operational staff, 3 and 4 top down.</td>
<td><strong>Strong Universal</strong>: External factors caused changes. Level 4 said internal relationships/partnerships. Most say top down is what drives the changes.</td>
<td>63% of frontline respondents are neutral / disagree that the organisation drives change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day to day ASB working</td>
<td><strong>Very Strong Universal</strong>: All mention operational staff in the day to day running. Most mention escalation processes.</td>
<td><strong>Strong Unique</strong>: 50% talk of operational staff but not processes, 50% talk of escalation/other processes but mention staff less.</td>
<td>70% of officers disagree that officers deal with ASB in the same way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent across org?</td>
<td><strong>Strong Unique</strong>: Mixed consistent and not consistent across organisation</td>
<td><strong>Moderate Unique</strong>: Levels 1 and 2 mostly say inconsistent and Cornwall. Level 3 and 4 say consistent across org and Cornwall.</td>
<td>85% disagree/neutral ASB dealt with the same across the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average / most common EI word in question set</td>
<td>21 / Mainly involving / staff / management</td>
<td>23 / Organisation / Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den – identifiers that support effectiveness</td>
<td><em>Individuals are involved in shaping how things are done through implicit and involving systems that allow for values and traditions as opposed to being subject to bureaucratic systems</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A hangover from the recipe to the directory cultural knowledge is that changes for ASB improvements would not, in the main, be agreed with by the organisation. Whilst individual issues were cited as an underlying theme, this also suggests that in relation to how things are done individuals are possibly disconnected from the organisation. Respondents who saw the organisation not agreeing with their ASB improvement suggestion indicates a lack of involvement and that operations are not matching each organisations demands (key rigidity). This is a possible indication of weakness or misalignment of culture and organisational vision and strategies (or a low symbolic referencing issue).

With directory cultural knowledge elements concerned with the how things are done through common approach and team effort, the EI key and sub word count had one of the highest averages (21). EI key words of staff, involving, management and organisation would indicate that there was involvement at all levels based on the high average numbers of these words used across all strategic layers. With greater ownership comes greater commitment to the organisation (Denison, 1990, p.7), which could be linked to the universal organisational commitments to ASB being something both organisations should be dealing with.

With the invisible elements of an organisation being the greatest contributor to organisational effectiveness (Hitt, Bierman, Shimizu, & Kochhar, 2001, p.14), shared systems of organisational norms are found in high involvement cultures (Denison, 1990, p.9). So if one measure of organisational cultural knowledge strength is consistency amongst participants in the collective construction of social reality, how consistent is this in how things are done in relation to ASB within both organisations?

The description of theory of action in relation to ASB in both organisations was far from universally themed through strategic layers. What was also notable was the superficial feel to the answers, with little or no reference to organisational process around ASB. The causes and drivers for ASB change were mixed across both organisations with external factors in the main cited by both agencies. Overall ASB changes had a ‘done to’ feel as opposed to proactive organisational changes based on response to external operating environments. This has a ‘we will change if were told’ feel, which has a slightly inflexible organisational undertone. Leaving aside
where the change actually comes from there seems to be greater indicators of confusion relating to where change is being driven from. It is possible that dominant traditional hierarchal structures are maybe out of touch with the ASB frontline?

The confusion is more prevalent in Cornwall Council around where change is driven from. The bottom layers see it as ‘bottom up’ and the top two layers see ASB change driven from the ‘top down’. It is difficult to translate this into involvement as the argument could be made that the bottom two strategic layers of the council feel they drive change, so could indicate involvement. On the other hand the top two layers see it as being driven downwards. Does this indicate lack of strategic awareness, or is it that things are being dissipated in the strategic middle?

When looking at police, which is a traditionally hierarchical organisation with a culture difficult to transform (Reiner, 1992, p.37), most of the strategic layers see change as being driven from top down. It was interesting to note that the top strategic layer of Devon and Cornwall Police was the only one who thought ASB change was driven through internal factors. This may indicate different (or minority) thinking. This again would be a question around how subject individuals are too bureaucratic systems that dictate change.

Translating the above into the frontline ASB operations there is a confusing picture depending on interpretation. A high percentage of frontline respondents disagree or are undecided if the organisation drives ASB change. This could indicate one of two things. Firstly it may be the self-for filling prophecy of inconsistency and low-symbolic referencing from the organisation. Through the previously discussed cultural knowledge question sets the frontline is searching for ASB solutions amongst themselves as a collective (through dispersed ASB knowledge acquisition). This also may indicate a low involvement culture in shaping how things are done as ASB is not consistently defined by the organisation. It could also be argued that if a large majority of the frontline do not see the organisation driving change, then frontline ASB officers are the change drivers themselves. What is important to note is that frontline respondents to this research who agreed that the organisation drives ASB change has a positive effect on the likelihood that they would see the changes as important, making real improvements and feel supported and guided by the organisation.
Staying with the frontline ASB focus, collectively and universality in approaches when dealing with specifically identified incident types through consistent ASB actions are a key determent of cultural strength (Cameron & Quinn, 2011, p.85). Looking at identifying action type in relation to a crime / ASB or mixture of both, frontline officers who saw the criminally weighted incident types (shoplifting, burglary, assault, public order) would use a criminal sanction to deal with it, with almost 0% using ASB action. With criminal law being clearly defined as a set of legislative acts, with a long history of being associated as part of good policing work by officers (Holdaway, 1989 p.58), the high symbolic referencing and clarity could be an explanation for such universal response in this category.

That said when moving into what could be seen as offence types which have some flex in their interpretation, the action type appears to shift in line with the flex. Harassment is criminally legislated against (Protection from Harassment Act, 1997), but harassment also features in the legal definition of anti-social behaviour in civil law (Crime and Disorder Act, 1998 1(1)). With the boundaries between civil and criminal act and actions more blurred (Burney, 2002, p.474) this shift is seen with 61% using a criminal sanction with harassment and 24% of respondents using an ASB sanction. The shift is seen more drastically when it comes to street drinking as another 'both' offence type (there is no street drinking act). It is more freely identified and associated with ASB. 89% of respondents would use an ASB sanction to deal with this incident type with only 6% would use a criminal sanction.

Noise and neighbour disputes, which are seen as more traditional ASB types (although noise can be criminal if found to be a statutory nuisance under the Environmental Protection Act 1990), clarity is universal with 0% of respondents considering the use of criminal sanctions in this area but look at using ASB or other sanction. What could be said overall is that frontline officers appear to have consistent approaches in identifying the course of action based on if the weighting is crime, ASB or both. This is despite ASB knowledge across the frontline mainly being gained from unstructured sources. There is a high level of thematic uniqueness in how ASB is dealt with by officers and across the organisation. This does not match, and could represent a process of elimination being exercised by respondents. Also it could be that no matter what the organisational cultural
knowledge issues are around ASB, whilst ASB is difficult to describe, you know it when you see it.

Whist the frontline may not see ASB being dealt with in a universal way but recognising ASB when they see it may be down to ignoring organisational guidance and using their own thoughts and judgements. With consistent action a key determent of cultural strength, the organisational strategic layers in both organisations have unique themes in understanding and description of ASB operations in practice. With the police strategic layers split between citing process and not staff and vice versa, the council strategic layers have a universal theme of ASB operations sit with operational staff. What is less prevalent across both organisations is the detailing of ASB process. Whilst the escalation process is mentioned there was universal theme in the lack of detailed explanation of ASB operational process.

**Dictionary / Consistency**

The dictionary cultural knowledge of an organisation should be all about the ‘what is’. Universality of definitions and descriptions is critical so organisational members look at things through the same lens. This means that symbolic referencing through values and direction need to be clear and understood. Continuing with action type in relation to incident type from the frontline respondents, there is a similar pattern relating to collective incident type interpretation as there was to action type. The universal theme is that the highest number of responses in each incident category (crime, ASB, both) is consistent with the weighting applied.
Table 7.4 Overall SACKDEN and EI dictionary cultural knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sack collective manifestations</th>
<th>Definitions and descriptions of organisational phenomena are collective in knowledge and cultural terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cornwall Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for joining org</td>
<td>Moderate Unique: Level 1 and 2 mention personal morals, level 3 and 4 mention interest / enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Unique: Only level 4 had a reason aligned to mission. No mention of personal morals. Most reasons interest / fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important aspects of work</td>
<td>Very Strong Universal: All have clear aims. All levels link to strategic priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important changes to ASB</td>
<td>Moderate Unique: Levels 3 and 4 mention higher level changes. Level 1 and 2 mention operational changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Universal: All but one mentioned partnership working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why change so important</td>
<td>Strong Unique: Mixed themes increased efficiency, consistency, better resource use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(organisational phenomena and aims)</td>
<td>Strong Universal: All mention something relating to increasing accountability and responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average / most common EI</td>
<td>14.5 - Mainly behave / aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word in question set</td>
<td>14 - Behave / Aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den – identifiers that support effectiveness</td>
<td>That individuals have core values and beliefs aligned with organisational need so as to behave in a manner to get the job done and clearly defined aims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On examining what could collectively be seen as values and aims, there are significant patterns of note through the strategic layers of both organisations. When looking at the reasons and values for joining the organisation, the top two strategic layers of the council mention personal morals whilst the top strategic layers of the police did not mention personal morals as explicitly, but talked of wanting to make a difference. The top two layers of the council cited interest and enjoyment but what has to be noted is that all of the top council strategic layers joined the organisation originally as fire fighters.

When moving down through the organisational strategic layers of the police, the main reason for joining is cited as interest and fun. With level 1 and 2 in the council there is more talk of personal morals and none of fun. Level 1 and 2 in the council linked to strategic priorities of the SCP and are priority focused in their answers. This above is not a judgement on the personal credibility of any of the respondents. What this does is to look at what individual motivation was for joining and how strongly they linked to the values and priorities of each organisation.

The commitment towards the organisation dealing with ASB is universal (94%) and that ASB is as important as dealing with crime (89%). The importance of ASB being seen as being as important as crime has some effect on how the frontline views elements of the organisation. Those on the frontline who see ASB as important as crime will be slightly more likely to see the organisation driving, supporting and driving ASB change and that ASB is the job of their organisation. This symbolic meaning of community protection appears to have some universality through question sets.

When moving onto looking at clarity of aims there is some universality from Cornwall Council, with all respondents referring to strategic priorities of SCP (eg: ASB, Drugs, Alcohol) in identifying the most important parts of their work. The police are not so partnership priority focused, with a high degree of universality in key thematic aims of reducing crime and keeping the public safe. This could be interpreted as the police looking after their own organisational priorities. With the councils priorities also partnership ones, it could also be argued that the police priorities are the partnership ones, and that the partnership priorities help the police achieve their priorities.
There is a distinct lack of reference to collective goal sharing (although the council priorities are the SCP partnership priorities) through the strategic layers which filters into the frontline. With 30% of frontline respondents seeing crime/ASB prevention as the most important part of their work, the collective aims of community safety accounted for 19% of respondents. Community safety links directly to the mission statements of both organisations. What is also interesting is that tackling crime was seen as a slightly less important part of frontline work than dealing with ASB. The majority of frontline respondents are police employed, with crime reduction a clear a strong universal theme through strategic layers. This provides and interesting indication of possible disconnect between what’s important to the strategic layers in the police organisation and what the frontline see as most important. What does this say about clarity of aims?

The police and frontline misalignment continues in relation to public satisfaction and confidence. The police and council have clear priorities around improving satisfaction of service and reducing victimisation. However this appears not to be consistent as only 1% of respondents indicate satisfaction / confidence as one of the most important parts of their work. This again points towards effect of low-symbolic referencing issues around clarity of aims and goals.

When looking at the strategic layers in relation to the aims of the organisation and the most important changes and clarity of how ASB is dealt with, there is some universality in responses. The operational frontline agrees that the organisation has made important ASB changes in how ASB is dealt with (66%). Those respondents who think this are also more likely to see the changes as positive, feel guided by the organisation and see the organisation driving change in relation to ASB. Moving into the strategic layers of the council, top level changes such as structure and budgets from layers 3 and 4 were seen as the cause for important changes in ASB. Layers 1 and 2 cited operationally focused changes. The police had universality in a partnership thematic when it came to the most important ASB changes. This implies that partnership working has not always been that prevalent. Partnership working is definitely not a new thing and is a presumed automatic way of working under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.
There may possibly be some confirmation of an imbalance in partnership working (actual or perceived). The presence of the theme within police strategic layer responses is that ASB is not the sole responsibility of their organisation. This indicates that the job is too big for one organisation or that ASB is not thought of as a key/priority area (even though the frontline is universal in seeing ASB as important as crime). It is also possible that police feel that the council have not taken on as much of the ASB workload in the statutory ASB partnership.

Clarity of ASB aims has virtually a 50/50 split on the frontline of those who see the organisation being clear in its aims of how ASB should be dealt with and those who do not see it being clear. Interestingly of those who though the organisation was clear on how ASB should be dealt with, 59% thought that it was not dealt with in the same way. Those who see the organisation as not being clear on how to deal with ASB are also less likely to see the organisation being clear on its ASB guidance, procedures, support and see ASB changes made by the organisation as being negative. This again may be the result of low symbolic referencing which has been a theme through-out organisational cultural knowledge layers.

Continuing on the notion of symbolic referencing it does question how the organisational aims are being translated if there is a lack of universal response in important ASB changes and clear organisational ASB guidance. Guidance does exist in relation to ASB (escalation process, policy) but it is not used in practice. Instead there is the issue of the frontline having a mainly unstructured attainment of ASB knowledge. This possibly indicates a dispersed organisational cultural knowledge memory sharing coupled with low symbolic referencing and ignoring of organisational guidance.

When looking at the EI most common words spoken in the dictionary question set, somewhat ironically, behave and aims were the most common. This almost indicates that the aims and common behaviour to meet those aims is talked about but does not translate into operational practice.

Returning to the frontline and consistency of incident identification and action, the categories of shoplifting, assault and burglary universally had the highest percentage of frontline respondents identifying them as criminal acts in line with the
weighting. When looking at the sanction used, 0% would use an ASB sanction in these three categories. However this was not the case in the Public Order category, which has a crime weighting. 82% of respondents would use a criminal sanction to deal with it, but 79% of respondents saw it as both ASB and crime. The inconsistency also seen with shoplifting where 93% would use a criminal sanction but 31% of respondents saw it both as ASB and crime.

This pattern continued in harassment and street drinking incident types which have a ‘both’ weighting. These both incident types had the highest percentage amount of both responses (although 25% saw harassment as criminal act and 50% saw street drinking as ASB). However whilst 68% of respondents saw harassment as being criminal and anti-social, 61% of those respondents would use a criminal sanction to deal with it. With street drinking 0% of respondents identified it as criminal with 6% of respondents saying they would use a criminal sanction to deal with it. There is more universality in interpretation of the ASB weighted incidents (neighbour dispute and noise). Virtually 0% of all respondents identifying these as a criminal act and 0% of respondents would use a criminal sanction.

What this shows overall is that broadly there is a universal theme in incident identification and matching action type when it is clearly crime or ASB. The greatest ambiguity is within the areas where there is less clarity like a ‘both’ weighting. Harassment, and in some respects street drinking, have a more mixed in incident classification. This is especially noticeable with harassment where action type (criminal) does not universality match classification type (both). Also the existence of the both classification due to the existence of ASB appears to have had an effect on how public order is classified. Whilst the action to deal with it is criminal, the interpretation is more varied suggesting that the both classification creates uncertainty in interpretation and subsequently incident classification.

With discussions around the key findings of each ASB cultural knowledge set of Devon and Cornwall police and Cornwall Council, conclusions are drawn in the following chapter in relation to what this actually means in an ASB performance context. Conclusions will be drawn collectively on each cultural knowledge set. Additionally new theory will be discussed in order to offer new insight into the effect of ASB symbolic referencing on cultural knowledge strength and operational
performance. This will then inform an overall conclusion which will also account for future research avenues.

Chapter 8 - Conclusions

The aim of the research was to conduct a preliminary investigation into the strength of ASB cultural knowledge within Cornwall of two organisations (Devon and Cornwall Police and Cornwall Council), in order to offer a new insight into ASB organisational cultural knowledge and possible links to ASB operational failings. With superior operational performance associated with a strong, consistent culture that supports the organisational mission (Saffold, 1998, p.546; Sorensen, 2002, p.70), a mixed methods approach using the SACKDEN cultural knowledge framework was used to preliminary assess cultural knowledge strength amongst participants.

The collective strength and effectiveness of cultural knowledge relating to ASB is assessed through thematic uniqueness or universality amongst respondents. This was then used to assess how aligned themes were through strategic layers and across the frontline. Ultimately conclusions have to be drawn on if the cultural knowledge supports the organisational mission, vision and themes of both organisations individually and collectively under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

With ASB being only one part of what both organisations have to deal with then why is ASB operational effectiveness so important? Leaving aside the day to day victims of ASB and the fear and misery ASB breeds, it is a key contributor to overall organisational mission, vision and priorities of both organisations. In order to reduce crime, improve victim satisfaction, protect people from harm and ultimately make communities safer, effective action against ASB is critical for both organisations wider objectives.

Conclusions are drawn on each individual cultural knowledge set that informs the overall conclusion about cultural knowledge strength. Any conclusions and inferences drawn are only generalisable amongst participants at this stage due to the preliminary nature of the research.
Axiomatic conclusion

Table 8.0 Overall Axiomatic cultural knowledge strength and effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Layers</th>
<th>Cornwall Council</th>
<th>Average EI</th>
<th>D+C Police</th>
<th>Average EI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axiomatic</td>
<td>Strong Universal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strong Universal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission awareness</td>
<td>Strong Universal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Universal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symbolic referencing</td>
<td>Strong Universal*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Universal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB aspirations</td>
<td>Strong Unique</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>org commitment</td>
<td>Moderate Universal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes strong universal in a negative cultural knowledge context

The axiomatic cultural knowledge set is the weakest overall and more so in Devon and Cornwall Police participants than Cornwall Council. With things of organisational value shared through symbolic referencing (Harvey, Treadway & Heames, 2006, p.195), there is low symbolic referencing evident which questions the real value and importance placed on ASB by organisational members.

Axiomatic knowledge relies on the organisation clearly defining ASB, thus providing clarity and consistency shared amongst organisational members. Strategic layer mission clarity is based on awareness rather than universal knowing. Low symbolic referencing is confirmed through there not being ASB definition, guidance or support from the organisation. The axiomatic EI average count is the lowest of all question sets, further confirming the weakness of the axiomatic cultural knowledge set.

Low symbolic referencing supports the theoretical low value placed on ASB by members of both organisations and uniqueness in knowing what to do to improve ASB operations. Low symbolic referencing and cultural knowledge weakness passes through the strategic layers into front line officers. Weakness in ASB mission awareness, support, meaningful ASB changes and clarity of guidance were all evident, with no consistent response of over 50% in any of the frontline axiomatic questions.
Recipe conclusion

Table 8.1 Overall Recipe cultural knowledge strength and effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Layers</th>
<th>Cornwall Council</th>
<th>Average EI</th>
<th>D+C Police</th>
<th>Average EI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recipe Influence and experience</td>
<td>Strong Unique</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence and flexibility</td>
<td>Very Strong Universal*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Moderate Unique</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience / response to external environment</td>
<td>Strong Universal / Unique</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Universal / Unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement and flexibility</td>
<td>Very Strong Universal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recipe cultural knowledge set is weak overall set which can be attributed to the low symbolic referencing of the axiomatic set. Strategic layer and frontline organisational members share strong commitment in that they should be dealing with ASB. Due to axiomatic ASB weakness, the lack of organisational ASB definition and clarity of process has left how ASB is dealt with inconsistent through strategic layers and frontline. This evidences that organisational ASB commitment does not support the personal one indicated by organisational members.

Frontline officers and strategic layers see ASB being dealt with inconsistently even though there is little issue with frontline officers identifying the difference between crime and ASB incidents. It can also be conclude that based on the weakness of strategic layers and frontline in the recipe cultural knowledge set, the organisations do not have great ASB adaptability in response to changes in external operating environments. A low average EI score of 17 coupled with organisational participants not universally identifying what to do for the best to improve ASB operations examples the weakness of organisational adaptability exampled though dispersed ASB thinking.

With cultural knowledge strength gauged through consistency amongst participants (Inceoglu, 2002, p.26), how ASB is dealt with on the frontline is highly unique and so inconsistent. This is a result of axiomatic inconsistency through low ASB symbolic referencing within both organisations.
Directory conclusion

Table 8.2 Overall Directory cultural knowledge strength and effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Layers</th>
<th>Cornwall Council</th>
<th>Average EI</th>
<th>D+C Police</th>
<th>Average EI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in shaping how things are done</td>
<td>Strong Unique / Moderate unique</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strong Universal / Strong Universal</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement / task completion</td>
<td>Very Strong Universal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonly held approach</td>
<td>Strong Unique</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The directory cultural knowledge set of how things are done is the most effective cultural knowledge set, but overall is the best of a bad bunch. The council strategic layers are like a ship with no rudder, unsure where change is driven from. The police organisational participants have a strong steer of where change is driven from, but much less involvement. Whilst council organisational members have more universality in day to day operations than police members; there is still weakness in consistent ASB approach making the directory strategic layers weak.

The issue on the directory frontline participants is the further effect of low symbolic ASB referencing in weakening the cultural knowledge structures. As a result frontline officers do not get their ASB knowledge from the organisation and do not deal with ASB in the same way. There is no clarity, process, support or definition from the organisation around ASB, or put simply low symbolic and low value support. With a shared system of organisational norms found in high involvement, high consistency cultures, the directory cultural knowledge set is far from this.
Dictionary conclusion

Table 8.3 Overall Dictionary cultural knowledge strength and effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Layers</th>
<th>Cornwall Council</th>
<th>Average EI</th>
<th>D+C Police</th>
<th>Average EI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core values and beliefs</td>
<td>Moderate unique</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong universal*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core values and beliefs</td>
<td>Very strong universal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very strong universal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational phenomena and performance</td>
<td>Moderate unique</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>Strong universal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational phenomena and aims</td>
<td>Strong unique</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong universal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes strong universal in a negative cultural knowledge context

The dictionary cultural knowledge is strong for police organisational members and weak for council members. With most important aspect of work having a very strong universal strength, police organisational members continue to have strength in interpretation of ASB phenomena, performance and changes made to achieve ASB aims. Council organisational participants share the strength in universality of most important aspects of work but have weakness in all other dictionary areas relating to organisational ASB phenomena, performance and aims.

The strength in commitment but overall weakness in dictionary cultural knowledge is also reflected across the frontline. With high strength placed on the importance of ASB, the how and why things are done when it comes to practical ASB operations is profoundly weak. What can be concluded is ASB knowledge acquisition and operational approach is individually interpreted as opposed to organisationally defined. This is supported by the low EI rating for this cultural knowledge set also making it one of the least effective cultural knowledge sets.

It is essential that core values of organisational members match the mission. There is strength in the ‘hearts and minds’ of organisational members in relation to ASB, how it is seen in practice is weak and dispersed. This is due to low symbolic referencing from the organisation leading to dispersed decoding of organisational ASB messages amongst organisational participants.
Low ASB symbolic referencing and polarisation theory

With I think said more across both organisations than I know in responses to ASB questions gives further evidence of low symbolic ASB referencing. As a collective organisational average, I think rises as you go up the strategic layers, leaving the conclusion that the top of the organisations which should be providing ASB clarity, are not doing so. However what also rises as a collective organisational average as you go up strategic layers is the amount of times organisational members refer back to ‘core business’ or the wider organisation when answering and defining ASB questions. The presence of low ASB symbolic referencing creates conditions of ambiguity and uncertainty towards ASB. This subsequently polarises organisational members away from ASB by referring back to core business in order to make sense of the ASB world, or polarisation theory.

When faced with ambiguity, officers (police) return to core business behaviours (Paoline, 2003, p.202). However this does not happen as two polar opposites which this seems to suggest and not exclusively to police officers. To account for this in an ASB context the new concept of polarisation theory is introduced to demonstrate the effect of low symbolic ASB referencing on the collective cultural knowledge sense making around ASB.

**Figure 8.0 Polarisation theory (ASB)**

Due to ASB being a part of, as opposed to the only business of organisations like police and councils, organisational members have core business behaviours (eg: police = crime and law enforcement, fire = fire prevention, rescue and response). Where low symbolic ASB referencing exists, the greater the polarisation of officers to refer back to core business behaviours to make sense of ASB situations where
ambiguity exists. The opposite occurs where high ASB symbolic referencing exists with lower core business behaviour displayed due to greater ASB clarity and sense making.

To create stronger ASB organisational cultural knowledge then the organisation has to be clear from the very top about ASB and ensure it is transferred consistently through organisational layers via process and policy. This will create conditions for organisational members to display lower core behaviour as there will be higher collective ASB sense making and so lower core behaviour displayed. This will create consistency and cultural knowledge strength which if aligned with organisational mission improve ASB operational performance.

The introduction of polarisation theory introduces a way to strengthen ASB cultural knowledge sets. In returning to the organisational iceberg the invisible base is made up of many separate elements like values, beliefs and rituals. However cultural knowledge takes these elements which are all contained within the culture of an organisation and groups them together in cultural knowledge sets. It is these cultural knowledge sets that provide stronger and more immediate support to organisational operations as opposed to the dispersed individual ones.

**Figure 8.1 The cultural knowledge organisational iceberg**
If the invisible elements of the organisation remain dispersed and not grouped into cultural knowledge sets, then this offers a weak platform for building successful (ASB) operations. Less collective belief, behaviour, attitudes, values, politics, groups, culture and traditions make a weak base. This in turn creates greater polarisation, especially where symbolic referencing is low. If high symbolic referencing exists so does greater collectivity (strength) of individual invisible elements into cultural knowledge sets. It is these cultural knowledge sets that provide the key pillar on which successful (ASB) operations will be supported by.

**Overall Conclusion**

Overall in line with the original research question the following conclusions have been reached:

- That ASB cultural knowledge amongst strategic layer research participants is weak.
- That H1 hypothesis is confirmed for frontline research participants in that ASB has low thematic universality amongst frontline officers in Cornwall.

Through weak thematic universality and high levels of uniqueness in frontline officer responses, the ASB cultural knowledge of Cornwall Council and Devon and Cornwall Police research participants is weak. The issues stem from low ASB symbolic referencing from the organisation, which relates to lack of clarity in ASB process, definition, support and mission awareness. With both organisations not providing a consistent framework to support collective ASB cultural knowledge a high degree of uniqueness amongst organisational members is present.

With ASB being part of both organisations overall business, the low symbolic ASB referencing questions how much value organisations place on ASB. With individual participants relaying high value commitment and weighting to the importance of ASB, this appears not to be backed organisationally thorough structures, process and performance. This very much is a case of individual officers ‘talking the talk’ but the organisation is not ‘walking the walk’.
The low symbolic ASB conditions create ambiguity and uncertainty amongst organisational members which increases polarisation towards core behaviour and actions away from ASB. This then lends the question that should ASB be dealt with by a stand-alone organisation, with no other function, rather than being part of the business of police and local authority? This would negate the effect of polarisation theory and lead to greater operational performance by having ASB as the only business of the organisation, or the ‘third way’ of dealing with ASB.

If ASB remains in competition with what is seen as primary functions of the organisation, then polarisation will occur as organisational participants will want to contribute to organisational outcomes that have value placed on them by the organisation. This will continue to leave ASB being a second order problem (Loveday & Smith, forthcoming, 2014) with mitigation of this issue only achieved if ASB is subject to first order symbolic referencing. In other words ASB/Community Safety must be clearly defined as the primary core business of an organisation which has no other competing functions (like we have seen in police and local authority). This then negates the effect of polarisation of organisational participants as there will be no other competing core behaviour to which to polarise.

If therefore police are blue, fire are red and ambulance are green what colour is a civil based ASB / community safety operational services that has a clearly defined primary remit of dealing with such issues? The ‘third way’ postulated here is indeed nothing new. As far back as 1999 the core to the success of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal was neighbourhood wardens (Coward, Etherington, Macmillan, & Wells, 2004 p.1). However with the introduction of PCSO’s under the Police Reform Act 2002, coupled with financial pressures on local councils, the provision of wardens has become subject to inconsistent assessment, with finance (not effectiveness) playing a major part (A Reporter, 2014; Fisher, 2014).

There is an increasing trend within the public sector in relation to additional functions being hived off by many organisations, particularly in the current financial climate. The PCC for Devon and Cornwall for example fully supports the Mental Health Concordat (Devon & Cornwall Police and Crime Commissioner’s Office, 2014) which looks to halve the number of police cells used as a place of safety in mental health crisis (Department of Health, 2014). This is in tandem with the
introduction of street triage, where mental health workers directly on the policing frontline, dealing with mental health crisis in order to minimise police involvement (Oxburgh, 2013).

As the developments identified above are driven by finance rather than effectiveness, the argument presented here is quite clear. This study has emphasised the importance of a clearly defined core organisational remit that is shared through high symbolic referencing throughout the organisation. The effectiveness of specialist workers intervening early may nip problems in the bud while also alleviating pressures on core services. Neighbourhood wardens should therefore be viewed in the same light as the street triage mental health workers.

The case for neighbourhood wardens as the resource for dealing with civil issues like ASB and community safety is based on effectiveness. This is especially relevant in deprived areas where trust between police and residents is low (Crawford, 2006, p.967). Moreover wardens are better placed to deal with signs of social decline that promote fear of crime issues through graffiti removal and CCTV use. With ASB seen as private trouble made public issue (Sacco, 1995, p.142), such civil incivilities are dealt with through civil action that is enforced by primary agencies. Neighbourhood Wardens having a civil role and an official presence can manage and work in disadvantaged areas. Crucially with a clear civil remit, neighbourhood wardens break away from the current emphasis placed on police enforcement of civility and law.

However whilst argument is made for the reinstatement of wardens based largely on the current financial situation as well as effectiveness (Loveday & Smith, forthcoming, 2014), the complementary argument I put forward is based on clarity of a specific resource with a defined core mission and function (civil enforcement / community safety). As this study has demonstrated a clear mission shared consistently throughout the organisation, coupled with strong organisational cultural knowledge will lead to superior operational performance. With high symbolic referencing of the core function which has little or no other competing functions will lead to organisational clarity and goal achievement.
With a clearly defined remit, the civil presence of wardens acting not only as the eyes and ears of the community but are able to focus on specific incivilities (Crawford, 2006, p.967) with an ASB / community safety focus. What is more important is that the presence of a singular clearly defined mission supported by high organisational symbolic referencing created conditions for organisational success. In fact the success attributed to neighbourhood wardens can be explained by this fact although their effectiveness could be further improved by strengthening cultural knowledge.

It is not the size of the ASB resource but the height of ASB symbolic referencing translated into clarity of definition and processes that creates successful ASB operations. Looking at the shared ambition of Cornwall Council and Devon and Cornwall police in making safer communities, the low symbolic approach to ASB creates the issue of not dealing with the pre-cursor to criminal actions. This can only lead to greater uncertainty and moral panic within the local community.

The argument could be made that both Cornwall Council and Devon and Cornwall Police are not measured on ASB success as an indicator of good performance, with success in crime reduction legitimising police and CSP actions. However there is a strong organisational commitment from organisational members highlighted in this research to deal with ASB. This should be built upon by both organisations by increasing the symbolic referencing towards ASB which in turn would raise the value placed on ASB by the organisation. However one further question remains. Should the clarity identified above actually stop there? Should ASB have a clear categorisation and definition similar to categories of criminal offences?

This research has shown, on a preliminary basis, that ASB operational improvement does not need increases in resource, but rather organisational clarity and definition. New concepts have been introduced relating to criminal justice agencies through the use of the SACKDEN framework to measure cultural knowledge strength which can be broadened to other operational areas outside of ASB. New theories have been introduced through polarisation theory and the three layer organisational cultural knowledge iceberg which bring new insight into ASB operational performance and the conditions created by high – low ASB symbolic referencing.
Future research

The research undertaken serves as a preliminary study to assess if there was justification to take the research beyond the parameters identified in this work. In relation to ASB cultural knowledge, this work could be broadened to whole organisations covering all members and business areas. This would enable agencies to determine the cultural knowledge strength of whole organisations in relation to ASB and to identify improvements that might be made.

Further research can also be justified into if ASB should actually be dealt with as part of public organisational business instead of the only business. Tensions and low status and value accruing to towards ASB have been identified as it competes with other functions of organisations tasked to deal with it. The theory of polarisation and the partnership tensions arise primarily due to the competing interests of organisations and how success is measured. Based on the difficulties experienced around ASB as well as the current financial climate, if there is not equal value placed on ASB as on other organisational business then it might be asked if these organisations are best able to deal with ASB?

Further investigation should perhaps be considered into a potential ‘third way’, where an organisation or resource is found that has the sole remit of dealing solely with ASB. Do statutory organisations need to be relieved of their ASB duty in favour of a non-statutory civilian organisation with an ASB function? The revisiting of wardens goes some way to filling the civilian organisation gap which currently exists. Wardens have been used with some success, although the issue of inconsistency in the adoption of their role and use in localities remains a problem. With councils having experience of running neighbourhood warden schemes, this research suggests that further exploration might be undertaken to determine if ASB responsibility should pass from current organisations to local authority warden schemes which might serve to improve ASB operational performance.
### Effectiveness identifier words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Main words</th>
<th>Sub words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Principles, Standards, Morals, Ethics, Ideals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Philosophy, Viewpoint, Thinking, Attitude, Idea, Way of life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims</td>
<td>Inspire, Plan, Intent, Try, Mean, Endeavour, Want, Seek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behave</td>
<td>Act, Perform, Conduct, Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Perform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dictionary

- **Individual**: Person, Me, Myself
- **Organisation**: Government, Civil service, Administration, Establishment, Systems
- **Involving**: Connecting, Connected, Linking, Concerning, Relating, Involved
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implicit</th>
<th>Understood  Implied  Unspoken  Inherent  Hidden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Embedded  Contained  Included  Included  Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Over Bearing  Officious  Interfering  Intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Organisation  Strategic  Executive  Board  Superior  Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Employees  Personnel  Workers  Workforce  Team  Body  Force  Frontline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Principles  Morals  Ethics  Ideals  Value  Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions</td>
<td>Habit  Conducts  Customs  Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Reliable  Steady  Dependable  Constant  Unswerving  Unfailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipe</td>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axiomatic</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

### Safer Cornwall Performance Figures 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>2011/12 actual</th>
<th>2012/13 actual</th>
<th>Change % 2012/13</th>
<th>2012/13 target</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling burglary rate per 1,000 households</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All recorded crime rate per 1000 population</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of domestic abuse crimes reaching court that achieve a brought to justice outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of SARC clients that receive follow up support within 72 hours of the SARC receiving notification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of acute serious sexual assaults attending the Sexual Assault Referral Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat incidents of domestic abuse (high risk victims at MARAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of recorded domestic abuse crimes where a charge is made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of police recorded domestic abuse crimes that are first time reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol, Violence and the Night Time Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence with injury rate per 1000 population</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of hospital admissions per 100,000 for alcohol-related harm</td>
<td>950 (Apr-Sep 11)</td>
<td>975 (Apr-Sep 12)</td>
<td>+3%</td>
<td>No target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of adults not coming to attention for further ASB in the 3 months after intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of victims of anti-social behaviour surveyed who are satisfied with the service received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of young people not coming to attention for further ASB in the 3 months after intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reoffending and Problem Drug Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opiate users completing treatment successfully (% growth)</td>
<td>117 (baseline)</td>
<td>164 (1)</td>
<td>+40.2%</td>
<td>142 / 21.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult drug users completing treatment successfully (% growth)</td>
<td>264 (baseline)</td>
<td>334 (1)</td>
<td>+26.5%</td>
<td>312 / 18.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of first time entrants to the Youth Justice System per 100,000 population aged 10 to 17</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>538 (2)</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders under probation living in suitable accommodation at the end of their order or licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders under probation supervision in employment at the end of their order or licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opiate users in effective treatment</td>
<td>1223 (baseline)</td>
<td>1168 (1)</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>1185 / 3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders after 12 months (frequency rate per young offender)</td>
<td>0.69 (2010/11 cohort)</td>
<td>0.69 (3)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people in the Youth Justice System receiving a conviction who are sentenced to custody</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adult drug users in effective treatment</td>
<td>1608 (baseline)</td>
<td>1500 (1)</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
<td>1585 / 1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Q4 Diagnostic Outcomes Monitoring Executive Summary (Public Health England)

2 Latest reported, 12 months ending December 2012 (Ministry of Justice)

3 Latest reported, October 2010 to September 2011 cohort, reoffending over the following 12 months (Ministry of Justice)
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