



RAND

EUROPE



UNIVERSITY OF  
OXFORD

# Making and Breaking Barriers

Assessing the value of mounted  
police units in the UK: Appendices

Chris Giacomantonio, Ben Bradford,  
Matthew Davies and Richard Martin



For more information on this publication, visit [www.rand.org/t/rr830z2](http://www.rand.org/t/rr830z2)

Published by the RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif., and Cambridge, UK

RAND® is a registered trademark.

© Copyright 2015 RAND Corporation and University of Oxford

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the sponsor.

RAND Europe is an independent, not-for-profit policy research organisation that aims to improve policy and decisionmaking in the public interest through research and analysis. RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

Support RAND  
Make a tax-deductible charitable contribution at  
[www.rand.org/giving/contribute](http://www.rand.org/giving/contribute)

[www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org)  
[www.randeurope.org](http://www.randeurope.org)

# Preface

---

This document contains appendix material referenced in the main report. The materials include:

- Appendix A: Project methodology resources
- Appendix B: Data tables
- Appendix C: Football data

Any requests for additional information on methods or data can be made through the corresponding author, Dr Chris Giacomantonio at [cgiacoma@rand.org](mailto:cgiacoma@rand.org).



## Appendix A: Project methodology resources

---

This appendix includes five research tools used by the research team at different stages in the project. These include:

- the SSO Codebook, which details the SSO methodology for both crowd and patrol settings
- the survey of police officers policing football matches, which was completed online through [surveymonkey.com](https://www.surveymonkey.com) and is presented here in pdf format
- the international questionnaire distributed to senior mounted officers in other countries, which was sent by email as a form-fill pdf and is presented here in text format
- the daily diary tool, which was distributed to mounted officers in hard copy and displayed here in pdf format
- the focus group schedules, which were used at police and football fan focus groups

## Systematic Social Observation Codebook

As described in section 3.3 of the main report, the Systematic Social Observation (SSO) data were recorded by field researchers using a mobile app called 'Forms'. A screenshot of the app is found in Figure A1 for illustration. Completion of the app was guided by a codebook which provides instructions to fieldworkers as to how data should be collected, and how to record and categorise the data. The codebook, presented below, was distributed in hard and electronic copy to all field researchers taking part in systematic observation within this project.

**Figure A1: Forms mobile app screenshot from Patrol Observation Codebook and Patrol Shift Codebook**

The figure displays two side-by-side screenshots of a mobile application interface. The left screenshot, titled "Patrol Observation Codebook", shows a form with the following sections: "Date and Time" with buttons for "(Set the Date)" and "(Set the Time)"; "Location (GPS)" with "(No Location)" and a "Use Device Location" button, accompanied by the instruction "Only use when at location of observation"; "Picture of scene" with a "Camera" button and the instruction "Optional and taken at discretion of observer"; "Number of mounted police present" with an empty text input field; "Number of non-mounted police present" with a text input field containing "0"; and "Number of PCSOs present" with an empty text input field. The right screenshot, titled "Patrol Shift Codebook", shows a form with the following sections: "Police force" with a "(Choose)" button; "Date" with a "(Set the Date)" button; "Location specifics" with a text input field and a microphone icon, accompanied by the instruction "Details about station/neighbourhood being patrolled"; "Start time of shift" with a "(Set the Time)" button; "Start time of public-facing activities" with a "(Set the Time)" button; and "End time of public facing activities" with a "(Set the Time)" button. Both screenshots show a standard Android status bar at the top and a navigation bar at the bottom.

Researchers attended a SSO workshop at Oxford in February 2014 to learn the research approach and review the codebook categories. After completing the initial workshop, researchers were then supervised in the field by a member of the core research team during their initial field shift to ensure fidelity to the approach.

---

# CODEBOOK AND GUIDANCE: PHASE 3

## SYSTEMATIC SOCIAL OBSERVATION OF MOUNTED POLICE

*Version 2 – Modified after piloting on 20.1.14*

*Version 3 – Modified after piloting on 22.1.14*

*Version 4 – Modified after piloting on 12.4.14*

### CONTENTS

TOP.....	1
Hypotheses of the study .....	3
Specific hypotheses for testing:.....	3
Patrol observations – Protocol.....	4
Patrol Observation Codebook structure.....	6
Encounter Codebook.....	8
Multiple Encounter variables .....	8
Interaction variables.....	10
Patrol Shift Codebook structure (one to be submitted per shift) .....	13
Crowd observations – Protocol.....	15
Crowd Observations Codebook v2 .....	16
Data Glitch logbook.....	19
<b>Guidebook:</b> Field guidance for SSO .....	20
Responding to questions and queries .....	20
Responding to questions from police.....	20
Responding to questions from members of the public.....	20
Responding to questions from people involved in an incident.....	20
General ethics statement .....	21
Interpreting Forms app categories .....	21
General rule for recording categorical data .....	21
Determining ‘tone’ of an interaction or encounter.....	21
Recording numbers of officers and citizens in patrol observations ...	22
Writing up your observation reports for Patrol – General framework .....	23

Writing up your observation reports for Crowd observations –  
General framework ..... 24

## HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

### SPECIFIC HYPOTHESES FOR TESTING:

1. Interactions between citizens and mounted police are better than interactions between citizens and other police (normally neighbourhood or response officers) in local policing contexts
  - a. Interactions are more respectful by officers
  - b. Interactions are more respectful by citizens
  - c. Interactions involve lower levels of conflict
  - d. Interactions are more likely to involve citizen voice
2. People are more likely to engage with mounted police than to engage with officers on foot or vehicle patrol in local policing contexts
3. Seeing mounted police in local policing contexts is likely to increase citizens' positive estimations of police effectiveness
4. Seeing mounted police in local policing contexts is likely to increase citizens' positive estimations of police legitimacy
5. Mounted police are more likely than other police to interact positively with people in crowd situations
6. Mounted police encourage more orderly behaviour in crowd situations than other policing options

-Back to TOP-

## PATROL OBSERVATIONS – PROTOCOL

We will engage in systematic observations of mounted police officers and neighbourhood officers in late winter and early spring 2014. Our intention is to develop (a) a statistical account of the volume, kinds, and quality of experiences between mounted police and citizens during routine patrol activities, and (b) a comparative account of the differences in volume, kinds and quality of experiences between mounted police and citizens as compared to those between neighbourhood police and citizens. We will also develop a qualitative/descriptive picture of normal mounted police activities and routines.

Variables to be recorded will fall under one of four categories of engagements between police and public:

1. **Interactions:** We will record one coding sheet for any instance where one or more police officers, while being observed, directly engage in a substantial or prolonged discussion or intervention with one or more citizens.
2. **Encounters:** We will record a separate coding sheet for any instance where one or more citizens actively notices or responds to a police officer while the officer is being observed, where this does not result in a substantial interaction.
3. **Multiple Encounters:** We will record a separate coding sheet for encounters where large groups gather for casual/friendly interactions around officers (e.g. to say hello, pet the horse, etc).
4. **Acknowledgements:** We will record stop-and-point, waves and other gestures towards officers. Where citizens actively recognise the presence of officers but where no more significant interaction or encounter takes place, we will record a simple count using a hand tally machine.

Observers will record all interactions and encounters that are visible to them during a shift. It will be up to the individual researcher to determine whether an instance of citizen/police interface is an interaction or an encounter, and this is something that will be iteratively discussed within the research team during the early stages of piloting.

If a situation involves both an interaction (e.g., with a victim, witness, complainant, or offender) and an encounter (e.g. where a crowd of onlookers are also present), the observer should endeavour to record a coding sheet for both an interaction and an encounter. If it is not possible to capture both effectively, the observer should always ensure to capture the details of the interaction first, and then attempt to capture details about the encounter, as we expect interactions to be rarer than encounters and so are higher priority for collection.

Observers will join mounted and neighbourhood units for full shifts, making sure to attend start-of-shift briefings (normally approximately 30 minutes before the start of patrol) and any end-of-shift debriefings as well as to be present for all public-facing work. Observers will be free to leave the shift

once officers have begun end-of-shift duties such as caring for horses and paperwork, so long as no further public-facing activities are planned within the shift timeframe.

Observers will also take notes during shifts, which will support the development of a short (2-5 page) ethnographic account of the shift's activities. The qualitative account will provide a narrative description of the day's activities as well as context to the quantitative data, and in particular seek to capture any information not included in the coding sheets but relevant to their interpretation.

Finally, observers will fill in a coding sheet relating to the overall shift, including start and end times of public-facing activities and types of activities undertaken by officers under observation.

*This method was piloted over a series of shifts in January 2014 and subsequently modified.*

-Back to TOP-

## PATROL OBSERVATION CODEBOOK STRUCTURE

Variables to be recorded for both encounters and interactions:

Variable	Description	Categories (where applicable)
Time of Day	Use mobile app to set the time	
Location	Use the mobile app to provide a GPS location	
Picture of scene	Take a photo of the scene [preferred but optional, and up to the observer to determine if appropriate]	
Number of mounted police present	Record the number of mounted police that are visible (both male and female)	
Number of female mounted police present	Record the number of female mounted police that are visible	
Number of non-mounted police present	Record the number of non-mounted police that are visible (both male and female)	
Number of female non-mounted police present	Record the number of female non-mounted police that are visible	
Number of PCSOs present	Record the number of Police Community Support Officers that are visible (both male and female)	
Number of female PCSOs present	Record the number of female Police Community Support Officers that are visible	
Number of security personnel present	Record the number of private or other security personnel that are visible (both male and female)	
Number of citizens involved	Record the number of citizens who are visibly noticing or interacting with police. <i>This should not be all citizens who are visible, unless they are all obviously noticing or interacting with police.</i>	

Age of citizens involved	Select all that apply	Young Children (U10) Teens and tweens (10 to 17) Young adult (18 to 24) 25 to 40 years old Over 40 years old
Gender of citizens involved	Select the gender	All male All female Mixed male and female Unknown
Ethnicity of citizens involved	Select the ethnicity category	All White/British White All Black/British Black All Asian/British Asian All other ethnicity (not white, black or Asian) Mixed non-white Mixed white and non-white Unknown
Encounter, Encounter, or Interaction?	Determine whether the experience is an encounter, a multiple encounter, or a more substantial interaction	Encounter Multiple Encounter Interaction
Comments	Manually enter or voice-to-text comments through app	
Did this observation involve dogs?	Record 'yes' if there were dogs present in the interaction, and especially where they interacted with the horse	Yes/No
Comments on the role of the dog(s) in the observation	If dogs were present, please describe their role (e.g. were they bothering the horse? Behaving? Barking at a distance?), Only provide lengthy comments if dogs impacted on police behaviour.	

-Back to TOP-

ENCOUNTER CODEBOOK

Further variables to be recorded if 'Encounter' is selected:

Variable	Description	Categories
Type of Encounter	Determine the nature of the encounter, based on the actions of the citizen(s) involved (select all that apply)	Taking picture/video of police Citizen verbally addressing police Police verbally addressing citizen Physical contact between citizen and police or horse (e.g. handshake, patting horse) Citizens watching police interaction/intervention Other encounter (specify in text box) Unknown
Overall tone of Encounter	Determine how the encounter reflects the citizen perception of police	Positive Neutral ('business-like' in tone; neither obviously positive or negative aspects observable) Ambiguous (about equally positive and negative aspects) Negative Unknown

-Back to TOP-

MULTIPLE ENCOUNTER VARIABLES

Further variables to be recorded if 'Multiple Encounter' is selected:

Variable	Description	Categories
Type of Multiple Encounter	Determine the nature of the encounter, based on the actions of the citizen(s) involved (select all that apply)	Taking picture/video of police Citizen verbally addressing police Police verbally addressing citizen Physical contact between citizen and police or horse (e.g. handshake, patting horse) Citizens watching police interaction/intervention Other encounter (specify in text box) Unknown
Length of Multiple Encounter (in minutes)	Provide an estimate of the length of the multiple encounter from the forming of the group to its	

8

dissipation		
Overall tone of Multiple Encounter	Determine how the encounter reflects the citizen perception of police	Positive Neutral ('business-like' in tone; neither obviously positive or negative aspects observable) Ambiguous (about equally positive and negative aspects) Negative Unknown

-Back to TOP-

INTERACTION VARIABLES

Further variables to be recorded if 'Interaction' is selected. Please try to record as many as possible. **If you are uncertain about any variable, please verify with the officer(s) involved.** If still uncertain, select 'Unknown'.

Variable	Description	Categories
Type of interaction	Determine what the interaction was about or to what it was related. <i>Only record as related to crime if specific crime(s) are discussed.</i>	Friendly or general discussion (unrelated to crime, ASB or traffic) Related to violent crime Related to property crime Related to ASB (incl. public intoxication and disorder) Related to traffic Related to other crime (specify in text box) Stop and Account Stop and Search Other interaction unrelated to crime, ASB or traffic (specify in text box)
Role of the citizen(s)	What role(s) did the citizen(s) have, who were directly interacting with the police?	Victim/complainant Witness/Informant Offender/alleged offender Group includes two or more of the above Citizen role(s) unrelated to crime, ASB or traffic (specify in text box) Unknown
Was the officer respectful towards the citizen?	To what extent did the officer(s) behave respectfully towards the citizen(s)? <i>(NB: Any disrespect shown should be categorised as disrespect)</i>	Showed disrespect Showed neither respect nor disrespect ('business-like' behaviour) Showed Respect Unknown
Was the citizen respectful towards the officer?	To what extent did the citizen(s) behave respectfully towards the officer(s)? <i>(NB: Any disrespect shown should be categorised as disrespect)</i>	Showed disrespect Showed neither respect nor disrespect ('business-like' behaviour) Showed Respect Unknown
Citizen participation in the interaction	To what degree did the citizen express their views and make themselves understood?	High level of citizen participation Medium level of citizen participation Low level of citizen participation None/almost no citizen participation in interaction

		Unknown
Level of conflict in the interaction	What, if any, conflict existed in the interaction? (select highest level of conflict)	No conflictual behaviour Calm verbal disagreement Agitated verbal disagreement Threat of harm Violence by citizen(s) Violence by police Violence by both citizen(s) and police
Who initiated the interaction?	Was the interaction initiated by police, the citizen(s) involved, or a third party?  <i>NB: If a complainant calls the police, who then dispatch the officer to an incident, this should be 'initiated by other police' rather than 'initiated by other citizens'. The latter category is for instances where citizens directly contact the attending officer(s).</i>	Initiated by attending officer(s) Initiated by citizens involved Initiated by other police (e.g. call for assistance, dispatch or tasking) Initiated by other citizens (e.g. complainant who is not involved in the interaction) Unknown
Overall tone of the interaction	Determine how the interaction reflects the citizen(s)'s perception of police	Positive Neutral ('business-like' in tone; neither obviously positive or negative aspects observable) Ambiguous (about equally positive and negative aspects) Negative Unknown
Length of the interaction	Enter an approximate minute length of the interaction	n/a
Level of citizen compliance	To what degree did the citizen comply with any requests or orders from police?	n/a – No requests/orders made by police No compliance: Full resistance to orders/requests Resisted compliance: Some resistance to orders/requests followed by compliance with orders/requests Full compliance: No resistance to orders/requests Unknown

Comments on citizen compliance	Please include brief comments on the way(s) in which the citizen(s) complied with the police (if relevant)
Outcome of the interaction	What was the result of the interaction? Friendly parting, unrelated to crime, ASB or traffic Information gathered (and no further action against citizen(s) involved) Verbal warning to citizen(s) Fine/citation given to citizen(s) Assist arrest (arrest completed by officers not involved in interaction) Arrest Other outcome (specify in text box) Unknown

-Back to TOP-

PATROL SHIFT CODEBOOK STRUCTURE (ONE TO BE SUBMITTED PER SHIFT)

Variable	Description	Categories
Police force	Select from list	Avon and Somerset Gloucestershire Lancashire MPS Other force (specify in text box)
Location	Enter name of neighbourhood/borough/ward/area where activities are taking place	TBD
Start time of shift	Enter time manually or use app*	
Start time of public-facing activities	Enter time manually or use app*	
End time of public-facing activities	Enter time manually or use app*	
End time of shift	Enter time manually or use app*	
Length of breaks during public-facing activities	Provide a total estimate in minutes	
Types of public-facing activities (check all)	Indicate the types of activities undertaken during the shift	Tasked patrol in hot spot Tasked patrol in town/city centre Random patrol High-visibility stationary position Visiting school or community centre Responding to call for service Planned crowd control op Responding to disorderly crowd (unplanned) Other activities (specify in text box)
Hand tally count	Enter the number of acknowledgements on your hand tally counter at the end of public-facing activities	
Other comments about shift data	Only for clarifying data on the shift; full notes on shift in separate report	

*\*Only use app to set time if you are entering this data at the specified time point (e.g. at start/end of shift or public-facing activities); otherwise enter manually if entering data at another time.*

[-Back to TOP-](#)

## CROWD OBSERVATIONS – PROTOCOL

We will engage in systematic observations of mounted police officers in crowd situations during spring and summer 2014. Our intention is to develop (a) a statistical account of the volume, kinds, and quality of experiences between mounted police and citizens during major public events, and (b) a comparative account of the differences in volume, kinds and quality of experiences between mounted police and citizens as compared to those between other kinds of police and security and citizens within these events. We will also develop a qualitative/descriptive picture of crowd policing.

Observers will record quantitative data during our patrol observations, relating to the effects of police presence on crowd activities, using a mobile app. Observers will be deployed to the following observations:

- St. Paul's Carnival, Bristol 2014, and preliminary planning (beginning TBD, event 6 July)
- Glastonbury Festival 2014, Somerset, and preliminary planning (beginning TBD, event 25-29 June, with training for volunteer observers to take place in late May or early June)

At each event, observers will record variables at set intervals over a set time period (exact timings TBD, but we initially expect an interval to be recorded every 5-10 minutes, over a period of 5 hours in total within a day). Observers will be assigned to positions, either static or moving, while recording observations. Assignments to positions will each be for a minimum of one hour. Variables for each interval will all be recorded on a single code sheet using a mobile app.

Observers will also prepare a brief ethnographic account (2-5 pages) of their experience at the event following each shift, to be completed within one day of end of shift. The qualitative account will provide a narrative description of the day's activities as well as context to the quantitative data, and in particular seek to capture any information not included in the coding sheets but relevant to their interpretation.

*This method was piloted at a football match on 12 April 2014 and subsequently modified.*

## CROWD OBSERVATIONS CODEBOOK V2

All estimations relate to activities visible from the position of the observer, during the time since the last interval was recorded. Variables to be recorded at each interval are:

Variable	Description	Categories (if applicable)
Time of Day	Use mobile app to set the time	
Location	Use the mobile app to provide a GPS location	
Position	Record the position of the researcher relative to police and the crowd	Static – In crowd Static – With police Static – Away from crowd and police Dynamic/moving
Festival position	If static, record the kind of location in which observations are taking place (festivals only)	At venue/stage – ingress At venue/stage – egress At venue/stage – during performance Away from venue/stage Other location (please specify)
Picture of scene	Take a photo of the scene [preferred but optional, and up to the observer to determine if appropriate]	
Number of mounted police present	Estimate the number of mounted police that are visible	
Number of non-mounted police present	Estimate the number of non-mounted police that are visible	
Number of security personnel present	Estimate the number of private security personnel that are visible within a 20m radius of observer location	
Are there female police present?	Yes/no question; yes if there are any female police present (mounted or otherwise)	
Size of crowd	Estimate the number of people visible to the observer in the selected area of observation (area of observation will be	No crowd Tiny (under 20) Small (20 to 100) Medium (101 to 200) Large (201 to 500) Very large (501 to 1000) Huge (Over 1000)

	field of vision in one direction)	
Density of the crowd	How closely packed are people in this space?	<p>Sparse – Individuals have plenty of space between one another and movement is unimpeded</p> <p>Somewhat dense crowd – Crowd includes a number of small dense groups with adequate space for movement by individuals</p> <p>Dense crowd – Crowd members are within 1m of one another and movement by individuals is often impeded</p> <p>Very dense crowd – Crowd members are mostly shoulder-to-shoulder and movement by individuals is hard or impossible</p>
Crowd movement	Describe whether and how members in the crowd are moving	<p>No movement – crowd members are almost all stationary (e.g. during an act, or in a rest area)</p> <p>Orderly movement – crowd members are moving as intended, at a moderate pace and without</p> <p>Mostly orderly movement – most crowd members are moving as intended, with some deviating and disturbing movement but no intervention required from police or security</p> <p>Disorderly movement – most crowd members are not moving as intended, requiring minor intervention from police or security</p> <p>Very disorderly movement – almost all crowd members are not moving as intended, requiring significant intervention from police or security</p>
Events	Please select all events that you witnessed since your last entry (if first entry of a shift, all events over first 5-10 minutes of shift)	<p>Visibly positive interactions between crowd and police</p> <p>'Playful' interactions between crowd and police</p> <p>Visibly negative interactions between crowd and police</p> <p>Physical altercations between crowd members</p> <p>Physical altercations between</p>

		crowd member(s) and police Police arresting or detaining crowd member(s) Verbal altercations between crowd members Verbal altercations between crowd member(s) and police Other events (please describe)
Characterization of crowd activity	How would you describe the crowd, from a safety standpoint?  <i>NB: Here 'violence' should include property damage as well</i>	Entirely peaceful Largely peaceful Some disorder, with no violence (e.g. some verbal confrontations, loud chanting) Some disorder, with violence Significant disorder, with no violence (e.g. many verbal confrontations, disorderly movements of crowd) Significant disorder, with violence Mass disorder
Number of engagements (tally)	Please enter the number of engagements (incl encounters, acknowledgements and interactions) recorded on hand tally counter since last entry	
Other Comments	Any other comments on your observations since the last entry or clarification on the data entered above.	

-Back to TOP-

## DATA GLITCH LOGBOOK

If you return a form with a known error, please use this logbook so we can identify and fix the error in the final dataset

Variable	Description
Date and time	Use mobile app to set the date and time
Approximate date and time of error submission	Manually set the approximate date and time of the error submission
Describe the error(s) in your submitted form	Enter text describing the error and any corrections to be made

-Back to TOP-

## GUIDEBOOK: FIELD GUIDANCE FOR SSO

This guidebook contains basic advice for conducting objective and ethical research using our specified methods. However, at all times how you respond to questions, queries or situations will be down to your judgement. If an unexpected situation arises in the field, please make a note of it and how you handled it in your written account of the day's activities.

### RESPONDING TO QUESTIONS AND QUERIES

It will be important to avoid extended discussions while in the field, primarily to avoid introducing bias to the officer(s) being studied. Discussions with the officers being observed, as well as with members of the public and other police personnel, may have the effect of changing the ways in which officers ultimately handle interactions or conduct themselves in the field. As such, in all cases try to keep your answers honest but succinct.

### RESPONDING TO QUESTIONS FROM POLICE

The officers will have been briefed about the study, and most mounted officers will be aware of it by the time observations begin. As such, do not try to mislead the officers regarding the purpose of the study. If asked for your opinion on any matter (mounted policing or otherwise), be honest, as this will be important to maintain trust throughout the observations. If asked about the study, emphasize that the research is looking at mounted policing relative to many things police do, and that these observations are only a part of a much larger study. Try to avoid specifics about the things we are measuring in the SSO exercise, as knowledge of these may influence officers' behaviours.

### RESPONDING TO QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

While on observations, if a member of the public asks what you're doing, please respond that you are part of a project studying various aspects of policing in the UK, and that at present you are recording your observations on a mobile app. If asked for further details, feel free to elaborate that you are specifically looking at mounted police work and that the final report will be available on the Oxford Criminology website later in 2014 if they are interested.

### RESPONDING TO QUESTIONS FROM PEOPLE INVOLVED IN AN INCIDENT

In most cases, it is likely that the police officer will explain your presence to any person(s) involved in an incident. If you are addressed directly, follow the guidance on responding to members of the public. If your presence or activity appears to be aggravating a situation or interfering with the ability of the officer(s) to do their job, withdraw from the situation and complete your data input at a better time.

-Back to TOP-

## GENERAL ETHICS STATEMENT

In all instances, if asked about ethics, privacy, or confidentiality issues, respond that all data is being recorded anonymously and will only be available to members of the project team. Pictures will only be taken in public spaces, and any future reproduction will blur facial features. You may also respond that all research is being done in accordance with Oxford's research ethics policies. Queries or complaints about our research should first go through Chris at the [mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk) address, after which any unresolved issues regarding the research may be sent to [ethics@socsci.ox.ac.uk](mailto:ethics@socsci.ox.ac.uk). Finally, remember that these observations are taking place in a criminal justice setting, and any recorded materials relating to an officer's shift could conceivably be requested in relation to a court proceeding. If such a request were made, we would comply with it.

-Back to TOP-

## INTERPRETING FORMS APP CATEGORIES

Most of the categories in the app should be easy to interpret. Some may require explanation, and so guidance is below. In many cases the decision will still be to the observer's judgement, so always feel free to discuss your choices with other observers to ensure consistency. As well, if you encounter any issues of interpretation that you feel should be included here, please let Chris know.

### GENERAL RULE FOR RECORDING CATEGORICAL DATA

For all categorical variables, only record a category if you are confident that it is accurate. If you can't be confident (e.g. if you are at too great a distance to see or hear), confirm with the officer after the incident has completed as they may be able to provide the required information. If you are still uncertain, record 'unknown'. If the observed information does not match a category, enter a new category in the appropriate 'other' text box.

### DETERMINING 'TONE' OF AN INTERACTION OR ENCOUNTER

The categories in this response are on a scale from Very Positive to Very Negative, where Positive and Negative refer to your impression of how the interaction reflects the citizen(s)' perceptions of the experience. 'Very positive' should be only those interactions where no negative aspects of the interaction could be assumed, and where an explicitly positive exchange occurred. 'Quite positive' should be those interactions or encounters that were predominantly positive, with some negative aspects. 'Neutral' refers to interactions or encounters that were neither positive nor negative, while 'Ambiguous' refers to those that had equal parts positive and negative aspects. 'Quite negative' is a predominantly negative interaction or encounter with some positive aspects, and 'Very negative' is an interaction or encounter with no discernible positive quality from a citizen perspective.

## RECORDING NUMBERS OF OFFICERS AND CITIZENS IN PATROL

### OBSERVATIONS

This will always be your best estimate of **number of officers visible** and **number of citizens involved** during an incident or encounter. As numbers of officers and citizens may change throughout the run of an incident or observation, use the *total* number involved from start to finish (e.g., if three citizens are involved at the beginning, and then one leaves and two more join, you should record five citizens involved). If the number of officers or citizens changes during an incident, make a note of this in the 'other comments' section.

The following resource provides some guidelines on crowd size estimates: [http://howto.wired.com/wiki/Estimate\\_the\\_Size\\_of\\_a\\_Crowd](http://howto.wired.com/wiki/Estimate_the_Size_of_a_Crowd).

It says:

- In a loose crowd, where people are at an arm's length of each other, figure about 10 square feet of space per person.
- In a tighter crowd, it's about half that, or 5 square feet.
- In a packed crowd, it's more like 2.5 square feet.

It also says estimating crowd size is very complicated, and even sophisticated techniques result in wildly different estimations, so your best effort is all we can ask.

-Back to TOP-

WRITING UP YOUR OBSERVATION REPORTS FOR PATROL – GENERAL  
FRAMEWORK

Within two days of completing an observation shift, please write a 2-5 page narrative account of your shift. This should include any observations you think are pertinent to (a) interpretation of the data you entered/explanation of lack of data, or (b) things that couldn't be captured by your data but are important to understand about mounted policing. Regarding the latter, in particular seek to comment on:

1. **The patterns of patrol/activity: How destinations, routes, and activities are chosen (feel free to inquire with officers as to why they do any specific thing)**
2. **Whether there is debate on the best use of time;**
3. **The kinds of activities observed during downtime and station time (paperwork, coffee breaks, computer briefings, social activities, etc);**
4. **Conversations between mounted officers, as well as between mounted officers and other officers;**
5. **The interactions between officers and other public employees, e.g. medical responders, school officials, etc;**
6. **Details of conversations you have with anyone (mounted officers, other officers, members of the public) where these shed light on practices or interpretations of mounted police.**

We will review the first few accounts together, and discuss this approach iteratively as the project progresses and new themes for inquiry emerge.

-Back to TOP-

## WRITING UP YOUR OBSERVATION REPORTS FOR CROWD OBSERVATIONS

### – GENERAL FRAMEWORK

Immediately after completing an observation shift, please write a 1-page narrative account of your shift. This should include any observations you think are pertinent to (a) interpretation of the data you entered/explanation of lack of data, or (b) things that couldn't be captured by your data but are important to understand about mounted policing. Regarding the latter, in particular seek to comment on:

1. **Whether, and how, mounted police intervened in crowd activities**
2. **Whether, and how, this differed from the ways in which non-mounted police intervened in crowd activities**
3. **Details of conversations you have with anyone (mounted officers, other officers, members of the public) where these shed light on practices or interpretations of mounted police.**

We will review the first few accounts together, and discuss this approach iteratively as the project progresses and new themes for inquiry emerge.

-Back to TOP-

### Football policing post-match survey

As described in Section 4.2, an analysis of a post-match officer survey at football matches was undertaken in order to build a more comprehensive account of the quality of policing at matches where mounted police were and were not present. Based on a request sent from the Mounted Working Group (MWG), officers were asked to fill in a brief online survey within one day of the completion of a policing operation at a football match. Surveys asked officers to rate the overall quality of policing at the match as well as related variables such as ability to respond to incidents in appropriate time, feelings of readiness to intervene and quality of interaction with the public. Surveys were aimed at officers in supervisory roles at the matches, though it was possible for any officer involved to complete it. A pdf version of the online survey is provided below.

## Football Policing Post-match Survey

### Survey Details

Please complete the following post-match survey regarding the match at which you recently were on duty.

All responses are collected anonymously and will not be attributed to you at any point.

Please answer ALL questions. The survey should not take more than 10 minutes to complete, and will be very valuable to our research on the policing of football matches.

# Football Policing Post-match Survey

## Match Details

Please enter details regarding today's match where you were on duty.

If you were involved in policing at more than one match, please enter the details of the first match you attended below, and enter details of other matches at Question 5.

### 1. Date of the match

Enter date  <sup>DD</sup> /  <sup>MM</sup> /  <sup>YYYY</sup>

### 2. Home team

  

### 3. Away team

  

### 4. Location

- Home team ground
- Other ground (please specify)

### 5. Please enter details of any other matches you were involved with on the same day.

## Football Policing Post-match Survey

### Your information

Please enter information about yourself on this page.

All information and survey responses are collected anonymously and none of your responses will be attributed to you at any time.

#### 6. Please select your police force from the list

#### 7. What is your rank?

- Police Constable
- Sergeant
- Inspector
- Chief Inspector
- Superintendent
- Chief Superintendent or above
- Commander or above (MPS)

#### 8. What was your role at the match?

- Football Intelligence Officer
- Bronze
- Silver
- Other (please specify)

#### 9. How many years experience do you have in policing? (please enter a number)

## Football Policing Post-match Survey

### Your evaluation of policing at today's match

In this section you will rate various aspects of the policing done at today's match. These responses are collected anonymously. Your most honest assessment is appreciated.

If you were on duty at more than one match today, please rate the first match at which you were on duty, and provide details for any other matches at Question 17.

#### 10. Was the number of police at today's match appropriate to the need?

Far too many      A few too many      Appropriate      Not quite enough      Far too few

                      

#### 11. How would you rate the level of disorder at today's match?

Very high disorder      Above average disorder      Average disorder      Below average disorder      Very low/no disorder

                      

#### 12. How fast were police response times to any incidents of crime and disorder at today's match?

Very fast      Appropriately fast      Somewhat slow      Very slow      No instances of crime or disorder at today's match

                      

#### 13. To what extent would you agree or disagree with this statement: "I felt prepared and able to deal with incidents at all times during the match"?

Strongly agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly disagree

                      

#### 14. How would you rate the overall police interaction with members of the public?

Very positive      Somewhat positive      Neutral      Somewhat negative      Very negative

                      

#### 15. In which ways, if any, could the match have been policed better?

- More police presence
- Less police presence
- More club security
- Better communication between sections/teams
- The presence of mounted officers, if none were on duty
- Faster response to individual incidents
- More effective response to individual incidents
- Better advance planning

Other (please specify)

## Football Policing Post-match Survey

**16. How would you rate the overall quality of policing at today's match?**

Excellent      Above average      Average      Below average      Poor/unacceptable

                      

**17. Do you have any other comments about the policing of today's match?**

## Football Policing Post-match Survey

### THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS SURVEY

If you have any questions about this research, you can contact the research team at:

[mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk)

## International Mounted Policing Questionnaire

A questionnaire was distributed to senior mounted police officers around the world in order to draw international comparisons with the research findings, as described in Chapter 8 of the main report. The questionnaire, which is presented below, was developed as a form-fill pdf which could be completed online or printed and completed as a hard copy. The questionnaire was also offered in Word (.doc) format for police forces without computers able to read form-fill pdfs. The questionnaire was e-mailed to participants along with a cover letter. The Word version of the questionnaire and cover letter is provided below.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I represent a research team examining mounted policing in the United Kingdom. Our project is based at the University of Oxford's Centre for Criminology, and is being supported by RAND Europe, a non-profit research institution. The research is being conducted on behalf of the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) Mounted Working Group.

As part of the current phase of the research, we are hoping to collect information on the organisation and practice of mounted policing in locations outside of the UK. We have developed a questionnaire for this purpose, which we have distributed to police officers in charge of mounted policing within their police service or force. You will find this questionnaire below.

We would greatly appreciate if you could fill this out and return to us either by email or in hard copy. We expect the questionnaire to take approximately 45 minutes to complete.

Your responses to this questionnaire will form part of a broader report on mounted police practice to be released in late 2014. Your involvement will support some of the first empirical research ever done on mounted policing, and will help us understand the practice of mounted policing in broader international context.

If you have any questions about the research, please feel free to contact me at [mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk) at any time.

Sincerely,

Dr Chris Giacomantonio  
Analyst, RAND Europe  
Research Associate, University of Oxford

### ***Confidentiality statement***

*Your participation in this research is voluntary and confidential. Your responses will be attributed anonymously in any report or publication originating from this research. The information and opinions you provide may be used in a report that will be released publicly, and may be identified as relating to the country in which your police force is located, but will not be attributed directly to you.*

*You have the right to withdraw your participation in this study at any time up to the date of publication of the report. Any clarification regarding the confidentiality or anonymity of your responses may be requested from the project manager, Chris Giacomantonio, at [mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk) at any time. If your concerns are not addressed by the project manager, you can contact the Oxford Research Ethics Office (Social Science Division) at [ethics@socsci.ox.ac.uk](mailto:ethics@socsci.ox.ac.uk).*

Please provide answers to all questions, then save the document and return via email to:

[mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk)

## Section 1: Mounted Unit Details

Name of your police force:

City (or other area of jurisdiction) and Country:

How long has your police force had a mounted police unit? (delete as appropriate)

- Less than 5 years
- 5-10 years
- 11-20 years
- 21-50 years
- More than 50 years

Please provide the following information about your mounted unit:

- A. Total number of full-time officers in unit \_\_\_\_\_
- B. Total number of part-time officers in unit \_\_\_\_\_
- C. Total number of civilian staff in unit \_\_\_\_\_
- D. Total number of volunteer staff in unit \_\_\_\_\_
- E. Total number of horses in unit \_\_\_\_\_

Has the size of your unit changed in the last 5 years?

- Yes, it has increased in size in the last 5 years
- Yes, it has decreased in size in the last 5 years
- No, it has stayed essentially the same size over the last 5 years

Could you please provide your opinion as to why the unit size has changed (if it has)?

Has your force ever disbanded its mounted unit? If so, when and why?

How much training is required by an officer before they can join the mounted unit (over and above regular officer training)? (delete as appropriate)

- a. None
- b. Under 2 months
- c. 2-6 months
- d. 7-12 months
- e. More than one year

Can you describe the training or selection process that is required for officers to join the mounted unit?

Can you describe the training or selection process that is required for horses to join the mounted unit?

In your currency, what is the approximate annual total cost of a regular police officer (constable or equivalent) in your police force (if known)?

---

In your currency, what is the approximate annual total cost of a regular mounted police officer (constable or equivalent) in your police force (if known)?

---

## Section 2: Activities of mounted unit

What kinds of activities does your mounted unit engage in? (check all that apply, click box to select)

- General patrol in urban/city centres
- General patrol in rural areas
- Tasked patrol in urban/city centres (e.g. high visibility patrol, hot-spots policing)
- Tasked patrol in rural areas (e.g. related to rural crime prevention)
- Search and rescue operations
- Crowd control at planned events
- Crowd control at political demonstrations
- Public order response to unplanned disorder
- Ceremonial activities (e.g. parades)
- Community engagement activities (e.g. school visits, open stable days)
- Mutual aid/assistance to other forces in need of mounted policing
- Other [Please click to specify](#)
- Other [Please click to specify](#)

What percentage of total working time do your officers spend on each of the following activities?

Patrol (general or tasked)	_____
Community engagement	_____
Ceremonial work	_____
Crowd control in peaceful crowds (maintaining order)	_____
Crowd control in disorderly crowds (restoring order)	_____
Training (professional development, training the horses, etc)	_____
Caring for horses (cleaning stables, grooming horses, etc)	_____
Search and rescue operations	_____
Mutual aid activities [assisting other police forces]	_____
Other	Percentage: _____

From the following list, please select the **two most valuable contributions** mounted police make to your force: (delete as appropriate, and place a '1' next to the most valuable contribution)

- Supporting neighbourhood patrol
- Supporting community engagement
- Supporting search and rescue operations
- Contributing to ceremonial events
- Supporting crowd control and public order activities

If you selected 'other' from the list, please specify 'other' activities here: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on reasonable expectations of demand for mounted police support in the near future, how would you describe your mounted unit's capacity? Would you say you have: (delete as appropriate)

- Far too many mounted police personnel
- A few too many mounted police personnel
- About the right amount of mounted police personnel
- A few too few mounted police personnel
- Far too few mounted police personnel

Have the activities of mounted police in your force changed in the last five years? If so, how?

Are you in contact with or do you otherwise know of mounted police units in other police forces?

- Yes
- No

If yes, are you aware of any ways in which your approach to mounted policing differs from theirs?

### Section 3: Opinions on mounted police

In your opinion, why does your police force maintain a mounted unit?

How would you characterise the opinion of most officers in your force in relation to mounted police? (delete as appropriate)

Very positive – almost all officers in the force think mounted police add value to the force

Somewhat positive – most officers in the force think mounted police add value to the force

Neutral – most officers have little or no opinion regarding mounted police

Ambiguous – about equal proportions of officers have positive and negative views regarding the value of mounted police

Somewhat negative – most officers in the force think mounted police are not particularly valuable for the force

Very negative – almost all officers in the force think mounted police are not particularly valuable for the force

How would you characterise the opinion of most officers in your force in relation to mounted police are in crowd control situations? (delete as appropriate)

Extremely valuable – We would not want to deploy to a crowd control situation without them

Reasonably valuable – We would strongly prefer to have them in most crowd control deployments

Somewhat valuable – They can be helpful in crowd control deployments but are not essential

Not very valuable – They are only rarely useful in crowd control situations, and in most cases other policing options are more appropriate

Not at all valuable – They are never the best policing option for crowd control situations

Not applicable – We do not deploy mounted police to crowd control situations

How would you characterise the opinion of most officers in your force in relation to mounted police are in local policing operations (other than crowd control)? (delete as appropriate)

Extremely valuable – They can be used effectively to support virtually any local policing operation

Reasonably valuable – They can be used effectively to support many local policing operations

Somewhat valuable – They can be used effectively to support some local policing operations

Not very valuable – They are only rarely useful in local policing operations, and in most cases other policing options are more appropriate

Not at all valuable – They are never the best policing option for local policing operations

Not applicable – We do not deploy mounted police in local policing operations

In your opinion, are there any policing tasks or situations for which mounted police are particularly suitable? If so, which ones?

In your opinion, are mounted police ever deployed to situations for which they are inappropriate, not useful, or potentially detrimental? If so, which one(s)?

How do mounted police compare to other crowd control tools you have available to you?

#### Section 4: Concluding questions

Has your police force ever done any tracking, evaluation or research related to the performance of your mounted unit?

Yes

No

If yes, can you describe the research?

As well, if there is a report related to the research and you are willing to share it with the research team, we would greatly appreciate if you attached it to your return email.

Do you have any other comments on the ways in which your force uses mounted police, or on their value in modern policing?

We are trying to contact as many mounted units as we can. Would you be willing to provide contact information of any colleagues who are in charge of mounted policing in other police forces?

Contact name 1:

Email:

Contact name 2:

Email:

Contact name 3:

Email:

Contact name 4:

Email:

Alternately, you could help by providing your colleagues with our contact email ([mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk)) and encouraging them to contact us.

## Closing Statement

THANK YOU for completing our questionnaire. We will produce a report based on this research in late 2014. If you would like a copy of the report, please feel free to request one by email at [mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk) and one will be sent once it has been approved for public release. A copy of the report will also be made available on the Oxford Criminology website at [www.crim.ox.ac.uk](http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk) in due course.

We will be holding a national symposium on mounted police work in Oxford, UK in November 2014, where we will share the findings of the project with police practitioners and other academics working in similar areas. If you are interested in attending this event you may contact us at the above address to reserve a place at the event for yourself and/or members of your mounted unit. There will be no cost for attending the event.

*If you have completed an electronic copy of this questionnaire, please email it to us at [mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk)*

*If you have completed a hard copy of this questionnaire, please scan and email it to us at [mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:mountedpolice@crim.ox.ac.uk). You can also mail it to:*

*Mounted Police Project  
Centre for Criminology  
Manor Road Building  
University of Oxford  
OX1 3UQ  
United Kingdom*

## Daily Diary tool

To develop understanding of the day-to-day activities of officers in mounted units, Chapter 3 of the main report explained that a daily diary tool was used, based on a similar tool developed for a NPIA study (Mclean & Hillier 2011), and modified in consultation with MWG members. The diary tool is presented below. This tool was e-mailed to all mounted units represented within the MWG, to be distributed to mounted officers in their respective forces through MWG representatives. A guidance sheet, included in the tool below, was provided, which explained the protocol for completing the tool. The basic unit of analysis captured by the daily diary tool are 'activity-events', which comprises a single activity or task for which a specific time was recorded in the diary. Officers completed physical copies of the diary forms by hand either during or after completing a shift and the forms were then returned by mail to the research team.

# Observation Diary

Date:

Station:

Shift Hours:

Badge no:

Time Period	In/Out of station		Activity		Off Hours?	Duration of sub task (minutes)	Initial Incident Type 1. Criminal 2. Non criminal 3. ASB 4. Traffic 5. Other(specify)	Outcome (and code if 4) 1. Task as original 2. Task change en route 3. Attend-no incident 4. Attend-different incident	Context 1. Self tasked (a)Community priority (b)Team Targets/Priorities 2. Tasked from briefing 3. Tasked over radio 4. Generated by public 5. Mobile data device 6. Other units	Detailed information on the task What were the details of the task? Does the context/activity need clarification? Provide as much detail as possible.	PW	UT
			Main Task Code	Sub Task Code								
	In	Out										
Main activity start time [ ][ ] : [ ][ ]												
Main activity end time [ ][ ] : [ ][ ]	[ ][ ]	[ ][ ]	[ ][ ]									
Main activity start time [ ][ ] : [ ][ ]												
Main activity end time [ ][ ] : [ ][ ]	[ ][ ]	[ ][ ]	[ ][ ]									
Main activity start time [ ][ ] : [ ][ ]												
Main activity end time [ ][ ] : [ ][ ]	[ ][ ]	[ ][ ]	[ ][ ]									
Main activity start time [ ][ ] : [ ][ ]												
Main activity end time [ ][ ] : [ ][ ]	[ ][ ]	[ ][ ]	[ ][ ]									
Main activity start time [ ][ ] : [ ][ ]												
Main activity end time [ ][ ] : [ ][ ]	[ ][ ]	[ ][ ]	[ ][ ]									

  

Task	Code	Task	Code	Task	Code	Task	Code	Task	Code	Task	Code
Admin	1	Custody	3	Traffic issues (e.g. collision)	G	To station	B	Missing persons	C	Other stable duties	C
Call handling/relief control room	A	Booking in	A	Patrol/visible presence/crime prevention	5	To appointment	C	Outstanding warrants	D	Free sub codes	
Completing PDRs	B	Custody duties-specify	B	Patrol	A	Transport evidence/property/other (specify)	D	Personal (non work) activities	E	Call/request/try to gather info-Specify	R
Incident-lined paperwork (e.g. Ema)	C	Interviewing detainees	C	Tasked Patrol	B	Victim/witness support & dealing	7	Ceremonial Events	F	Call for/request other support-specify	S
Personal work admin (e.g. Ema)	D	Dealing with incident/complaint	4	Checks/Stops	C	Victim/witness assurance	A	Other CT Patrol	G	Discussion with colleague	T
Non-incident lined paperwork	E	Arrest	A	Informal visit/stop-off	D	Interviews	B	School Visits	H	Link with/support other agency-specify	U
Briefings/meetings	2	Evidence-gathering	B	Info requests/enquiries from MOP	E	Returning property	C	Training (personal)	J	Other (specify)	V
Handover	A	Formal warning (e.g. PCN)	C	Intelligence-gathering	F	Taking crime report/statement	D	Training (horse/remount)	K	Probationer training	W
Special ops	B	Informal warning/diffuse situation	D	Scene guarding/security	8	Other activities	8	Stable and Care Duties	9	Supervisory role	X
Standard	C	Pursuit/give chase	E	Travel	6	Court duties/escort	A	Grooming/Feeding	A	Support other force	Y
		Search (person/property)	F	Responding/attending incident	A	Meal/other breaks	B	Cleaning stalls or horseboxes	B	Waiting (for whom?)	Z

### Guidance

1. Ensure you have completed the details on the front of the booklet
2. Record the time that you begin a task in the appropriate boxes under 'Time Period'. Please record the tasks as they are completed throughout the shifts.
3. Sub-tasks will be completed within main tasks, and the time spent on these tasks must also be recorded.
4. All time must be accounted for.
5. If your task is not on horseback, near to or otherwise involving your horse, place an X in the Off Horse? Box
6. Record whether you are in or out of the station by placing an 'X' in the relevant box.
7. To record tasks: Record the main task first, using the codes provided on the observational diary (this will be a number from 1-9). Next, record a sub-task. The sub-task will be connected to the main task heading, and may only be used for this main task. There are also "Free" sub-task codes, which you are allowed to use for any of the main task headings. Note that there is an "Other" free sub-task code.
8. If responding to / called out to an incident, record the type of incident you are called out to in the "Initial incident type" column, using one of the codes provided (1-5). The outcome of the incident response should also be recorded, using one of the codes provided (1-4).
9. Record how you were tasked in the "Context" column, using the codes provided (1-6). If you were self tasked, record whether this is a response to a community priority or a policing team target/priority. There are also codes for being tasked by briefings, over the radio, via a mobile data device, a task generated by a member of the public, or a task picked up from another unit (i.e. handover).
10. Please also provide details of the task in the relevant column. Pay particular attention to whether any of your coding needs clarification.
11. In the "PW" (Paper work) column, place an 'X' where paperwork was involved.
12. In the "UT" (Unproductive Time) column, place an 'X' where you consider that there was unproductive time spent. Please bear in mind the sensitivity of this variable (you might prefer to code this following your observation). What counts as unproductive time is left to your judgement, and will be used to assist later analysis. Possible examples of unproductive time include:
  - Waiting for individuals
  - Multiple entry of data
  - Problems with IT systems
  - Several units attending the same event by mistake

## Football fan focus group schedule

Chapter 6 of the main report described how the research team sought to identify citizen views on mounted policing in public order contexts through focus groups with key stakeholder groups. Two focus groups with football fans were conducted and the script below was used by the research team to guide the discussions.

*This focus group will involve 5-10 fan association members, organised through the Football Supporters Foundation. Focus group participants will likely know each other within the network of supporter group organisers, which will hopefully encourage more open discussion. The focus group will be recorded using a digital recorder, and all comments will remain confidential in the final report.*

### 1. Opening

Thank you for agreeing to participate. Over the next 90 minutes or so, we will ask the group a number of questions regarding your experiences of police work relating to football matches. We are seeking to understand how various tactics are received and understood by those who experience them.

All of your comments will be audio-recorded in a confidential manner, and any reports made from this research will be fully anonymous. As such, we encourage you to speak freely and honestly and ask questions wherever things are unclear.

At the end of the session you will be given our contact information should you wish to follow up on the results of this research, and you are welcome to withdraw your participation at any time up to the publication of the research results. Before we begin, are there any questions?

### 2. Contextual

Key question: What experience do participants have in attending matches?

It would be helpful for us to first get a sense of who our participants are, so if we can begin with each person telling us:

- How long have you been going to football matches?
- Roughly how many games did you attend last season?
  - How many of those were home/away games?
- How would you describe the crowds that attend your team's games?
  - Do you ever expect crowd trouble at matches?
    - Under what circumstances?

### 3. Experiences of policing at football

We would like to understand your overall perceptions of safety, security and policing at the matches you have attended, and feel free to reflect on matches you have attended at other grounds as well.

Key question: How do fans perceive the policing of football matches?

- Generally, how safe do you feel at the games you attend?

- Is this different at different games (e.g. local derbies)?
- Do you feel there is usually enough security and police around?
  - Too much or too little?
- How do you feel about the policing of matches you have attended?
  - Do you take any notice?
- What is security like inside the ground?
- Do you ever talk to police officers when going in or out of the ground?
  - If yes, what are they like?
- Do you think the police are sufficiently equipped to deal with crowd trouble?
  - Do they usually do a good job in responding to crowd trouble?
  - Do they ever create crowd trouble?

#### 4. Experiences of mounted at football

Key question: Where do mounted police sit within these perceptions of policing at football? What functions are they believed to carry out and how effective are they regarded?

Part of our study is about understanding the value of mounted police at football matches. We'd like to ask a few questions about your experiences of police on horseback.

- First, do you ever see any police horses at the games?
  - How does their behaviour compare to officers on foot or in vehicles?
- Why do you think police use horses at football matches?
  - Does their presence have any effect on how you feel when you go in or out of the ground?
  - Do you think police on horses are easier to approach than other police?
- How do other fans usually respond to mounted police?
- Have you ever seen a police helicopter at a match?
  - (if yes) Does this make you feel any safer?

#### 5. Further questions

Back to some more general questions about policing at football matches:

- What is the most disorderly game you've attended?
  - What happened?
  - How did security and or police respond to the situation?
- Have you ever had any particularly positive or negative experiences of policing at football?

#### 6. Wrapping Up

Thanks again for your participation. Before we wrap up, we would appreciate some feedback on the focus group.

- First, are there any questions you think we should have asked that we did not ask?
- Finally, is there anything anyone would like to contribute that they have not yet had a chance to say?

-FINISH AND DISTRIBUTE INFO CARDS-

## Non-mounted police officer focus group schedule

The research also aimed to understand the opinions of police officers regarding the value of mounted police, and more specifically their perceived effects and relative value across a number of deployment scenarios. Thus, two focus groups with non-mounted police officers were held – one with police working in public order settings and the other with those working in a neighbourhood context. The script below was used by the research team to guide these focus groups.

*These focus groups will involve between 5-10 officers of any rank who, within their current role, regularly work with mounted police. The focus group participants should ideally know one another, and potentially be drawn from the same units or area of operations within a single police force. The focus group will be recorded using a digital recorder, and all comments will remain confidential in the final report.*

### 1. Opening

Thank you for agreeing to participate. Over the next 90 minutes or so, we will ask the group a number of questions regarding your work as police officers, and some specific questions about mounted police work as well. We are seeking to understand how various tactics, including the use of mounted police, are seen within police forces. This focus group is part of a larger study into mounted policing in the UK.

All of your comments will be audio-recorded in a confidential manner, and any reports made from this research will be fully anonymous. As such, we encourage you to speak freely and honestly and ask questions wherever things are unclear.

At the end of the session you will be given our contact information should you wish to follow up on the results of this research, and you are welcome to withdraw your participation at any time up to the publication of the research results. Before we begin, are there any questions?

### 2. Contextual

Key question: What is their experience in the force?

First, we would like to know a little about the members of this focus group.

- ROUND: Can each participant please outline their current rank, role, and years of experience?

### 3. Police work

Key Question: What is successful police work?

We're now going to ask a few questions about your jobs as police officers. Some of these questions may seem very general, so please feel free to interpret these as you see fit.

- First, in your current role, what does good police work look like?
  - How do you measure success?
  - What might be considered 'bad' policing or grounds for improvement?
- Is success measured differently by different kinds of police?
  - In different units/branches?
  - In different forces?

#### 4. Mounted police

Key question: What experience do officers have working with mounted?

Now we have some questions about mounted police, and we are under the impression that everyone here has some experience working alongside mounted branch.

Contact with mounted

- Has anyone here ever worked as a mounted officer?
  - How often do you work with mounted branch in your current role?
    - Daily, weekly, monthly, less than once a month?
      - (If any say rarely in current role) What about in previous positions you've held?

Key Question: What are mounted police for?

Impressions of Mounted Work

- In what situations will you normally work with mounted?
- Do they support local operations such as crime reduction?
- Are they ever deployed in unexpected or odd situations?
  - Examples?
- What do you think they spend most of their time doing?
  - Is this time well spent?

Value

- What, in your opinion, is the most important thing that mounted branch brings to policing?
- Are there things that mounted can do better than other police?
- In what situations are mounted most effective?
  - What makes them effective? (Probes: officer safety; ability to maintain order; effect arrests etc.)
- Are there situations where they are indispensable?
- Where are they less effective than other options?
- Are there any uses of mounted that seem inappropriate?
- When mounted police are present, does that change the way you do your job?
  - Always for the better? (Probe: enables/makes more confident to take action).
- How does presence of mounted make you feel? (Probes: more confident; better supported; like something is going to happen).
  - In crowd situations?
  - In neighbourhood patrols?
  - (Any other identified deployments)

#### 5. Wrapping up

Thanks again for your participation. Before we wrap up, we would appreciate some feedback on the focus group.

- First, are there any questions you think we should have asked that we did not ask?
- Finally, is there anything anyone would like to contribute that they have not yet had a chance to say?

-FINISH AND DISTRIBUTE INFO CARDS-

## Appendix B: Data tables

---

This appendix contains additional data relating to the quasi-experiment in Gloucestershire and London. The tables below show results from the regression analyses relating to the quasi-experiment in Chapter 3 of the main report. Beta coefficients and p-values are displayed – the key value is the ‘difference in differences’ coefficient, which shows change in opinions, from pre to post, in the test sites compared with the control sites. A positive coefficient here suggests opinions in the test sites improved *relative to* opinions in the control sites.

To compare change in trust in confidence among residents in the test sites with change among residents in the control sites, a ‘difference in differences’ approach was used, with the matched pairs design (Gloucester, Cirencester/Tetbury and South London) also taken into account. Accordingly, fixed effects linear regression models predicting outcomes on each of the key indicators were estimated (in Stata 12.1). Recall that individual respondents were ‘clustered’ into the three experiment/control pairs. While the trial was concerned to capture individual level opinion, the nesting of individuals’ responses within pairs based on geographical and other factors may have influenced these opinions.<sup>1</sup> Fixed effects models allow this clustering in the data to be taken into account; a dummy variable for each matched pair is included in the model, which will partial out any area-level or ‘structural’ factors which might influence trust and confidence in the police. Regression modelling allows direct testing of the hypotheses that the experimental intervention induced a change in opinion in those areas that received it relative to those which did not, via inclusion of a ‘difference in differences’ coefficient (an interaction term for condition and time period).

Six coefficients are therefore shown in models below.<sup>2</sup> Coefficients in the rows marked ‘Baseline period’ (coefficient 1) show the difference between the test and control groups at the baseline (i.e. during the ‘pre’ period before the experimental intervention was implemented). This will, ideally, be non-significant, since a significant coefficient here would indicate that there was a systematic difference between test and control sites in relation to the indicator in question. That said, the difference in differences approach should be robust to some baseline variation, since the value of interest is relative, rather than absolute, change. The second coefficient, in the rows marked ‘Control areas’ (coefficient 2), shows the difference between the pre- and post-periods in the *control* sites, that is, the pretest-posttest change in trust and confidence in the areas that *did not* receive the experimental intervention. The third coefficient, in the rows marked ‘Test

---

1 Boruch, R., Weisburd, D. and Berk, R. (2010) ‘Place Randomised Trials’ in Piquero, A.R. and Weisburd, D. (eds) (2010) *The Handbook of Quantitative Criminology*, New York: Springer

2 Coefficients 1, 2 and 4 were taken directly from each model. Coefficient 3, along with its standard error and significance level, was calculated using the `lincom` function in Stata.

areas' (coefficient 3) shows the pretest-posttest change in the *test* areas; the change in trust and confidence in the areas that *did* receive the experimental intervention. The fourth coefficient, presented in the rows marked 'Difference in differences' (coefficient 4), indicates the change in the measures of trust and confidence (from pre to post period) within the test sites *relative to* the control sites. It is this coefficient that provides the test of the hypothesis that the experimental intervention enhanced perceptions of police. A positive, significant, coefficient here would mean that the experimental intervention was associated with a positive shift in opinion in the test sites, when compared with the control sites, in relation to the measure in question (as discussed in the main body of the report, this 'positive shift' can take the form of a buffering effect, wherein a decline in trust and confidence in the control sites was not repeated in the test sites). The value for coefficient (4) is simply (3) minus (2) – it represents the difference between change in the experiment areas and change in the control areas.

Finally, the dummy variables representing the fixed (area level) effects are also shown. These can be interpreted as representing the 'structural variation' in trust and confidence across the three matched pairs. Gloucester is the omitted reference category (London in the models excluding Gloucester) - note that trust and confidence tended to be higher in the London pair than in either Gloucestershire pair.

**Table B1: Binary logistic regression models predicting trust in police community engagement**

	Full sample						Excluding Gloucester					
	Understand issues		Engage public		Deal with issues that matter		Understand issues		Engage public		Deal with issues that matter	
	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )
<b>Baseline period</b>												
Test area (ref: control area)	-0.07	0.64	-0.01	0.95	-0.40*	<.005	0.21	0.26	0.05	0.77	-0.15	0.47
<b>Control areas</b>												
Post period (ref: pre period)	-0.38**	<.005	-0.02	0.86	-0.39*	<.005	-0.46**	<.005	-0.1	0.56	-0.60**	<.005
<b>Test areas</b>												
Post period (ref: pre period)	0.05	0.72	0.02	0.90	0.16	0.30	0.04	0.85	0.11	0.52	0.13	0.53
<b>Difference in differences</b>	0.44*	0.03	0.04	0.83	0.55*	0.01	0.50+	0.05	0.21	0.39	0.73*	0.01
<b>Fixed effects (ref: Gloucester/London)</b>												
Cirencester/Tetbury	0.11	0.36	0.27*	0.02	0.29*	0.03	0.14	0.26	-0.05	0.69	-0.1	0.47
London	-0.03	0.83	0.32**	0.01	0.39**	0						
Constant	0.98**	0	0.20+	-0.08	1.23**	0	0.85**	0	0.49**	0	1.57**	0
N	1865		1811		1804		1221		1171		1170	

+ p<.1, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01

**Table B2: Binary logistic regression models predicting trust in police fairness**

	Full sample				Excluding Gloucester			
	Dignity and respect		Friendly and approachable		Dignity and respect		Friendly and approachable	
	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )
<b>Baseline period</b>								
Test area (ref: control area)	0.2	0.32	-0.36+	0.05	0.02	0.93	-0.59*	0.03
<b>Control areas</b>								
Post period (ref: pre period)	-0.2	0.28	-0.28	0.13	-0.67**	0.01	-0.72**	0.01
<b>Test areas</b>								
Post period (ref: pre period)	-0.15	0.44	0.25	0.16	-0.01	0.98	0.43+	0.09
<b>Difference in differences</b>	0.05	0.86	0.53*	0.04	0.66+	0.07	1.14**	<0.005
<b>Fixed effects (ref: Gloucester/London)</b>								
Cirencester/Tetbury	0.59**	<0.005	0.71**	<0.005	0.39*	0.03	-0.09	0.6
London	0.21	0.18	0.81**	<0.005				
Constant	1.56**	<0.005	1.35**	<0.005	1.97**	<0.005	2.37**	<0.005
N	1794		1806		1175		1193	

+ p<.1, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01

**Table B3: Binary logistic regression models predicting trust in police effectiveness**

	Full sample				Excluding Gloucester			
	Prevent crime		Catch offenders		Prevent crime		Catch offenders	
	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )
<b>Baseline period</b>								
Test area (ref: control area)	0.09	-0.2	0.25	-0.18	0.25	-0.25	0.35	-0.24
<b>Control areas</b>								
Post period (ref: pre period)	-0.24	-0.19	-0.04	-0.17	-0.25	-0.23	-0.39+	-0.21
<b>Test areas</b>								
Post period (ref: pre period)	-0.27	0.17	-0.30	0.08	-0.28	0.27	-0.48	0.04

<b>Difference in differences</b>	-0.03	-0.28	-0.26	-0.24	-0.02	-0.34	-0.09	-0.31
<b>Fixed effects (ref: Gloucester/London)</b>								
Cirencester/Tetbury	-0.15	-0.17	0.16	-0.14	0.01	-0.17	-0.03	-0.15
London	-0.17	-0.17	0.19	-0.15				
Constant	2.22**	-0.17	1.51**	-0.14	1.98**	-0.19	1.80**	-0.17
N	2073		2062		1357		1346	

+ p<.1, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01

**Table B4: Binary logistic regression models predicting overall confidence**

	Full sample						Excluding Gloucester					
	Good job		Confidence		Report crime		Good job		Confidence		Report crime	
	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )	$\beta$	se( $\beta$ )
<b>Baseline period</b>												
Test area (ref: control area)	0.12	-0.44	-0.07	-0.72	0.2	-0.37	0.01	-0.95	0.05	-0.85	0.07	-0.8
<b>Control areas</b>												
Post period (ref: pre period)	-0.21	-0.16	-0.28	-0.16	-0.1	-0.63	-0.28	-0.12	-0.45+	-0.06	-0.48+	-0.06
<b>Test areas</b>												
Post period (ref: pre period)	-0.18	0.22	0.20	0.34	0.13	0.56	0.00	0.98	0.14	0.60	0.40	0.20
<b>Difference in differences</b>	0.03	-0.89	0.47+	-0.1	0.23	-0.45	0.28	-0.28	0.60+	-0.1	0.87*	-0.03
<b>Fixed effects (ref: Gloucester/London)</b>												
Cirencester/Tetbury	-0.08	-0.49	-0.04	-0.8	0.16	-0.39	-0.37**	0	-0.2	-0.27	0	-0.99
London	0.29*	-0.03	0.15	-0.39	0.16	-0.39						
Constant	1.03**	<0.005	2.11**	<0.005	2.05**	<0.005	1.33**	<0.005	2.28**	<0.005	2.34**	<0.005
N	1934		2001		1973		1279		1311		1294	

+ p<.1, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01

## Appendix C: Football data

---

Table C1 below presents further details of the ground level data for policing at football matches, discussed in Chapter 4. The data comes from the UK Football Policing Unit (UKFPU) and the MWG. The table shows data on mounted police presence, key outcomes (ejections, disorder and arrests), and number of matches at each football ground relating to the 50 grounds where Premier League and Championship matches took place during the 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13 seasons.

**Table C1: Ground level data at Premier League and Championship matches, 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13**

Home team	Proportion of matches with mounted units present	Mean number of ejections	Proportion with UKFPU reports of disorder	Mean number of arrests	Number of matches in dataset
Arsenal	97.3	4.6	0.04	3.3	74
Aston Villa	0	5.8	0.20	3.7	55
Barnsley	26.87	0.4	0.15	0.6	67
Birmingham City	0	0.7	0.33	3.2	72
Blackburn Rovers	0	4.6	0.31	3.4	54
Blackpool	0	3.0	0.20	2.2	60
Bolton Wanderers	43.86	8.4	0.16	2.4	57
Brighton & Hove Albion	0	2.1	0.16	1.9	43
Bristol City	28.36	2.0	0.28	1.0	67
Burnley	0	1.1	0.28	1.9	67
Cardiff City	0	0.8	0.16	0.4	68
Charlton Athletic	92.31	3.0	0.23	0.5	13
Chelsea	100	6.9	0.20	3.0	71
Coventry City	0	0.9	0.29	1.0	49
Crystal Palace	21.88	1.0	0.39	0.5	64
Derby County	0	1.0	0.21	0.7	66
Doncaster Rovers	19.61	1.2	0.43	1.0	51
Everton	86.44	3.9	0.19	1.5	59
Fulham	98.33	1.6	0.07	0.8	60
Huddersfield Town	76.92	1.2	0.46	1.5	13
Hull City	24.62	2.0	0.12	0.6	65

Ipswich Town	0	1.9	0.14	0.9	63
Leeds United	98.57	1.1	0.37	4.8	70
Leicester City	0	1.5	0.20	0.9	65
Liverpool	91.3	2.4	0.20	2.2	69
Manchester City	88.73	20.5	0.30	3.7	71
Manchester United	88.57	9.5	0.17	6.3	70
Middlesbrough	27.42	0.3	0.19	1.2	62
Millwall	53.73	3.2	0.30	1.5	67
Newcastle United	62.96	5.1	0.37	3.6	54
Norwich City	1.47	1.3	0.13	0.7	68
Nottingham Forest	0	0.5	0.22	1.9	67
Peterborough United	0	0.8	0.30	1.8	40
Portsmouth	6	1.4	0.30	0.9	50
Preston North End	0	1.1	0.12	1.0	25
Queens Park Rangers	94.83	4.9	0.31	2.0	58
Reading	9.68	1.2	0.27	1.0	62
Scunthorpe United	0	1.5	0.47	0.7	30
Sheffield United	20.83	4.6	0.46	2.0	24
Sheffield Wednesday	38.46	1.0	0.46	1.0	13
Southampton	5	4.1	0.28	1.1	40
Stoke City	0	0.5	0.10	1.0	62
Sunderland	88.14	1.3	0.14	5.9	59
Swansea City	0	2.3	0.18	0.6	60
Tottenham Hotspur	97.01	2.8	0.06	1.2	67
Watford	0	1.6	0.14	0.4	64
West Bromwich Albion	0	2.1	0.10	2.7	52
West Ham United	56.92	0.5	0.29	1.3	65
Wigan Athletic	56.6	7.7	0.26	1.5	53
Wolverhampton Wandere	0	1.8	0.22	2.8	59
Total	35.0	3.0	0.2	1.9	2,804

*Source: Data on ejections, disorder and arrests at matches provided by the UK Football Policing Unit. Data on mounted police presence at matches provided by the Mounted Working Group.*