

TOP CATS: THE ROLE AND REQUIREMENTS OF LEADERSHIP IN COMMUNITY JUSTICE INITIATIVES

Susie Atherton and Annette Crisp, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, De Montfort University

Abstract *Community justice initiatives attempt to meet dual aims of dealing with offending and engaging citizens in their local community. They exist throughout the criminal justice system, where policy is being firmly placed at a more local level. Arguably, this requires a clearer understanding of the community in which they are implemented and of what is understood by the term 'community'. In addition, a feature of community justice initiatives often includes partnership working and concerns over the role of leadership, in relation to responsibility and accountability, in order that such initiatives are effectively implemented. Leadership is also highlighted as a key component necessary for building social cohesion and social capital (Rai, 2008; Cattle Report, 2006; Coleman, 1990), which many community justice initiatives aim to improve on, or draw from. This paper explores the role and type of leadership which can be identified in various community justice initiatives and its importance in contributing to our understanding of social cohesion and communities. The paper assesses current attempts to implement community justice in the context of different styles of leadership and highlights the inherent complexities of organisations and multi-agency working, which need to be better understood.*

Keywords *Community, community justice, leadership, policing, restorative justice.*

Introduction

Since the late 20th century, governments have used an idealised notion of 'community' as a basis for a range of public policies. From their election in 1997, the Labour government adopted 'active citizenship' as central to their 'Third Way' approach (Giddens, 1998), offering an alternative to centralised state control (Powell, 2000). The recent coalition government consultation paper, 'Breaking the Cycle' (Ministry of Justice, 2010) outlines the more recent attempts to engage local communities in the preservation of personal safety and in expectation of their active participation in the 'rehabilitative revolution' proposed for criminal justice.

The term 'community' presents broad categorisations (Hughes, 2002) alongside a vague and almost indefinable concept (Pease, 1994). Despite this, attempts have been made, such as Wilmott (1987), who identified three different types of 'community'. These are based on geographical boundaries (*territorial communities*); citizens sharing political, religious or leisure interests (*interest communities*); and those whose citizens have a sense

of 'belonging' to a place or with others (*attachment communities*). However, it is argued that these categories are too simplistic, as specific geographical areas could have strong ties through shared political ideology, or weak ties due to different beliefs, values and norms (Shapland, 2008). Schiff (2003) emphasises that, to build cohesive communities, assumptions cannot be made about bonds due to location, beliefs or sense of belonging in that residents also need to have a consensus of approach and equality of access to services.

Within the various types of community identified by Wilmott (1987) is the more complex issue of the 'wide diversity of people with varying perceptions, interests and safety concerns' (White, 2003: 139), presenting an 'unstable and contestable policy terrain' (Hughes & Rowe, 2007: 317). This emphasises the many challenges of placing criminal justice policy at a more local level, as a lack of understanding about the community various policies are meant to work in can act as a barrier to their effectiveness and successful implementation.

There are clear political elements to the debates around defining what is meant by the term 'community', for example, O'Shea (2000) noted the political dimension to community policing. These range from the structural and managerial issues which respond to the requirements of decentralisation and participatory management and those related to unclear principles of bureaucracy which conflict with democratic principles. Communitarian theory places greater emphasis on the value of networks and bonds among citizens over that of 'neoliberalist' ideals of individual gain, and seeks to promote characteristics of obligation and solidarity (Hughes, 2002). Within this theory are currently two clear strands of debate, namely the conservative communitarian project (see Etzioni, 1994) and radical communitarianism (see Jordan, 1996). The conservative communitarian project presents a move towards the 'remoralisation' of society and the rebuilding of a sense of obligation. This vision views the ideal community as homogenous and stable and assumes that it would have the resources with which to govern itself (Hughes, 2002). In contrast, radical communitarianism works within a range of small-scale communities, as opposed to one homogenous community and advocates participatory democracy, recognising the diversity within society and requirement of mutual tolerance of differences along with a shared common goal (Jordan, 1996).

These attempts at providing a better understanding of community demonstrate the complex issues in place, before even considering the aims, objectives and focus of responsibility for community justice initiatives. However, it is important to understand these issues in order to better assess what projects aiming to address crime and disorder at a local level require to be effective. Leadership could be an important requirement to ensure the successful implementation of community justice initiatives and to avoid unexpected outcomes presenting themselves. This paper explores the role of leadership within community justice initiatives, with examples from policing, probation and restorative justice, all of which involve a number of agencies and links with the community. An exploration of leadership also enables an understanding of the ways in which community engagement with addressing crime and disorder can address exclusion and discrimination, in light of the values of the organisation or agency behind the

community justice initiative. Organisational culture clearly can impact on practice and on the values and ethical judgements made by professionals, for example, 'cop culture' on policing practices (Reiner, 1985; Chan, 1997; Foster, 2003; Loftus, 2010) and the new focus on risk assessment and management within the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) (Kemshall, 2002; 2003). The complexities of organisations and, therefore, leadership are also briefly explored to highlight further issues for consideration and research.

Crime, disorder and the impact on 'communities'

Crime and fear of crime and disorder presents an important area in which policy can attempt to improve quality of life at a local level. It is argued that crime and disorder is more prevalent in deprived areas, where residents also lack access to public services, which could equip them with the resources and skills to address offending and its underlying causes (Gregory & Hunter, 1995). It must be noted that not all residents living in deprived areas will either commit crime, be a victim of crime or turn a blind eye to the suffering of others, as this is affected by the presence of sources of social support and also, in the case of youth crime, input and commitment from parents (Weatherburn & Lind, 1998).

However, crime and disorder and the response to it may not always be the most appropriate mechanism by which to bring citizens together, as this is often viewed as the result of divisions within communities and subject to citizens' assigning blame to certain individuals or groups. Specific incidents such as knife crime or gang related violence threaten residents' safety and also their willingness to engage with others, and among those who do, the relationships formed may dissipate if the problem is resolved, or if it is found to be impossible to surmount. In addition, citizen responses to crime and disorder can be fraught with problems in terms of the 'vigilante' style methods they may resort to, often as a direct result of dissatisfaction with the police (Sharp *et al.*, 2008; Williams, 2005).

This lack of confidence and co-operation from citizens can manifest itself as de-legitimising the authority of criminal justice agencies (Wilson, 2004; Sharp & Atherton, 2007). Residents or even groups of residents can feel marginalised by the state, for example, as seen in the experiences of young males from black and other ethnic minority groups as the target of police stop and search exercises (e.g. Brunson & Miller, 2006). Such experiences can then affect views about other aspects of the criminal justice system, leading to what Sampson & Bartusch (1998) have termed 'legal cynicism'. Perhaps in response to these issues, critical criminologists have long held the belief that alternatives to state and centrally controlled justice systems must be explored, in order to promote the 'utopian visions of an ideal social democratic society in which the well-being and security of all members would be assured' (Lacey & Zedner, 1995: 304). However, it is with caution that politically left ideology should adopt this and view the relocation of criminal justice to the local level, as there remain questions as to who is empowered by such an approach and if, in fact, such an approach can still produce and maintain inequalities (Rai, 2008). Conversely, those to the right have also adopted community based criminal justice initiatives under the guise of rebuilding deprived communities, but

with the accusation that such initiatives were in fact an attempt to take attention away from the inefficiencies of state control (Lacey & Zedner, 1995). More recently, in widespread press articles and news reports are concerns that David Cameron's 'Big Society' plans are presented as a means to justify cuts in public spending and mitigate against protests from all sectors of society.

Addressing crime and justice issues in the community

Approaches to community justice around the world encompass several clear themes (Wolf, 2006), including community engagement, which seeks to engage a range of stakeholders in planning and implementation phases of community based initiatives. Community justice also advocates placing operations within the community they serve and making more use of restorative justice measures. In addition, offenders who require additional support to address the underlying cause of their behaviour will have links through community justice initiatives to treatment facilities, job training and other services (Wolf, 2006).

Many community justice initiatives also aim to promote community safety and improve the quality of life, along with addressing inequalities and reducing crime. This approach is increasingly becoming rooted throughout the criminal justice system, specifically policing, the courts and prison systems. Community justice often also employs a problem solving approach, to treat crime as a 'series of problems to be solved' rather than a 'contest to be won' (Karp & Clear, 2000: 328). These measures comprise assessing levels of offending and disorder on the basis of where they occur in order to set priorities (Taylor & Harrell, 1996) and also to target resources and to increase understanding about which areas need the most assistance (Kelling, 1992). Finally, these measures require evaluation on the basis of their success in meeting targets to reduce crime and improve quality of life (Sherman, *et al.*, 1997). With the responsibility for addressing crime and disorder shifted to local criminal justice agencies and citizens, community justice is often concerned with improving quality of life and also the capacity for community members to work together to address problems, in a sense to implement informal and formal social controls and prevent further problems (Bursik & Grasmick, 1993; Lacey & Zedner, 1995).

However, in a review of neighbourhood renewal policies in Birmingham and Wolverhampton, Rai (2008) found inequalities in democratic decision making and participation in community-wide issues. Carley (2005) noted the example of Aberdeen as a community who defined boundaries, and thus expectations, as a result of a process of dialogue between organisations and providers. Residents involved in a series of neighbourhood renewal activities, after having engaged with the process, were pleased that their concerns and perceptions had been granted due recognition whilst service providers, including those in the area of criminal justice, were working on service provision based on 'coterminous boundaries' and accord.

Another finding from Rai's (2008) research was that leadership in local governance was vital, however, there were concerns raised about the role of centrally governed state institutions, in which some residents had little confidence or trust. The expectations of leaders were that they would have a strong connection to the community and be known

as trustworthy and honest. Partnership working, again seen as very important, was flawed by disagreements, conflicting goals and poor communication. The role of state institutions in this process was also questioned in terms of bureaucracy, which impeded communication and led to a view among some residents that active participation was ineffective. Other obstacles to engaging all citizens included some reporting not having time to spare and others simply not being aware that fora existed in which they could have their say (Rai, 2008).

What is meant by leadership?

A report on social cohesion by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2004) reviewed the causes and aftermath of race-related rioting in Oldham, Bradford and Burnley during the summer of 2001. The definition adopted for this study presented the common features of a cohesive community as including a 'sense of belonging' within communities, valuing diversity, providing equality of opportunity, and 'strong and positive relationships' across the community (ODPM, 2004: 6). The Cattle Report (2006) produced by the Institute of Community Cohesion (ICC) at Coventry University explored the attempts by Oldham Borough Council to encourage community cohesion after the disturbances in 2001. Leadership was viewed as an important part of building the foundations for achieving cohesion and this was identified in Oldham. However, concerns were raised regarding the continuing dependency of others on this leadership deferring to them for decisions and not feeling empowered themselves. Changing this approach was viewed as vital, in order that all sectors of the community are equally involved, including the statutory, voluntary and business sectors (Cattle Report, 2006).

Bolden *et al.* (2003), in their review of leadership theory and competency frameworks, recognise evolving schools of thought that identify the characteristics of the leader from the early idea of the 'Great Man' to more contemporary iterations of the 'Transformational Leader'. A more recent response to the term notably identifies the concept of dispersed leadership, which proposes that, rather than being limited to key personnel within an establishment, leadership is a process which permeates throughout an organisation, thus generating collective responsibility for control.

Trait theories such as the 'Great Man' attempt to identify characteristics found in the nature of leaders to facilitate opportunities for training and self improvement processes. In practice, whilst a number of similarities might be found, researchers remain unconvinced, suggesting that such qualities are inconsistently identified and may additionally be linked to a number of accompanying skills (Stogdill, 1974). Behaviourist theories seek to identify the processes and situations in which the worker might be motivated to work more effectively and, subsequently, apply these principles to identify the best means by which the leader/worker interrelationships (situation) might maximise performance. Whilst this tends to focus on a bottom-up approach to leadership, there is an assumption that the effective leader/manager will have an appreciation of the task and be able to appropriately respond to changes along a continuum (contingency) as the task progresses. For some behaviourists, these approaches may be reflected within a graduated representation of an action focussed management style (Adair, 1973; McGregor, 1960; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958; Blake & Moulton, 1964).

The dynamics of leader and follower are represented by a number of ideas where theorists have attempted to seek and, subsequently, identify relationships which result in a contract or transaction as a situational response, recognising that in some situations the leader might additionally be viewed as a servant (Greenleaf, 1970). Such relationships might be recognised in, for example, the role of faith leaders within the community.

The complexities reflected within modern organisations have found purchase in theories of leadership which promote the team approach, choosing to focus not only on the role of the leader, but on how individuals might become essential components of a team. Belbin (1993) identifies the team leader who recognises, manages and, subsequently, values the range of diverse talents of their work-force as opposed to the more traditional concept of the patriarchal solo leader.

Organisations such as those key to the functioning of the criminal justice processes have, in recent years, identified more readily with theories aligned to the new public management process. The need to justify aspects of worth and best value via performance targets seems to challenge the traditional significance placed on an organisational requirement for leadership. In these organisations, managers appear to maintain the status quo by executing operational demands as effectively as possible, whilst leaders seek out new opportunities and guide and promote them efficiently in order to direct organisations. According to Wright (2000: 91), 'in policing, modern rational management has been promoted as the method through which an economical, efficient and effective police is to be achieved'. This seems to provide a contrast between what may be described as a series of behaviours, which are then ascribed to styles of leadership and the idea of the transformer who first acts as visionary then transforms the activities of a group of individuals or an organisation.

Whilst early management theorists found it relatively simple to divide the role and function of managers within organisations and to quantify the changes expected as a result of the application of their beliefs, it appears that this is no longer straightforward. Ethics, workplace democracy and the impact of technology have all meant that the responsibility and expectations of the workplace manager and staff may in many cases be interchangeable (Bergmann *et al.*, 1999).

The use of Action Learning sets for cross-sector training, particularly in relation to strategic leadership, appears to be one of a number of ways forward. The Leading Powerful Partnerships (Independent Command Programme) developed by the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) is an example of a programme available to leaders whose role involves multi-agency engagement. With the more recent impact of the Localism Bill 2011, the desire by government to further empower communities will create a more significant need to extend leadership development projects and offer leadership training opportunities. It will also attempt to support community members in facilitating their political ambitions for a more confident community at a local level, in addition to the need to prepare organisational leaders for solving more complex matters.

The recent Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) publication, 'Antisocial Behaviour: Stop the Rot' (2010), provides an example of the potential dangers of a poor management response to a range of complex issues. According to the report there is a public expectation that there will be a joined up agency/organisational response to their complaints around antisocial behaviour and those issues which directly effect citizens' quality of life. Unfortunately, the research suggests that, rather than meeting expectations, there is a tendency for multi-agency initiatives to involve 'lengthy partnership processes which have distinctive significant negative consequences for victims' (HMIC, 2010: 9).

Highlighting evidence from engagement with Community Safety Partnerships, the report also identifies partnership failures associated with variable standards of working; partners who focus mainly on working together, strategy or process rather than working for the public, and the negative impact of a 'meetings' culture. There is an underlying suggestion that these characteristics are manifest in other strategic partnerships within local communities, including those that directly relate to community justice (HMIC, 2010). Therefore, it is anticipated that there will need to be a critical reconsideration of the traits and abilities required of leaders and managers across all sectors to meet the challenge of such complex issues and also address the expectations of citizens.

The Neyroud Report (2011) recommends a cross-sector approach to leadership which it suggests should extend from the public to the private sector. The idea of complexity in leadership is not a new but it may take time to extinguish the cultural dynamics of organisational self-interest, perpetuated by performance led targets of recent years and the self serving interests of some leaders to diminish in favour of a more holistic approach (Bennington & Hartley, 2009).

Neighbourhood policing

Community and neighbourhood policing appear to represent some of the first moves towards attempts to develop justice in the community and to engage local citizens in taking responsibility for crime and disorder. The term 'community policing' is characterised by uncertainty as to whether it presents a whole new philosophy in policing or a series of initiatives and programmes adopted by police forces to reduce crime and build public confidence (Moore, 1992; Eck & Rosenbaum, 1994). It is argued that community policing enables the police in democratic societies to operate with the consent of the public and also work directly with them, as it is now recognised that they cannot work in isolation and must encourage co-operation from the communities they serve (Rowe, 2008).

Neyroud & Beckley (2001: 220) state that 'good policing in the twenty first century requires more than good performance. It needs a renewal of contract between police officer and the citizen'. Davies & Thomas (2003) undertook what they termed a discursive analysis of policing in the context of New Public Management and suggested as a result, that the focus on performance was incompatible with community orientated policing. They argue that community policing focuses upon the more traditional 'feminine' skills of communication and cite evidence from Heidensohn (1992), Reiner (1992), Fielding (1994),

Gaston & Alexander (1995) and Walklate (2001), among others, in support. Davies & Thomas (2003) also note that performance led policing, an essential component of this management ethos, appeals to the more masculine led cultures within the police, focussing on meeting targets based upon reactive policing techniques in crime detection, rather than proactive reduction practice, thus negating the very skills of 'building' and 'bonding' with communities in order to encourage community cohesion.

Implementing community policing faces numerous challenges from institutional structures within police forces (Chan, 1997) and resistance from the communities they serve (Brogden & Nijhar, 2005; Hughes & Rowe, 2007). The response to crime and disorder in deprived communities by the police and others they work with cannot fully address the structural and social problems that can be attributed to causing crime, such as socio-economic inequalities, drug and alcohol use, unemployment, and poor living conditions (Rowe, 2008).

The organisational culture of the police, along with specific traits of masculinity, bravado and task orientation (Reiner, 1992) implies that the type of leadership found within the police would lend itself to more traditional 'Great Man' approach (Stogdill, 1974). However, with the need for more collaborative working, this leadership approach may not be the most effective. Collaborative working, as is increasingly found in community justice initiatives, would require a more inclusive approach with more consultation or dispersed leadership (Bolden *et al.*, 2003).

An example of this can be found in police led operations which aim to deal with specific offences in a targeted and zero-tolerance approach, but which then require follow-up work by a range of agencies to prevent further offending and re-build trust and confidence in the community. Such an approach is referred in the US as crackdown and consolidation (Millie, 2005), which aims to follow up the more heavy-handed approach of the police with crime prevention and community safety measures. For example, problematic drug users and suppliers could be targeted by police operations, to be followed up by programmes to treat and offer welfare support to users by health and social services teams. Therefore, the leadership will change as the key aims of the initiative and type of expertise and resources change, from the police to healthcare professionals. This can also require a period of engagement from citizens to enable offenders/users to reintegrate into the community with the support of employers, social landlords, healthcare services and faith based services.

Probation services and restorative justice

Community justice is often seen as a precursor to restorative justice and is also viewed as a more appropriate approach to dealing with crime and disorder in deprived and fragmented communities (Faulkner, 2003). Developed in the early 1990s, this model looks to neighbourhoods and communities to participate in programmes specifically designed to address crime and justice issues to have a collective impact beyond addressing the needs of victims and offenders (Bazemore, 1997). In addition, the current criminal justice system at all levels faces a 'crisis of legitimacy', which could in part be addressed through restorative justice models (Garland, 2001).

The principles of restorative justice, namely the prevention of harm, restoration of community harmony, protection of human rights and a more inclusive approach to the administration of justice (Marshall, 1999), are emerging as the foundation to a fundamental shift in criminal justice policy. This approach embraces an understanding of the structural factors within society which contribute to crime and, as with community policing, it requires a collaborative and inclusive approach (Sullivan & Tift, 2001).

Initiatives which fall under the remit of restorative justice can be led and implemented by the police, for example, to deal quickly with minor quality of life offences, which may have a practical solution such as cleaning graffiti. The agency primarily responsible for coordination and implementation of restorative justice is the probation service. The values of probation staff lend themselves to viewing offenders as capable of restoring harms caused, whilst also ensuring court order or sentence conditions are not breached.

The values of probation service staff fit in well with the key principles of restorative justice, namely offering social support, non-judgemental interaction with offenders and moves to reconcile victims and offenders (Braithwaite & Strang, 2001). It is also important to note the international reach of this approach, demonstrating how the key aims meet the diverse needs and different cultural understanding to deal with crime and justice. Restorative justice initiatives have been widely documented in New Zealand based on Maori traditions and the focus on the family conferencing (Morris & Maxwell, 2003); in the USA, to address the needs of young offenders and sentencing circles used widely in Canada and the USA (Bazemore & Umbreit, 2003). However, concerns have been cited in relation to the extent of participation and powers afforded to citizens as part of restorative justice programmes, highlighting the need for clear guidelines alongside a socially inclusive process (Crawford, 2003) and, arguably, clear understanding of leadership and accountability.

For both the police and probation service, the leadership role is very much as identified by Greenleaf (1970) - those charged with the responsibility of the management of restorative justice may find they need to constantly defer to others with specific expertise, to keep the process inclusive and meet the range of needs of victims and offenders – to be more of a servant, or coordinator, than a leader. The requirement to manage teams, whilst valuing diversity and strengths of members, aligns with Belbin's (1993) understanding of the role of team leaders, away from the more transformational 'Great Man' leader (Stogdill, 1974).

Conclusion

The political shift from centralised to local management and administration of crime and justice has been demonstrated in the range of changes in approach and new initiatives within criminal justice policy. Such changes have been demonstrated in policing methods and different forms of justice to support both victims and offenders, as well as impacting on the wider community. Notions of active citizenship (Powell, 2000) and recent government papers to enable active participation (Ministry of Justice, 2010) further emphasise the continuing need and intentions to move from state and centralised control of crime and justice.

The concerns expressed as to how to best understand the term 'community' (Hughes, 2002; Pease, 1994; Wilmott, 1987; Schiff, 2003; Shapland, 2008) clearly demonstrate the complexities inherent in trying to place crime and justice in the hands of communities and citizens, without considering their demographic features, socio-economic circumstances and diversity. Despite the challenges of placing crime and justice policy at a more local level, its significance in citizens' lives and its impact on communities make it an important issue to address. In deprived areas, high crime rates and lack of resources to regenerate such areas can block attempts to address crime and its many causes (Gregory & Hunter, 1995). However, assuming a lack of resources and opportunities in deprived areas leads to citizens being unable to change their circumstances and can itself be a simplistic view. High levels of social capital, social cohesion and the bonds to create a cohesive community may not be dependent on levels of deprivation or affluence, again, highlighting the complexity of our understanding of 'community'.

Alongside this are the challenges of bringing citizens together under the remit of dealing with crime and disorder, whether due to the potential for a temporary bonding effect (Shapland, 2008) or a distrust of existing state criminal justice agencies (Sharp *et al.*, 2008; Williams, 2005). Others have made a direct link to the need to explore alternatives to state control over crime and justice in order to begin the process of dealing with inequalities and having a more inclusive approach (Lacey & Zedner, 1995).

With the aims of community justice initiatives ranging from dealing with offending and victims, to attempts to improve quality of life for residents and bring community cohesion, there are similarities in the various approaches. Community justice takes a problem solving rather than an adversarial approach, with consultation and collaborative working practices (Wolf, 2006; Sherman, *et al.*, 1997; Bursik & Grasmick, 1993). There are inevitable challenges to achieving all these aims without a clear assessment of the type of community intended to benefit from such initiatives. Research has demonstrated that initiatives aimed at neighbourhood renewal have experienced inequalities in decision making and participation alongside the importance of clear leadership and consensus of approach (Rai, 2008).

Leadership, whether as explicitly linked to individuals (Greenleaf, 1970; Stogdill, 1974), a more collaborative arrangement (Bolden *et al.*, 2003) or team management approach (Belbin, 1993) has an important role in implementing community justice and building social cohesion (Rai, 2008; Cattle, 2006). The type of leadership also appears to have a link to organisational culture, which, in turn, can impact on the way in which collaborative community justice initiatives are implemented (Wright, 2000; Bergmann *et al.* 1999).

Within the police service and aims of neighbourhood policing are tasks relating to reducing offending, improving community safety and engaging citizens. The leadership in these initiatives is relatively easy to define and understand as coming from the police themselves, but with numerous examples of requiring partnerships with other agencies. The organisational culture of the police demonstrates leadership styles of 'Great Man' and a more dispersed approach with clear lines of consultation with a wide range of sectors in the community, in order to address all crime and disorder issues (Bolden *et al.*, 2003).

Comparing this with restorative justice approaches, which can be police led in initial stages but also are managed by the probation service, who have a clearer ethos of supporting offenders as well as victims and communities. The probation service has had a longer history of collaborative working and working towards the effective management of teams (Belbin, 1993). Community justice centres seem to combine this ethos with clear leadership in the form of the judge and also the focal point of the community court.

Establishing leadership approaches within community justice appears then to be an important element in assessing their effectiveness, although a more thorough review and appraisal of this is required. Although this adds to the concerns and debates regarding how to ensure community justice initiatives are successfully implemented, there is evidence that this requires further analysis and understanding, alongside a better understanding of the community benefitting from such initiatives. With the shift of the administration of justice and improving community safety in the hands of local agencies and citizens, along with the absence of central control dictating priorities, the source and therefore type of leadership needs to be better understood, as do the requirements of leaders operating under such policies and approaches.

The role and impact of leadership also needs to be explored at local government level, as the key authority in reducing crime and disorder in communities, along with a better understanding of the role of the voluntary sector. With calls for engaging citizens in local issues under the remit of the 'Big Society', actually achieving and implementing such plans requires more in-depth exploration of the changing nature of leadership and the changing nature of dealing with crime and justice. This emphasises the need for an understanding of the complexities of the organisations, agencies and communities involved in community justice and how this can impact on the effectiveness of their implementation. In a culture where success is still focused on performance targets and identifying efficiency and effectiveness, an understanding of the potential barriers is becoming increasingly necessary. The aims of community justice promise a great deal and, if they are to offer a more inclusive, more democratic and participatory alternative to traditional notions of justice, more needs to be done to unravel the complexities, potential pitfalls and success stories.

References

- Adair, J. (1973) *Action-Centred Leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Alderson, J. (1979). *Policing Freedom*. Plymouth: Macdonald and Evans
- Bazemore, G. and Umbreit, M. (2003) A comparison of four restorative conferencing models, in Johnstone (Ed.) *A Restorative Justice Reader: Texts, sources, context*, Cullompton, Devon: Willan.
- Belbin, R.M. (1993). *Team Roles at Work*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann
- Bergmann, H., Hurson, K. and Russ-Eft, D. (1999) *Everyone a Leader: A grassroots model for the new workplace*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J.S. (1964) *The Managerial Grid*. Houston TX: Gulf
- Bolden R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A. and Dennison, P. (2003) *A Review of Leadership Theory and Competency Frameworks*, Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter.

- Braithwaite, J. and Strang, H. (2001) 'Restorative Justice and Civil Society' in H. Strang and J Braithwaite (Eds.) *Restorative Justice and Civil Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brogden, M. and Nijhar, P. (2005). *Community Policing: National and International Models and Approaches*. Cullompton, Devon: Willan
- Brunson , R. K. and Miller , J. (2006) *Young Black Men and Urban Policing in the United States*, *British Journal of Criminology*, 46: 613 – 40 .
- Bursik, R.J., Jr., and Grasmick, H.G. (1993). *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Cantle, T., Kaur, D., Athar, M., Dallison, C., Wiggans, A. and Joshua, H. (2006) *Challenging Local Communities To Change Oldham: Report Of Institute Of Community Cohesion*, Coventry University.
- Carley, M. (2005) *Bringing Neighbourhood Centre Stage: Report on a 24-hour event for Unitary Authorities* Hosted by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, Liverpool 28 February – 1 March, 2005 Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- Chan, J. (1997) *Changing Police Culture: Policing in a Multicultural Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1997.
- Clear, T.R. and Karp, D.R. (2000) 'Community justice: A conceptual framework', in C.M. Friel (Ed.) *Boundary changes in criminal justice organizations*, Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Coleman, J. (1990) *Foundations of Social Theory*. Harvard University Press Cambridge.
- Crawford, A. (2003) 'In the hands of the public' in Johnstone (Ed.) *A Restorative Justice Reader: Texts, sources, context*, Cullompton, Devon: Willan.
- Davies, A. and Thomas, R. (2003) Talking COP: Discourses of Change and Policing Identities, *Public Administration*, 81 (4): 681-699, Malden Blackwell
- Eck, J. E. and Rosenbaum, D. (1994) 'The New Police Order: Effectiveness, Equity and Efficiency in Community Policing', in D. Rosenbaum (ed.), *Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Newbury, Park, CA: Sage.
- Etzioni, A. (1995) *The Spirit of Community: Rights, responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda*, London: Fontana.
- Faulkner, D. (2003) Taking citizenship seriously: Social capital and criminal justice in a changing world, *Criminal Justice*, 3(3): 287–315.
- Fielding, N. (1994) 'Cop Canteen Culture' in T Newburn and B Stanko (eds) *Just boys doing business*, London: Routledge
- Garland, D. (2001) *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gaston, K. and Alexander, J. (1997) Women in the police: Factors influencing managerial advancement; *Women in Management Review* 12 (2): 47-55
- Greenleaf, R. (1970) *Servant as Leader*. Center for Applied Studies
- Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gregory, R. and B. Hunter (1995) *The Macro Economy and the Growth of Ghettos and Urban Poverty in Australia*. Canberra: Discussion Paper No. 325, Centre for Economic Policy Research, Australian National University.

- Heidenson, F. (1992) *Women in control? The role of women in law enforcement*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press
- Home Office (1999) *Best Value: Briefing notes for the police service audit and inspection*, London: Home Office
- Hughes, G. (2002) 'Plotting the Rise of Community Safety: Critical Reflections on Research, Theory and Politics', in G. Hughes and A. Edwards (eds) *Crime Control and Community: The New Politics of Public Safety*, pp. 20–45. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Hughes, G. and Rowe, M. (2007). Neighbourhood Policing and Community Safety: Researching the Instabilities of the Local Governance of Crime, Disorder and Security in Contemporary UK *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 7(4), 317-46.
- Jordan, B. (1996) *A Theory of Poverty and Social Exclusion*, Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Kelling, G. (1992), Measuring what matters: a new way of thinking about crime and public order, *City Journal*, 2 (2): 21-34.
- Kemshall, H., Parton, N., Walsh, M. and Waterson, J. (1997), Concepts of Risk in Relation to Organizational Structure and Functioning within the Personal Social Services and Probation. *Social Policy & Administration*, 31: 213–232
- Lacey, N. and Zedner, L. (1995) Discourses of community in Criminal Justice, *Journal of Law and Society*, 22 (3), 301-325.
- Llewellyn-Thomas, S. and G. Prior (2007) *North Liverpool Community Justice Centre - Surveys of Local Residents*, Research Series 13/07, London: Ministry of Justice.
- Marshall, T. (1999). *Restorative justice: an overview*. London: Home Office
- McGregor, D. (1960) *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Millie, A. (2005) Reducing burglary by crackdown and consolidation, *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 28 (1): 174 - 188
- Ministry of Justice (2010) *Breaking the Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offenders*, London: HMSO
<http://www.justice.gov.uk/consultations/docs/breaking-the-cycle.pdf>
- Moore, M. H. (1992) 'Problem-Solving and Community Policing', In M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.) *Modern Policing. Crime and Justice. A Review of Literature*, Vol. 15. Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- Morris, A. and Maxwell, G. (2003) 'Restorative Justice in New Zealand: Family group conferences as a case study' in Johnstone (Ed.) *A Restorative Justice Reader: Texts, sources, context*, Cullompton, Devon: Willan.
- Neyroud, P. and Beckley, A. (2001) *Policing Ethics and Human Rights* Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- O' Shea, T. (2000) The Political Dimensions of Community Policing: Belief Congruence between Police and Citizens, *Police Quarterly* 2000 (3): 389
- ODPM (2004) *Neighbourhood Wardens Scheme Evaluation*. London: ODPM.
- Pease, K. (1994) 'Crime Prevention', in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds) *Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, pp. 659–703. Oxford: OUP.
- Powell, M. (2000) 'New Labour and the Third Way', *Critical Social Policy*. 20(1): 39–60.
- Rai, S. (2008) *Routes and barriers to citizen governance: An exploration of the influences and barriers that impact on citizen participation in local governance*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Reiner, R. (1992) Policing in a Postmodern Society, *The Modern Law Review*, 55: 761-81

- Rowe, M. (2008) *Introduction to Policing London*, Sage Publications
- Sampson, R.J. and Jeglum-Bartusch, D. (1998) Legal cynicism and (Subcultural?) Tolerance of deviance: The neighborhood context of racial differences, *Law and Society Review*, 32, 4.
- Schiff, J. (2003) *Restorative Justice and Criminal Justice: Competing or Reconcilable Paradigms?* Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Shapland, J. (2008). *Justice, Community and Civil Society: A contested terrain* Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Sharp, D., Atherton, S. and Williams, K. (2008) Civilian policing, legitimacy and vigilantism: Findings from three case studies in England and Wales, *Policing and Society*, 18 (3).
- Sharp, D. and Atherton, S. (2007) To Serve And Protect? The Experiences of Policing in the Community of Young People from Black and Other Ethnic Minority Groups, *British Journal of Criminology*, 47, 746 – 763.
- Sherman, L.W., Gottfredson, D. C., MacKenzie, D. L., Eck, J., Reuter, P. and Bushway, S. D. (1997) *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. Report to the U.S. Congress. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Justice, 655.
- Stogdill, R. (1974) *Handbook of Leadership* (1st Ed.). New York: Free Press
- Sullivan, D. and Tift, L. (2001). *Restorative Justice: Healing and the Foundations of Our Everyday Life*. Monsey: Willow Tree Press.
- Tannenbaum, R. and Schmidt, W. (1958) How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review* 36(2), 95-101
- Taylor, R.B. and Harrell, A.V. (1996) *Physical Environment and Crime*, U.S.A.: National Institute of Justice.
- Walklate, S. (2001) *Gender Crime and Criminal Justice*, Cullumpton: Willan Publishing.
- Weatherburn, D. and B. Lind (1998) *Poverty, Parenting, Peers and Crime-Prone Neighbourhoods*. Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice, No. 85. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- White, R. (2003) Communities, conferences and restorative social justice, *Criminal Justice*, 3(2): 139–160.
- Williams, K. (2005) 'Caught Between a Rock and a Hard Place': Police Experiences with the Legitimacy of Street Watch Partnerships, *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44 (5).
- Wilmott, P. (1987) *Policing and the Community*, London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Wolf, R.V. (2006) *Community Justice Around the Globe: An International Overview*, Crime and Justice International, 22 (93).
- Wright, A. (2000) Managing the future: An academics view' in F Leishman *et al.* (Eds) *Core Issues in Policing* (2nd edition) Harlow Pearson.