

УДК [316.624:316.354:351.74](477.54)

**SOCIOLOGICAL MONITORING «PUBLIC SAFETY AND TRUST TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES» AS A STEP TO DEVELOPING COMMUNITY POLICING IN KHARKIV REGION****Serdyuk Alexey** – PhD in sociology, senior lecturer, Deputy Head of Scientific-Research Lab of Crime Enforcement, Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs**Timothy G Shilston** Master of Philosophy of Philosophy, Regional Presence Coordinator. European Union Advisory Mission – Ukraine**Sokurenko Valerii** – Doctor of Science in Law, senior lecturer, Rector, Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs

*У статті представлені результати опитування жителів Харкова і Харківської області з проблем публічної безпеки і довіри до правоохоронних органів, проведеного Харківським національним університетом внутрішніх справ у співпраці з Головним управлінням Національної поліції Харківської області за підтримки Консультативної місії Європейського Союзу, в рамках «Щорічної програми безпеки Харківської області» і «Регіональної програми публічної безпеки і порядку в Харківській області 2016 - 2017». Автори проаналізували проблеми оцінки роботи поліції за допомогою якісних і кількісних методів. Автори підкреслюють важливість вивчення громадської думки як основного елементу оцінки поліцейської діяльності. Серед компонентів ком'юніті полісінг (поліцейської діяльності спрямованої на потреби місцевої громади) автори виділяють наступні: близькість, видимість і доступність поліції; рішення довгострокових проблем; проактивна профілактика; багатосторонні партнерські відносини; активну участь громадян в правоохоронній діяльності. Автори стверджують, що подібні дослідження повинні бути регулярними, і результати повинні впливати на складання «Щорічної програми безпеки регіону». Результати досліджень та щорічних звітів за програмою безпеки повинні відкрито публікуватися, щоб громадяни бачили, що проблеми безпеки їхнього регіону відображені в пріоритетах не тільки поліції, але і інших відомств. У дослідженні проаналізовано ряд суб'єктивних та поведінкових показників, таких як: сприйняття публічної безпеки, оцінка діяльності поліції в дзеркалі громадської думки, довіра до правоохоронних органів, взаємодія з поліцією, віктимологічні показники, проблеми правоохоронної діяльності в місцевій громаді і очікування місцевих жителів від правоохоронних органів. Автори розглядають це дослідження як крок від «реактивної поліцейської діяльності» до проактивної поліцейської діяльності заснованої на моделі «ком'юніті полісінг» в Харківській області.*

**Ключові слова:** соціологічне дослідження, ком'юніті полісінг - поліцейська діяльність спрямована на потреби місцевої громади, публічна безпека, довіра до правоохоронних органів, оцінка роботи поліції.

*В статье представлены результаты опроса жителей Харькова и Харьковской области по проблемам публичной безопасности и доверия к правоохранительным органам, проведенного Харьковским национальным университетом внутренних дел в сотрудничестве с Главным управлением Национальной полиции Харьковской области при поддержке Консультативной миссии Европейского Союза, в рамках «Ежегодной программы безопасности Харьковской области» и «Региональной программы публичной безопасности и порядка в Харьковской области 2016 - 2017». Авторы проанализировали проблемы оценки работы полиции с помощью качественных и количественных методов. Авторы подчеркивают важность изучения общественного мнения как основного элемента оценки полицейской деятельности. Среди компонентов комьюнити полисинг (полицейской деятельности направленной на потребности местной общины) авторы выделяют следующие: близость, видимость и доступность полиции; решение долгосрочных проблем; проактивная профилактика; многосторонние партнерские отношения; активное участие граждан в правоохранительной деятельности. Авторы утверждают, что подобные исследования должны быть регулярными, и результаты должны влиять на составление «Ежегодной программы безопасности региона». Результаты исследований и ежегодных отчетов по программе безопасности должны открыто публиковаться, чтобы граждане видели, что проблемы безопасности их региона отражены в приоритетах не только полиции, но и других ведомств. В исследовании проанализирован ряд субъективных и поведенческих показателей, в том числе: публичная безопасность, оценка деятельности полиции в зеркале общественного мнения, доверие к правоохранительным органам, взаимодействие с полицией, виктимологические показатели, проблемы правоохранительной деятельности в местном сообществе и ожидания местных жителей от правоохранительных органов. Авторы рассматривают это исследование как шаг от*

«реактивной полицейской деятельности» к проактивной полицейской деятельности основанной на модели «комьюнити полисинг» в Харьковской области.

**Ключевые слова:** социологическое исследование, комьюнити полисинг – полицейская деятельность направленная на потребности местной общины, общественная безопасность, доверие к правоохранительным органам, оценка работы полиции.

*The results of sociological survey of Kharkiv and Kharkiv oblast citizens regarding public safety and trust to law enforcement agencies conducted by Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs in cooperation with the Main department of the National Police in the Kharkiv region, supported by the European Union Advisory Mission in the frames of «Annual safety program of the Kharkiv region» and «Regional program of public safety and order in the Kharkiv region 2016 – 2017» are presented. The authors have analyzed a problems of assessment of police work through purely technical and quantitative measures. Authors emphasized the importance of gathering and responding to public perceptions as a basic Community policing elements among which are the following: proximity, visibility, approachability of police; long term problems solving; proactivity, prevention; multi agency partnerships; active citizen involvement. The authors noticed that research should be frequent and the outcome should influence the drafting of an annual multi-agency community safety strategy (CSS). The results of the consultation, together with the CSS itself should then be published openly so that citizens can be reassured that their concerns are reflected in the priorities not just of the police but of other related agency stakeholders. The authors have analyzed a number of subjective and behavioral indicators, including: Public Safety, Evaluation of police activity in the mirror of public opinion, Trust to law enforcement agencies, Interaction with police, Victimological indicators, Problems of law enforcement activity in the local community and Expectations from law enforcement agencies. Authors consider this survey as a step from «Response Driven Policing» towards authentic «Community Policing» in Kharkiv region.*

**Keywords:** survey, community policing, public safety, trust to law enforcement agencies, performance of law enforcement.

### Introduction

Assessment of police work through purely technical and quantitative measures is often problematic [7, 12]. Traditionally in post – soviet Ukraine the system has been elaborate, somewhat arbitrary and highly mechanistic, with the threat of punishment linked to perceived under performance [13]. Such a regime inevitably leads to the manipulation of figures and a distortion of police activity in pursuit of outcomes deemed favourable. The needs of the public become marginalised and subordinated to this numbers game, process becomes all important whilst outcomes as seen from the public perspective are of secondary concern at best.

We must be clear that quantitative measures are not intrinsically poor means of measuring police performance, however the argument here is that to be effective in meeting public needs they must be rigorously associated with what the public seeks from their police services. This in turn implies that the police, and other law enforcement agencies, must, when planning activities, first proactively engage with the public in order to establish their concerns and hence their needs. Once completed the results of this public consultation can be reflected in police activity and that activity can be assessed in part by quantitative measures. The difference being that now police managers can be confident that pursuit of numbers is authentically aligned with public needs and achievement of targets will boost public confidence.

This requirement sits well with the recent Law of Ukraine «On National Police» [13]. It is specified in part 3 of article 11 that «... the level of the population's trust in police shall be the main criterion for assessing efficiency of operation of police agencies and units».

#### ***Community policing: the importance of gathering and responding to public perceptions***

According to Stenson [10] the methods of what today we would call «community policing» can trace their origins to 19<sup>th</sup> century Britain. However, most authors state a more recent birth. Nalla [4], as part of a summary of the history of policing in the USA, describes how during the 1980s police agencies across the country recognised that the so called «professional model» of policing, with its emphasis on crime statistics, response times and technology had created a problematic distancing between police and the public they serve. In its place came «community policing» with its now familiar rhetoric of crime prevention, community engagement, problem solving and decentralisation. Brogden and Nijhar [1], Kempa [3] and Terpstra [5] are amongst those who agree that community policing has become the dominant policing business model in western nations for at least the last three decades.

Friedmann [2] offered the first concerted attempt at a definition of community policing to appear in the academic literature:

*Community policing is a policy and strategy aimed at achieving more effective and efficient crime control, reduced fear of crime, improved quality of life, improved police services and police legitimacy, through a proactive reliance on community resources that seek to change crime-causing conditions. It assumes a need for greater accountability of police, greater public share in decision- making and greater concern for civil rights and liberties [2, p.4]*

Central to this definition is the notion that the public should be offered a greater share in decision making and by implication that the police should respond to their legitimately expressed concerns. Friedmann was by no means

the last to define community policing and two years later Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux [6] offered what, perhaps because of its brevity and simplicity, has become a frequently cited definition:

*... a philosophy of full-service, personalized policing where the same officer patrols and works in the same area on a permanent basis, from a decentralized place, working in proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems* [6, p.6]

Again there is an overt acceptance that citizens should be involved in policing, indeed that policing is something that should be done WITH the public not TO the public. In this concept police officers become servants of the people and not instruments of the state.

Continuing that theme Skogan and Hartnett [9] identified several basic components of the community policing model and in doing so they place even more emphasis on citizen involvement [9, p.5]:

*... organizational decentralization and a reorientation of patrol in order to facilitate two-way communication between police and the public. It [community policing] assumes a commitment to broadly focused, problem oriented policing and requires that police be responsive to citizens' demands when they decide what local problems are and set their priorities*

Finally, Terpstra [5, p.67] as part of a meta analysis reviewed the international literature up to 2009 and he identified five recurrent elements in the descriptions of community policing which can be summarised thus:

- 1 Proximity, visibility, approachability of police
- 2 Long term problems solving
- 3 Proactivity, prevention
- 4 Multi agency partnerships
- 5 Active citizen involvement

When taken together, what these various commentaries demonstrate is that at the heart of the community policing model lies a reciprocal relationship; the active involvement of citizens in policing, or at least setting police priorities, and the eager responsiveness of the police to those concerns [8, p.359]. It follows that police first need to establish what those concerns are. This consultation can be done in a variety of ways from the routine conversations between residents and patrolling police officers to the more formal and structured use of focus groups and interviews with citizens as part of a carefully planned public survey. Such research should be frequent and the outcome should influence the drafting of an annual multi-agency community safety strategy (CSS). The results of the consultation, together with the CSS itself should then be published openly so that citizens can be reassured that their concerns are reflected in the priorities not just of the police but of other related agency stakeholders.

In Kharkiv region, beginning in February 2017, representatives of several local law enforcement agencies and other stakeholders have been meeting with the aim of creating a CSS for the Kharkiv region for the calendar year 2018. The European Union Advisory Mission for security sector reform has acted as a consultant throughout, and its experts have been sharing experience and expertise gained from similar exercises in western Europe. This is the first such exercise in Ukraine.

One of the first actions of the group was to commission the Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs to conduct a formal survey of public opinion concerning community safety and policing issues.

#### **Method**

The annual monitoring sociological survey «Public safety and trust to law enforcement agencies» is investigated taking into account pilot studies conducted by the University and Main Department of National Police of Ukraine in the Kharkiv region in 2013, 2016 and 2017 by Serdiuk O. and Buhaichuk K. [11].

**The objective** is to assess key indicators of the performance of law enforcement agencies in the Kharkiv region from the public perspective (public trust to law enforcement agencies, level and dynamics of crime, public safety and order).

**Method of data collection** – «face to face» individual structured interviews at the residence of respondents, using a paper questionnaire.

**Sample** – we use a two-stage quota sampling (N=4287): at the first level - the selection of the settlement, at the second level – a quota based on gender and age in the settlement. The survey of Kharkov region residents (N=2956) carried out during the period from 25/04/2017 to 29/05/2017. The survey of Kharkov city residents (N=1331) carried out during the period from 11/05/2017 to 31/05/2017. Sample Error (with a confidence level of 95%) is: for figures close to 50 %  $\pm 2,68$  %; to 20 %  $\pm 2,15$  %; to 5 %  $\pm 1,17$  %.

For a correct understanding of the obtained data, there is a need to identify two peculiarities of public opinion:

2. public opinion is not «what exists», but «how it is perceived by citizens». Regarding the crime situation and public opinion, these are not a «direct indicator» of law enforcement activities (such as number of detainees, or the percentage of disclosure), it is a «consequence» of police work and is distant in time.

2. public opinion is rather stable phenomenon and changes slowly, if to change it than it should be six months - year, therefore, an interval for assessing public opinion about the work of law-enforcement agencies was selected one year.

#### **Results**

##### **Public Safety**

The subjective perception of the level of crime, compared with 2016, reflects increasing. 18% of respondents

report about high crime rate (8% in 2013, 14% in 2016). About the low crime rate report 24% of respondents (46% in 2013, 36% in 2016). In Kharkiv, the level of crime is perceived as slightly higher than in the settlements of the region.

Fears of crime compared with 2016 decreased. 8% of respondents (18% in 2013, 12% in 2016) seriously alarmed and feared by crime. The averages are between «Slight Concern» and «Significant Concern».

The desire to avoid some places in the area of residence in order not to become a victim of the offender, in comparison with the previous one, remains unchanged. As in previous years, about 45% of respondents report about such places. About absence - 28% (33% in 2013, 31% in 2016). At the same time, inhabitants of settlements of the region show less desire to avoid certain places, feel safer than residents of Kharkiv.

Changes in the behavior of citizens during the dark time is one of the basic indicators for assessing the crime situation. The obtained data show a decrease in the proportion of citizens who do not change their behavior in comparison with previous years in Kharkiv (from 36% in 2013, 30% in 2016 to 29% in 2017) and an increase in the region (from 42% in 2013, 38% in 2016 to 48% in 2017). It was paid attention to the increase of the proportion of citizens taking passive security measures (from 24% in 2016 to 32% in 2017) and active security measures (from 12% in 2016 to 21% in 2017).

In Kharkiv, the proportion of those who take passive security measures has increased – people do not leave their houses without any needs, choose someone to accompany them, feel alert (from 21% in 2016 to 35% in 2017). In the region the percentage of such persons remained stable (28%).

Both in the city and in the region, there were considerably more people taking active safety measures - they carry the means of self-defence, or take a dog with them. We see an increase in 1.5 times in Kharkiv (from 15% in 2016 to 24% in 2017) and 3 times in the Kharkiv region (from 5% in 2016 to 15% in 2017). The percentage of people taking other security measures has also increased.

Approximately two-thirds of inhabitants of Kharkiv and the region, if they become the object of criminal offenses, contact police. At the second place - relatives and friends, that one third of respondents will contact. A small percentage of respondents (13% - 15%) will defend themselves on their own. The inhabitants of Kharkiv more than residents of the regional districts are counting on the help of the prosecutor's office, local authorities and public organizations. Inhabitants of the region express more intentions to go to the court than Kharkiv residents.

Data on the subjective perception of the dynamics of crime indicate that inhabitants of the Kharkiv region are experiencing its increase compared with 2013 and 2016, reflecting the general criminal situation and it's confirmed by the quantitative data of statistical reporting.

#### ***Evaluation of police activity in the mirror of public opinion***

Data on the subjective perception of police success in carrying out their tasks indicate an increase of positive assessments of activities in general and in territorial units of the Kharkiv region apart. In Kharkiv, compared with previous years, the situation remained practically unchanged. About 18% of the respondents (15% in 2016, 13% in 2013) are evaluating excellent police work and better than worse - 46% (33% in 2016, 34% in 2013).

Among law enforcement agencies, inhabitants of the Kharkiv region consider police work to be the most successful (Table 1). Less successful than the work of the police in Kharkov city, they consider the work of the new patrol police. According to the degree of satisfaction there is Security Service of Ukraine (SSU) work, prosecutor's office, and the least successful respondents consider the work of court. In general, residents of the region are more satisfied with the activities of law enforcement agencies than Kharkiv residents.

Table 1.

#### **Index score\* successful accomplishment of law enforcement tasks (The index ranges from «-1» - Very bad to «+1» - Excellent)**

<b>Law enforcement agencies</b>	<b>Kharkiv</b>	<b>Regional police stations</b>	<b>Kharkiv region in total</b>
Police	0,22	0,25	0,23
Prosecutor's office	0,14	0,18	0,16
Court	0,13	0,17	0,13
SSU (Security Service of Ukraine)	0,15	0,19	0,17
New Patrol Police**	0,08	-	-

\* To simplify the comparative assessment of the answers, they are calculated in the index. The index ranges from «-1» - Too bad to «+1» - Excellent. The recalculation is carried out by assigning answers to the question «How do you think local ... police, prosecutor's office, court, SSU and the new patrol police?»: Very bad – «-1»; Rather bad – «-0,5»; Difficult to answer – «0»; Rather good – «+0,5»; Excellent – «+1».

\*\* Only for residents of Kharkiv.

The subjective successful perception of public order protection in the streets, squares, and other public places indicates a slight decrease in the positive assessments of this task, both in Kharkiv and in the Kharkiv region.

The subjective successful perception of citizens health protection from criminals indicates a significant improvement in the Kharkiv region and deterioration in Kharkiv. In general, the successful perception of citizens lives and health protection from criminals has deteriorated.

The subjective successful perception of citizens property and accommodation protection from criminals also indicates a significant improvement in the Kharkiv region and deterioration in Kharkiv. In general, successful perception of citizens property and accommodation protection from criminals has deteriorated.

The subjective successful perception of the fight against illegal drugs distribution shows a deterioration of the overall situation compared with 2016. It is noted the significant reduction of positive assessments in this task accomplishments in Kharkiv city and improvement in the Kharkiv region.

The subjective successful perception of juvenile delinquency prevention also indicates a deterioration of the overall situation compared with 2016. There is a very significant decrease in the positive assessments of this task accomplishment in Kharkiv and a slight decrease in the Kharkiv region.

The subjective successful perception of hooliganism and vandalism prevention indicates about deterioration of the overall situation compared with 2013 and 2016. There is a significant decrease in the positive assessments of this task accomplishment in Kharkiv, and increase in the Kharkiv region.

The subjective perception of the fight against prostitution, as in the previous cases, shows a deterioration of the overall situation compared with 2013 and 2016. There is a significant decrease in positive assessments of this task accomplishments in Kharkiv and decrease in the Kharkiv region. It should be noted that public opinion of settlements inhabitants of the region regarding this task may reflect the general situation but not the situation in a certain village or district center.

The subjective successful perception of the fight against corruption and bribery indicates about negative assessments of this task accomplishments as a whole and does not show positive changes compared with 2013 and 2016 both in Kharkiv and the Kharkiv region.

The subjective successful perception of road safety indicates about deterioration of the overall situation compared with 2013 and 2016, both in Kharkiv and in the Kharkiv region. The biggest deterioration took place in Kharkiv.

The subjective successful perception of rapid response and contacts from citizens who need the assistance, indicates a significant deterioration of the overall situation compared with 2016. There is a very significant decrease in the positive assessments of this task accomplishments in Kharkiv and some improvements in the Kharkiv region.

Best of all in public opinion, police manage with the protection of public order; citizens health advocacy from criminals, informing and interacting with citizens, as well as rapid and timely response.

Worst of all, Kharkiv residents assess fight against corruption and bribery. It is also negatively assessed fight against drug trafficking, prostitution and counteraction to hooliganism and vandalism. It should be noted that these problems (along with property crimes, thefts) were announced by the Kharkiv region inhabitants, as the most challenging.

#### **Trust to law enforcement agencies**

Trust to police (Picture 2), compared with previous years, has increased. There is an increase of trust to police both in Kharkiv and the Kharkiv region. In Kharkiv and in the Kharkiv region, trust to police in 2017 is almost the same.

About 65% of the Kharkiv region inhabitants fully and partially trust to police (57% in 2016, 64% in 2013), prosecutor's office - about 55%, but SSU, court and the new patrol police - about 52%.

According to the index rate (Table 2), trust to police is the highest among all law enforcement agencies. Prosecutors, SSU and courts are less trusted. Inhabitants of Kharkov city trust the new patrol police the least.

It should be noted that indicators of trust to law enforcement agencies (except police) are higher among inhabitants of the Kharkiv region. This is more likely due to the fact that they are less in contact with the prosecutor's office and SSU than their actual awareness of the activities of these services.

Table 2.

**Index score\* trust to law enforcement agencies**

<b>Law enforcement agencies</b>	<b>Kharkiv</b>	<b>Regional police stations</b>	<b>Kharkiv region in total</b>
Police	0,30	0,28	0,29
Prosecutor's office	0,19	0,24	0,22
Court	0,16	0,23	0,19
SSU (Security Service of Ukraine)	0,19	0,25	0,21
New patrol police**	0,13	-	-

\* To simplify the comparative assessment, answers are calculated in the index. The index ranges from «-1» - I do not trust to «+1» - I totally trust. Calculation was carried out by assigning answers to the question «Do you trust your local law enforcement agencies (police, prosecutor's office, court, SSU and new patrol police)?»: I totally do not trust -1; To some extent I do not trust - «-0,5»; Difficult to answer - «0»; To some extent I trust - «+0,5»; I totally trust - «+1».

\*\* Only for residents of Kharkiv.

The fears of police, compared with 2016, have slightly decreased. 25% of respondents (27% in 2016, 40% in 2013). are strongly and partially afraid of police - in Kharkiv and in the Kharkiv region, rates of police fear are practically the same. About 69% of residents are not afraid of the police at all, for all years of the survey, this percentage is unchanged.

Respondents are afraid of new patrol police more than police. 64% of respondents are not afraid of new patrol police, 27% - are strongly and partially afraid.

**Interaction with police**

The awareness about the district police inspector is middle, and slowly decreases year by year. In all types of settlements, about third of citizens did not hear about the district inspector or his activities. The percentage of those who are personally in contact with the district inspector decreases, and the percentage of those who heard something about his activity from others is increasing. In Kharkiv the awareness about the district police inspector has deteriorated, in the region it has improved.

Among the ways to approach police, there is emergency telephone number 102, three quarters of respondents are ready to use this method if necessary. About third of respondents are ready personally to come to the police station. The fifth part knows the district inspector telephone number and is ready to call him and about 14% know where the district inspector is located and are ready to come to him personally. 9% know other police phone numbers and 4% know how to do it through Website / Internet.

Approximately 20% of respondents contacted the police during the year, it should be noted that the percentage of those who contact police increases year by year - 19% in 2016, 12% in 2013.

Satisfaction with communication with police officers, as compared with 2016, has decreased in all types of settlements. About 16% of respondents are fully satisfied with communication with police officers (24% in 2016, 23% in 2013). In Kharkiv and in the Kharkiv region, it is approximately the same. The averages are positive and are grouped between the average zero and the «Rather satisfied» score. It should be added that, among expectations of law enforcement agencies, respondents separately distinguish expectations of attention to their cases and courtesy of the law-enforcement agencies themselves, which significantly affects the positive professional image of law-enforcers.

The percentage of persons that faced with unlawful police actions, compared to 2017, increased to 2 percentage (from 7,6% to 9,2%). In Kharkiv (8,7%) it has not changed and is lower than in the Kharkiv region (10,8%), due to which this growth took place.

The willingness to assist law enforcement agencies is very high. This readiness is slightly higher in the settlements of the region. In total 40% of respondents are ready to help law enforcement agencies, and under certain conditions - another 40%. Respondents who are not ready to assist only 20%.

**Problems of law enforcement activity in the local community**

Victimological indicators show that in Kharkiv more people became victims of unlawful encroachments than in settlements of the Kharkiv region. In addition, percentage of those who reported about it to police is higher in Kharkiv - 40%, than 13% in the Kharkiv region.

Among respondents, interviewed in Kharkiv, there are twice more people who were detained by the police or were taken to the police station - such persons are about 6% in the city, and 3% in the region. This situation remained the same during all survey years.

Among the reasons for not reporting about crime to the police are the stereotypes prevailing that it will be useless, as well as trying to solve everything on their own.

By identifying issues, there were investigated problems related to the protection of public order of the local community (Table 3) and the expectations of the local community from law enforcement agencies (Table 4).

Among the problems which are often referred to there are violations of public order (hooliganism and vandalism, fights and debaucheries), property crimes (theft, robbery), corruption, and the use of alcohol and drugs (Table 3).

Table 3.

**Problems of law enforcement activity  
(% of responses, grouped by categories)**

Law enforcement agencies	Kharkiv	Regional police stations	Kharkiv region in total
<b>Property crimes</b>	<b>17,1</b>	<b>28,0</b>	<b>24,7</b>
<i>Incl. Thefts</i>	<i>11,5</i>	<i>21,4</i>	<i>18,4</i>
<i>Incl. burglaries</i>	<i>3,1</i>	<i>3,2</i>	<i>3,1</i>
<i>Incl. robberies</i>	<i>2,4</i>	<i>3,3</i>	<i>3,0</i>
<i>Incl. banditism</i>	<i>0,2</i>	<i>0,1</i>	<i>0,1</i>
<b>Public order</b>	<b>17,1</b>	<b>13,3</b>	<b>14,5</b>
<i>Incl. hooliganism</i>	<i>12,9</i>	<i>5,9</i>	<i>8,1</i>
<i>Incl. vandalism</i>	<i>2,6</i>	<i>3,8</i>	<i>3,4</i>
<i>Incl. fights and debaucheries</i>	<i>1,7</i>	<i>3,6</i>	<i>3,0</i>
<b>Drugs</b>	<b>10,5</b>	<b>13,5</b>	<b>12,6</b>
<b>Alcohol</b>	<b>6,8</b>	<b>11,8</b>	<b>10,2</b>
<b>Corruption</b>	<b>5,0</b>	<b>3,9</b>	<b>4,2</b>
<b>Prostitution</b>	<b>2,4</b>	<b>4,0</b>	<b>3,5</b>
<b>Juvenile delinquency</b>	<b>1,4</b>	<b>1,7</b>	<b>1,6</b>
<b>Traffic</b>	<b>0,8</b>	<b>1,5</b>	<b>1,3</b>

Table 4.

**Expectations from law enforcement agencies  
(% of responses, grouped by categories)**

Law enforcement agencies	Kharkiv	Regional police stations	Kharkiv region in total
Protection	7,3	12,1	10,6
Work	9,2	9,3	9,3
Order	5,9	8,2	7,5
Assistance	2,1	5,2	4,3
Guard	1,6	4,9	3,9
Patrolling	1,3	4,3	3,3
Fairness	2,3	3,5	3,1
Human attitude	1,4	2,7	2,3
Duty fulfillment	2,0	1,6	1,7
Justice	1,4	1,3	1,3
Rapid response	2,6	0,6	1,2
Nothing	2,9	2,4	2,6

Among the expectations of law enforcement agencies (Table 4) there are expectations of public order and high-quality performance of their duties (work), citizens also expect justice from law-enforcement agencies, honesty and courtesy of the law-enforcers themselves. In some places, among the expectations, there are requests for patrolling during the dark time.

### Discussion

Based on the results, it is possible to distinguish three priority directions of improvement of law enforcement agencies work in the Kharkiv region:

**1. Information and interaction.** The inhabitants of the city and the region are experiencing an increase level of crime, they are worried about it and respond to changes by their behavior (firstly, they use different measures for the personal security and security of their own property). The vast majority of citizens are ready to help law enforcement (80%) and trust them (55-65%). Based on it, the law enforcement agencies should engage public and inform them about criminal risks and necessary security measures.

**Awareness.** In this perspective, citizens should be assisted how to make their behavior safer and what better ways to protect themselves and their property from criminal encroachments. Citizens also need to know how to contact police, other law enforcement agencies, who should be addressed and in what cases, to know the location of the police stations and telephone numbers of district inspectors.

**Interaction.** Local residents should be encouraged to inform about crimes and offenses in places of residence and to simplify the ways of reporting about criminal and other threats to public security (or to expand such opportunities).

**2. Professional image and trust to law enforcement officers.** Reduction of regional residents satisfaction with communication with police officers, increase of police misconduct, negative assessment of the fight against corruption, and indications of poor professional qualities of law enforcement officers themselves, along with citizens expectations of honesty, courtesy and indifference to their duties from law enforcement officers themselves - requires measures directed to improving the professional image of officers and increasing the level of trust in the entire system of law enforcement.

**Professional image.** The process of police interaction with citizens needs to be improved. The ethical, polite and indifferent attitude of the police and other law enforcement officials to the problems of the inhabitants comes to the first place. Appearance, uniformed clothing, equipment, compliance with ethics and communication are a representative components of law enforcement functions that significantly affects the perception of citizens by law enforcement as defenders of rights and freedom of citizens.

**Trust.** Rapid and timely response to citizens complaints is one of the basic components of trust to law enforcement agencies (along with the accomplishment of other law enforcement functions). This creates public feeling that they will receive response to their contacts that law enforcement officers are not indifferent to their problems etc. At the same time, according to the results of the survey, residents of Kharkiv region identify deterioration of rapid and timely response by law enforcement agencies to their applications, requests and complaints, which require all interested parties to improve this area of work.

**3. Public safety.** Public opinion and trust are the direct consequence of how successfully the law enforcement agencies deal with their direct tasks. The biggest attention should be paid to the prevention and counteraction of offenses that inhabitants of specific settlements are most worried about. For this purpose in the annexes, we gave a list of problems and expectations from inhabitants of specific settlements, and it is necessary to pay attention by the heads of the relevant territorial units.

*The targeting of law enforcement activities to the most acute problems in specific territorial units* should be done taking into account the local specifics and wishes of local residents.

According to the results of the study, the most acute problems for the inhabitants of the Kharkiv region are violations of public order (hooliganism and vandalism, fights and debaucheries), property crimes (theft, robbery, burglaries), corruption, and the use of alcohol and drugs.

Among all areas of work, Kharkiv residents assessed the fight against corruption and bribery the worst. The fight against drug trafficking, prostitution, hooliganism and vandalism is also negatively assessed. There was a deterioration in the assessment of the success of road safety and the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

Based on this, it can be listed the *most problematic areas of law enforcement activities* that residents concern about the Kharkiv Region:

- counteraction to property crimes (theft, robbery, burglaries);
- counteracting violations of public order;
- fight against corruption;
- consumption of alcoholic beverages. The counteraction of this phenomenon is interagency character, it requires efforts to reduce the number of places where alcohol has been selling, to reduce the time frame of alcohol trade, to prevent counterfeiting trade and bootlegging, and to control the sale of alcohol to minors. Since the concentration of violations of public order occurs along with the places of alcohol sale- from the realization of this task it should be expected to have a positive impact on countering violations of public order, violent and other crimes;
- combating drug trafficking;
- the fight against prostitution;
- ensuring road safety;
- prevention of juvenile delinquency, including consumption of alcohol and drugs by juveniles.

**Security feeling.** This indicator, which directly depends on the presence of law enforcement officers in the respective area of service. If citizens see law enforcement officers in the streets, in uniform, they feel more secure. The results of the survey directly indicate the need for patrolling during the dark time in some territorial units. This expectation has been expressed along with the general safety and security wishes.

#### **Conclusion**

In the final conclusion we should say that this survey represents a step from «Response Driven Policing» towards authentic «Community Policing» and expect that our results help the law enforcement agencies of Kharkiv region to obtain 4 tasks:

1. Consideration of a level of population's trust in police as the main criterion for assessing performance indicators of police agencies and units in certain locality;
2. Targeting certain assignments in police work in accordance with the needs of local community (detected by the survey) and improve of public security as a consequence of such targeting;
3. Setting interaction between police and local citizens, building «positive professional image of policemen»;
4. Implementing basics of «Community Policing» in the work of practical units.

**REFERENCES:** 1. Brogden M. E. and Nijhar P. Community Policing: National and International Models and Approaches. Portland, OR: Wilan, 2005. 2. Friedmann R. R. Community Policing: Comparative Perspectives and Prospects. New York: St Martin's Press, 1992. 3. Kempa M. Tracing the diffusion of policing governance models from the British isles and back again: some directions for democratic reform in troubled times // Police Practice and Research. vol. 8 (2), 2007. P. 107-123. 4. Nalla M. K. Democratic policing: a comparison of police officers' perceptions of their role and functions in transitional societies // Journal of Criminal Justice and Security. vol. 4, 2009. – P. 520-535. 5. Terpstra J. Community policing in practice: ambitions and realization // Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice. vol. 4 (1), 2009. P. 64-72. 6. Trojanowicz R. and Bucqueroux B. Community Policing: How to get it started. – Cincinnati, OH: Anderson, 1994. 7. Shilston, T. G. Black Box: A Qualitative Method for Improving Public Confidence in Policing through Micro-Analysing Service Delivery // Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice. vol. 5 (2), 2011. P. 125-131. 8. Shilston T. G. One, two, three, what are we still counting for? Police performance regimes, public perceptions of service delivery and the failure of quantitative measurement. // Policing. vol. 2 (3), 2008. – P. 359-366. 9. Skogan W. G. and Hartnett S. M. Community Policing Chicago Style. New York: Oxford University press, 1997. 10. Stenson K. Community policing as a government technology / Stenson K. // Economy and Society. vol. 22 (3), 1993. P. 373-389. 11. Сердюк О. О. Публічна безпека та довіра до правоохоронних органів : За результатами досліджень 2013–2017 років, проведених в Харківській області : [монографія / Сердюк О. О., Бугайчук К. Л. ; за заг. ред. Сокурєнка В. В.] ; МВС України, Харків. нац. ун-т внутр. справ ; Голов. упр. Нац. поліції в Харків. обл. – Харків : ХНУВС, 2017. – 360 с. 12. Сердюк О.О., Баранник О. Б., Щербакова І. В. Публічна безпека та довіра до поліції: результати соціолого-кримінологічного дослідження громадської думки // Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія «Соціологічні дослідження сучасного суспільства: методологія, теорія, методи» : Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 37. – Х.: ХНУ імені В.Н.Каразіна. – 2016. С. 129-135. 13. Закон України «Про Національну поліцію» // Голос України : газета Верховної Ради України, 06.08.2015.