

Aberystwyth University

Police practitioners and place managers' understandings and perceptions of heritage crime in Nottinghamshire

Poyser, Bethan; Poyser, Sam

Published in:

International Journal of Police Science & Management

DOI:

[10.1177/1461355717730837](https://doi.org/10.1177/1461355717730837)

Publication date:

2017

Citation for published version (APA):

Poyser, B., & Poyser, S. (2017). Police practitioners and place managers' understandings and perceptions of heritage crime in Nottinghamshire. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 19(4), 247-260. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461355717730837>

Document License

CC BY

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Aberystwyth Research Portal (the Institutional Repository) are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Aberystwyth Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Aberystwyth Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

tel: +44 1970 62 2400

email: is@aber.ac.uk

Police practitioners and place managers' understandings and perceptions of heritage crime in Nottinghamshire

International Journal of
Police Science & Management
2017, Vol. 19(4) 247–260
© The Author(s) 2017
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1461355717730837
journals.sagepub.com/home/psm



Bethan Poyser

Nottingham Trent University, UK

Sam Poyser

York St John University, UK

Abstract

'So you know, as daft as it sounds, if you've got a building, that really isn't a priority, is it?' Despite the wealth of heritage sites in the UK, the topic is a marginalised area of criminological study here. It has been argued that there is discordance between the concepts of 'heritage' and 'crime'. One is holistic; the other set in the law. Through a programme of semi-structured interviews with 'heritage place managers' and questionnaires delivered to neighbourhood policing teams in Nottinghamshire Police, this research aimed to examine this clash. In particular, it aimed to compare and contrast heritage place managers' understandings and experiences of heritage crime with those of police practitioners. It was found that the two groups differed markedly in this respect, creating feelings of frustration and stagnation for both. Such findings are of particular concern in the light of statistics which demonstrate that heritage crime is occurring frequently across the UK, and evidence that offenders are targeting new heritage assets and sites in response to changing legislation. Budget cuts, which continue to impact upon policing priorities in Nottinghamshire, further compound the problem. The conclusion of this article details the potential impacts of these findings and suggests changes relating to both the heritage and policing sectors.

Keywords

Heritage crime, police perception, heritage protection, cultural value, heritage practitioners

Submitted 25 Jul 2017, accepted 20 Aug 2017

Introduction

The understandable dominance of high-priority crime, such as street crime for example, arguably means that already marginalised areas of crime are sometimes misunderstood and possibly neglected by police practitioners. This can lead to feelings of frustration from victims of marginalised crimes and police practitioners themselves (Mawby, 2016). Similar frustrations have been noted in relation to areas such as rural and wildlife crime (Nurse, 2013; Poyser and Poyser, 2016). Limited research thus far has observed that police practitioners have neglected heritage crime for decades (Kila and Bellcells, 2015). One of the primary reasons for the limited awareness of heritage crime and other marginalised crimes, is the notion that they are 'victimless' (Grove, 2014). This is despite the fact that, as

research demonstrates, heritage crime has secondary human victims such as 'heritage place managers' (individuals employed to look after a heritage site; such as a castle warden), from herein referred to as HPMS, and the surrounding community (Oxford Archaeology, 2009).

Heritage crime is a difficult form of crime to police and prevent. Indeed, traditional methods of policing and crime prevention are ordinarily made redundant in the face of heritage assets and sites (Grove, 2013). Moreover, although much heritage crime occurs out of ignorance, there is little

Corresponding author:

Sam Poyser, York St John University, Lord Mayor's Walk, York YO31 7EX, UK.

Email: sam.poyser@gmail.com

incentive not to commit it, as punishment is rare (Kindred, 2011). This is despite the fact that heritage crime differs from many other crimes in its permanence, i.e. once a heritage crime has been committed, the damage cannot be undone. History is destroyed. This alone makes heritage crime a topic worthy of criminological attention.

Tackling heritage crime necessitates forward-thinking and initiative, which present a challenge in the current austerity-led policing environment in England (Newburn, 2015). This environment sits against the backdrop of a recent surge of interest in heritage crime from some criminological scholars and high-ranking police practitioners (Thomas and Grove, 2014). However, the work of these individuals has not prompted universal change relating to the policing of heritage crime. Force focus on heritage crime varies dramatically. For example, forces such as Cheshire and Kent devote substantial resources to the area, whereas the Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Plan (Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner, 2016) mentions 'heritage crime' once (and fails to explain what it is). Although numerous external variables influence force engagement with heritage crime, including the somewhat exclusive nature of the heritage sector (Pendlebury and Gibson, 2009), perceived disinterest from police practitioners continues to contribute to feelings of frustration from HPMs. Through a programme of semi-structured interviews delivered to HPMs ($N = 9$) and questionnaires delivered to police practitioners ($N = 100$) in three districts of Nottinghamshire, this research aimed to examine such perceptions and indeed understandings of heritage crime, on the part of both HPMs and police practitioners.

What is heritage crime?

There is '... a growing movement to categorize certain crimes as heritage crime' (Thomas and Grove, 2014: 1), alongside arguments that heritage sites and assets possess a significance that may make crimes against them more socially and emotionally devastating than other crimes. Indeed, Kindred (2011: 2) argues that '... ancient buildings have not only aesthetic and historical value in themselves, but often wider cultural and community significance'.

Heritage crime ranges from the theft of lead from listed buildings (English Heritage, 2011); to 'nighthawking' (the illegal metal detecting upon, and the removal of artefacts from, archaeological sites); to vandalism committed upon heritage sites (Wilson and Harrison, 2013). Even 'harmless' acts of so called 'play vandalism' such as graffiti (Cohen, 1973) become more serious when committed against heritage assets, as graffiti removal destroys the historical fabric of the asset in question (Shelbourn, 2014).

The severity of heritage crime in England has been highlighted by a small number of scholars (see, for example, Thomas and Grove, 2014). However, the area remains marginalised and misunderstood by academics, police and the public, despite the integral role heritage plays in England socio-economically (Historic England, 2015a). Two reasons are suggested herein for the lack of understanding and marginalisation of heritage crime. First, the prevalence and density of heritage assets across England (Historic England, 2015b) means that they may be encountered by the public on a daily basis. The regularity of encountering heritage assets may desensitise and devalue their importance, leading to a lack of care for them. Second, the heritage sector is arguably elitist, failing to adequately appeal to, include, or engage with deprived communities (Pendlebury et al., 2004). As such, despite the fact that deprived communities may be rich in heritage (Coombes et al., 2012), their inhabitants may have little motivation to prioritise or protect it.

Heritage crime is defined as 'any offence which harms the value of England's heritage assets and their settings to this and future generations' (Historic England, 2015c). The 'heritage assets' included in this concise definition are as follows:

Listed buildings, scheduled monuments, World Heritage Sites, protected marine wreck sites, conservation areas, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, protected military remains of aircraft and vessels of historic interest, undesignated but acknowledged heritage buildings and sites. (Historic England, 2015c)

Although Historic England successfully informs the public of what heritage crime is, in self-creating their definition, the heritage body also reaffirms the 'canonized definitions' of heritage (Sørensen, 2007). Arguably, defining heritage is the preserve of the powerful (Smith, 2006). Nijkamp and Riganti (2009) write that the moment an object is labelled as 'heritage', a value judgement is made, in which that object is distinguished from others and new meaning is added to it. In heritage, making a value judgement may exclude those who do not subscribe to the dominant interpretation of heritage (Graham and Howard, 2008); to what Historic England believes should be preserved and protected. The powerful maintain a strong role in defining and designating heritage (Maddrell et al., 2014), and hegemonic discourse reinforces the heritage sector's exclusive culture (Adams, 2013).

Indeed, certain interpretations of heritage are presented and protected by powerful heritage bodies (Fairclough, 2008), permitting these dominant interpretations to be filtered into the public consciousness. For example, in England, Waterton (2010) notes that heritage is presented in a

controlled, neat fashion, one that is mimicked in the English interpretation, policy and management of heritage. As such, the public may struggle to value sites and assets that do not ‘fit into the dominant aesthetic’ (Smith, 2006), possibly hindering their recognition of heritage crime upon less ‘obvious’ heritage assets and sites.

Outside England, definitional issues with heritage crime continue. First, however, the words ‘heritage’ and ‘crime’ must be examined separately to understand from where such definitional problematics stem.

‘Heritage’ and ‘crime’

Whereas crime has a set definition in ‘behaviour which is so defined by the criminal law’ (Cressey, 1951: 546), interpretations of heritage are different: ‘Heritage is taken to include everything that people want to save, from clean air to Morris dancing, including material culture and nature. It is all pervasive, and concerns everyone’ (Howard, 2003: 1).

Brisbane and Wood (1996: 4) however, argue that heritage is ‘things of value which we have inherited and wish to keep for future generations’. Heritage is complicated. It can be intangible (Stefano et al., 2012) and possess multiple meanings. Additionally, heritage crime may appear to disproportionately affect a community, due to emotional bonds to local heritage assets (Waterton and Watson, 2011).

‘Crime’ is far more defined than ‘heritage’. Consequently, combining ‘heritage’ and ‘crime’ incurs many issues (Thomas and Grove, 2014). For example, responses to crime are usually reactive (Reiner, 2000), whereas heritage necessitates a proactive response (Francioni and Gordley, 2013). Insufficient legislation may be in place to protect heritage assets, or damaging alterations to heritage assets may even be permitted by a government institution (Thomas and Grove, 2014). The words and actions surrounding heritage and crime are discordant, whilst the interpretative nature of heritage, combined with the set definition of crime in law, does not aid in creating universal legislation, or definitions for the area. The latter, in turn, has meant that European countries have adopted very different interpretations of the phenomenon, and have therefore focused their responses and preventative efforts differently. In Italy, for example, there is a focus on preventing and responding to crimes against cultural heritage such as archaeological and art theft (Block, 2014) by the long-established and highly specialised Carabinieri Department for the Protection of Cultural Heritage (the largest police unit of its type in Europe) (Nistri, 2011). Similarly, in Spain, the focus is primarily upon cultural heritage crimes such as art theft and the illegal trafficking of cultural goods by the Spanish ‘Guardia Civil’ Historical Heritage (Police) Squad (European Commission, 2011). Both the

Italian and Spanish cultural heritage crime police forces engage directly with their respective Ministry of Culture (UNESCO, 2016), indicating that this type of crime is taken extremely seriously. From this perspective, England’s efforts pale in comparison with its European neighbours. For example, the ‘Art and Antiquities’ unit of the Metropolitan Police (met.police.uk) tackles heritage crime only within the boundaries of London.

Police practitioners’ understandings and perceptions of heritage crime

Bearing in mind the discordance between the concepts of heritage and crime, and the variations in definitions of heritage crime across Europe, issues surrounding police practitioners’ understandings and perceptions of heritage crime in England would seem probable. Shelbourn (2010), for example, found that police officers attending an archaeological excavation that had experienced theft and damage showed interest only in the crime they understood, namely a vandalised Portacabin, as opposed to the extremely serious archaeological damage that had occurred. Few police forces in England possess sufficient training or education concerning heritage crime, and therefore, some practitioners are unaware that it even exists (Oxford Archaeology, 2009). Importantly, even if police officers do recognise heritage crime, they are unable to record it (Shelbourn, 2014); for there is no system to differentiate between heritage crime and ‘regular’ crime on police databases. Because police officers are forced to record heritage crime incorrectly, there is arguably little motivation to record it at all. Such issues have significant implications for the ‘dark figure’ of crime (Williams, 2012) in this area.

Awareness of heritage crime is beginning to grow in academic and policing spheres, however, with such growth comes potential for misinterpretation. Furthermore, the current austerity-led policing environment (Travis, 2015) is not conducive to this growth in interest. For example, heritage crime often occurs in rural areas (such as church lead theft), but it is not exclusive to rural areas. Nonetheless, possibly due to financial restrictions, many forces that do engage actively in the policing of heritage crime have categorised it as a subcategory of rural crime. This is likely further to complicate understandings and perceptions of the phenomenon for police practitioners and the public alike (see, for example, Sussex Police, 2016; Thames Valley Police, 2016). Nonetheless, some forces, such as Cheshire, do make a clear distinction between heritage crime and rural crime. Indeed, Cheshire Police’s website offers thorough information and resources on the phenomenon, which may equip the public with the knowledge to distinguish heritage crimes from other crimes, subsequently allowing

the force to target their service effectively (Cheshire Police, 2016).

Unfortunately, such efforts to engage with heritage crime are not replicated across England's police service. The forces that do focus upon heritage crime are found in counties which are home to key drivers behind the movement to raise awareness of it. For example, when Richard Crompton was the 'Heritage Crime Lead' for the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO), he also maintained the position as Chief Constable of Lincolnshire Police (Hough and Beckford, 2012). Subsequently, Lincolnshire Police were able to educate their officers regarding, and assume the policing of, heritage crime into their daily operations. A similar situation occurred when Andy Bliss, Hertfordshire Police's Chief Constable, succeeded Richard Crompton as 'Heritage Crime Lead' (Heritage Alliance, 2013). Police forces may appear to be neglecting heritage crime when, in reality, they may just lack a key driver of the heritage movement in place to offer guidance.

Although limited research has been conducted regarding police practitioners' understandings, perceptions and responses to heritage crime, the Nighthawking Report (Oxford Archaeology, 2009) appears to confirm the need for a key driver who can engage forces with the problem. This report found that if individual officers took an interest in heritage crime, their colleagues became interested, and awareness across the whole force gradually increased (Oxford Archaeology, 2009). Results from this report also confirmed the previously mentioned notion that police practitioners are largely unaware of heritage crimes occurring, let alone their severity. One example showed officers completely ignoring the severity of nighthawking, eschewing their responsibility and suggesting that the indirect victim of the crime (a farmer) should simply contact his solicitor (Oxford Archaeology, 2009). Moreover, the Nighthawking Report revealed a distinct lack of confidence from heritage professionals in police practitioners, in highlighting their belief that officers attending incidents showed little care, nor understanding. Importantly, such poor experiences had wider consequences, including reduced faith in the force as a whole.

The answer to improving police practitioners' understanding and perceptions of heritage crime may lie in collaborative partnership working. One example of successful collaborative partnership working is the 2011 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Historic England, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), ACPO, participating local authorities (LAs) and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs). This formalised multi-agency partnership has built a network of co-operation and support between signatories, outlining the roles and responsibilities of each in relation to understanding, preventing and prosecuting heritage crime (Historic England, 2016a). The importance of skill sharing

and regional partnership responses to heritage crime are emphasised, for these are: '... a means to achieving a more formal strategic approach to enable the LAs, Police and English Heritage to tackle heritage crime more effectively and expediently' (English Heritage, 2011).

Numerous local authorities across England have signed the Memorandum of Understanding. With local authorities involved, a heritage crime agenda of protection and prevention can potentially be segued into the operations of already established CSPs, resulting in a network of local groups who can combine forces to combat heritage crime alongside existing community projects (Harrison, 2013). Cheshire West Council were one of the first local authorities to sign the Memorandum of Understanding, and have successfully segued heritage crime into their existing operations, creating schemes such as 'Heritage Watch' (Cheshire Police, 2016). Another voluntary partnership is the Alliance to Reduce Crime Against Heritage (ARCH). Established in 2011, ARCH brings together various parties, including police forces, councils, non-government organisations (NGOs) and individuals from the English heritage sector to 'galvanise local action against heritage crime' (Historic England, 2016b), spearhead local responses, and raise awareness, thereby reaching individuals/areas that the Memorandum of Understanding may not. Membership stood at 193 in 2013 (English Heritage, 2013). Indeed, upon signing up to ARCH in 2013, Lincolnshire Police spearheaded local response by organising a heritage crime exhibition at a local museum, the first of its kind (The Collection Museum, 2016). Unfortunately, whilst certain dioceses in Nottinghamshire have signed up to ARCH (English Heritage, 2011), suggesting some awareness of the partnership in the county, Nottinghamshire Police to date, have not.

Researching heritage crime

We know little about heritage crime in comparison with other forms of crime. Indeed, most questions remain unanswered, including those concerning patterns, trends and motivations of the 'heritage criminal' (aside from the fiscally motivated operations of those who commit acquisitive forms of heritage crime, such as lead theft) (Coombes et al., 2012). More research on heritage crime is necessary, but, of course, academic research operates within political, cultural and economic conditions (Carlen, 2012) it cannot control. The holistic aspect to heritage crime may elicit derision, or be perceived as less robust than traditional areas of criminological study. Indeed, an indication that such issues exist can be found in the only book produced in the UK on heritage crime, an edited volume that devotes its chapters to examining heritage crime around the world and methods used to tackle it (Thomas and Grove, 2014).

This research study aimed, therefore, to contribute in a small but significant way to the scant body of British research in this area. As such it was orientated towards the following aims:

1. To establish and examine HPMs experiences of heritage crime, and to compare this with the neighbourhood policing teams' (NPTs), in several districts of Nottinghamshire, experiences of heritage crime.
2. To determine the discrepancies between respective NPTs' and HPMs' understandings and perceptions of heritage crime.
3. To examine how understandings and perceptions of heritage crime which NPTs possess affect their responses to instances of the phenomenon.

These aims were investigated through both qualitative and quantitative research.

Methodology

The research methodology began with a review of the literature concerning heritage crime to examine definitional issues and ascertain police practitioners' and HPMs' understandings and perceptions of the phenomenon. It should be noted that a traditional starting point for analysis, namely data sources such as official heritage crime rates, were unable to be utilised because heritage crime is not recorded as a separate type of crime in police databases (Shelbourn, 2014).

Primary data generation was achieved in two ways. First, the researcher conducted a series of semi-structured interviews with HPMs ($N = 9$) of heritage sites across randomised districts of Nottinghamshire (permission was granted from all interviewees in advance). With little information available concerning HPMs' experiences of heritage crime (Oxford Archaeology, 2009), it was decided that interviews were essential. The sample was generated through snowball sampling, allowing the researcher to reach individuals who may have been difficult to access through alternative sampling methods. This said, it was acknowledged that bias is difficult to control with snowball sampling because recommendations made by interviewees for other participants may be based on attempts to confirm their own opinion (Babbie, 2016).

Interviews were chosen primarily because they allow the researcher to find out directly from the interviewee things which are otherwise unobservable (Patton, 1990). It was anticipated that interviews with HPMs would reveal a dichotomy between, and allow direct insight into HPMs' and police practitioners' understandings and perceptions of heritage crime.

To complement the interviews undertaken, the researcher contacted all NPTs in Nottinghamshire to see whether they might accept delivery of a postal questionnaire and six NPTs responded that they would. Subsequently, questionnaires were posted to each of the police stations that the NPTs resided in, across three districts of Nottinghamshire. Questionnaires concentrated upon ascertaining police practitioners' understandings, perceptions and experiences of heritage crime. Respondents remained anonymous, due to the nature of their roles, however, all occupied front-line roles dealing with members of the public. Postal questionnaires were particularly advantageous because they could be completed at the officers' convenience. Although a low/no response rate was possible, and the use of a questionnaire meant that the researcher could not clarify any misunderstandings participants had (Oppenheim, 1966), it was believed that the advantages of postal questionnaires outweighed the disadvantages. One hundred questionnaires were mailed, and 65 were completed. The weakness of this sample was that it was unrepresentative of all districts and force areas in Nottinghamshire, and the results may not be generalisable outside Nottinghamshire.

Results

Analysis of both the interviews and questionnaires remained simple, with closed and fixed choice responses being swiftly transformed into numerical codes (Punch, 2000), and analysed using SPSS. Significant comments from the interviews with HPMs are examined first, followed by discussion of the questionnaire responses.

Heritage place managers' understandings and perceptions of heritage crime

Anonymous, semi-structured interviews were conducted with nine HPMs of heritage sites across three districts in Nottinghamshire ('HPM' and 'interviewee' are used interchangeably in this segment).

Defining heritage crime and awareness of partnerships to reduce the phenomenon. Every HPM had experienced heritage crime on their site, or against their asset, to a varying degree. Many felt that 'A lot of it [heritage crime] stems from ignorance' (Interviewee 8). Often, an HPM's heritage asset/site influenced their definition of heritage crime. For example, Interviewee 1, whose heritage site was a scheduled monument, defined heritage crime as being against 'Scheduled ancient monuments and the land surrounding them'; whereas Interviewee 3 argued 'Heritage crime is... damage to this particular heritage site and its grounds'.

Clearly, many of the HPMs' definitions of heritage crime were personal and emphasised both the interpretive nature of heritage and the connection many felt to their heritage sites. This said, the definition most similar to that provided by Heritage England was found from Interviewee 2. Unlike the other HPMs, Interviewee 2 did not specify that heritage crime was only against heritage sites similar to her own, in describing it as 'damage or loss to any historic fabric'.

Interviewees appeared to possess very little knowledge of partnerships in existence aimed at reducing heritage crime, despite their role in protecting a specific heritage site. Indeed, no interviewee was aware of the ARCH)

Experiences of police practitioner responses to, and understanding of, heritage crime. HPMs felt that when they had reported heritage crime to the police, the response was often poor. Interviewee 1 reported that heritage crime occurred so often without any police response that heritage assets had been permanently removed from the site in question. Another said that upon reporting heritage crime which had occurred on her site, the 'Police were called and didn't come out' (Interviewee 3). Importantly, when another heritage crime occurred on Interviewee 3's heritage site, which was reported by a local individual to the police, Interviewee 3 was informed by this person that 'The police didn't... seem interested'.

Although the accuracy of the individual who informed Interviewee 3 of the negative response from the police cannot be confirmed, this does support claims from other interviewees in this study, in terms of the poor responses they, too, experienced when reporting heritage crime. A further incident, relayed by Interviewee 2, showed how the police response differed dramatically between local officers and those who responded when 999 was called in reaction to a heritage crime. The heritage asset in question was undergoing restoration work, and thieves had broken in and stolen a significant amount of lead. Interviewee 2 mentioned that, unlike the local officers, those who responded to the 999 call seemed to exhibit little concern and indeed, on one occasion, worsened the situation: 'The police... did come to the church, but they didn't secure the site, they left the fire doors open. Because the police had got in through a fire door [they] left [it] unsecured, and they didn't call either the vicar or myself'. This interviewee continued to explain how the next day, stonemasons who had been working on the site, phoned the police to report the break in, to which the response was: "'We know about it! We've got your wheelbarrow, it's at the station", because they'd used the stonemason's wheelbarrow to shift the lead...'

Overall, the common response was minimal and occasionally disparaging, as Interviewee 7 recalled: 'One of the things I was told was "You're an institution, you've got insurance"'.

Most interviewees believed that the police practitioners they had encountered failed to understand heritage crime, or its severity. Interviewee 9 commented that the lack of police understanding made dealing with instances of heritage crime 'particularly difficult', but also that: 'When you look at the nuts and bolts of everything, the police deal with heritage crime quite regularly, they just don't know it'. Another commented that: 'The only time where the police have actually come out to me was when I got spat at and had a can thrown at me'. (Interviewee 8).

The latter appears to highlight the strong dichotomy between understandings of crimes which are perceived as victimless – heritage crimes – and crimes with a direct human victim, and the subsequent priority placed upon them. Interviewees 1 and 4 both recalled attempted thefts from their heritage sites, first, money stolen from a safe upon a heritage site, and second, burglary from a café on a heritage site. In comparison to when these interviewees had reported heritage crime, police responded well and investigated thoroughly. Police practitioners, it appears, were more willing to respond to criminal behaviour they understood as such and dealt with routinely.

Some interviewees felt that police understandings of heritage crime improved when they liaised regularly with the same officers, thereby fostering relationships. One interviewee believed that because he went so regularly with issues pertaining to heritage crime, to the same police station: 'The people... on the reception desk... probably have a very good idea and understanding [of heritage crime]...'. HPMs also reported that sometimes, individual police practitioners could be very sympathetic: 'You will occasionally find officers who are incredibly sympathetic and do understand where you're coming from' (Interviewee 3).

It is important to note, however, that police practitioners were not, according to some HPMs, unaware of all types of heritage crime, particularly that of lead theft. Specific legislation exists that has been crafted to combat the previously UK-wide epidemic of lead theft, which affected many heritage assets (Home Office, 2013). Some interviewees felt that the aforementioned legislative measures and nationwide force (and media) coverage of lead theft had improved police knowledge of the area; and that this would result in more positive responses to this particular heritage crime. By contrast, however, HPMs who had experienced lead theft commented that although the stolen lead was often found, police still did not understand how distressing this crime could be: 'They see it as a crime, and a bit of lead is a bit of lead, whereas to me, a bit of lead has intrinsic history... because its personal to the site, so I don't see it in monetary value, I see it more in what's tied up in the history of the object' (Interviewee 5).

Resourcing issues and improving police practitioners' understanding of, and responses to, heritage crime. HPMs felt that resourcing was a major factor in the poor response to heritage crime many had experienced from police practitioners. All agreed that limited resourcing prevented police from engaging with, understanding and responding to heritage crime. Austerity measures have also damaged local authorities' budgets, subsequently limiting the resources spent on the heritage environment (Slocombe, 2013). Acutely aware of budgeting issues, HPMs were often under significant monetary constraint themselves. Indeed, as Interviewee 4 said, 'We used to, when I first came, have burglar alarms and sensor alarms in the place, and they connected to the police... but that was too expensive to continue'.

Crucially, the listed nature of these heritage assets limited HPMs from utilising traditional situational crime prevention methods, such as CCTV. Every HPM acknowledged that the inability to adopt such methods meant that they were severely disadvantaged. Two HPMs felt that because local people were aware that their heritage sites did not possess CCTV, other forms of crime and anti-social behaviour crept onto their heritage site, citing issues such as: young people loitering, vandalism to other items on the heritage site (including bins, fixed lights), drug taking and used needle disposal, and public drinking. Indeed, when reporting theft of lead flashing from the asset in question, Interviewee 2 commented that the police response was often 'Have you got CCTV?' If you haven't then there's not a lot we can do'. The interviewees felt that basic crime prevention systems that could help police in combatting heritage crime were either too costly or could not be affixed to historical fabric.

HPMs were asked what they would suggest to improve their local force's understanding of heritage crime. Interviewees 1, 2, 6, 7 and 8 wished for a trained point of contact, a 'heritage crime officer' to communicate with, who would fully understand the gravity of heritage crimes, as Interviewee 7 outlined: 'Ideally I'd like there to be a single point of contact... within the police'.

Interviewee 2 noted that her local beat police's understanding of heritage crime had improved vastly when she invited them onto the heritage site: 'What helped us get a police understanding was when we showed them (the police) some of the engravings, you know, because we'd lost this engraved lead that had name and footprints and dates on...'. This action gave these practitioners a connection to their local heritage, which Interviewee 2 believed was crucial in improving their understanding: 'For them to have a connection to their local heritage is really helpful cause our local beat police do and they are well aware... they understand'. Interviewees 7, 8 and 9 echoed Interviewee 2's belief. Another idea for improving police

practitioners' understanding of heritage crime came from Interviewee 5, namely the notion of utilising the heritage site for the practitioners' own means. Interviewee 5 discussed an example of where he worked with other public services in this way; 'We work quite closely with the local fire brigade, we say, come and have an exercise because we've got grounds that you want... and that's good because that works two ways, if we need them they know our site...'.

Ultimately however, HPMs recognised that implementing a training programme, or designating heritage crime officers, would be highly unlikely in the austerity-led environment in which police practitioners operate. A sobering comment came from one HPM, who said, 'So you know, as daft as it sounds, if you've got a building, that really isn't a priority, is it?'

Police officers' understandings and perceptions of heritage crime

Police officers ($N = 65$) across three districts of Nottinghamshire revealed a number of interesting features relating to their understandings and perceptions of heritage crime.

Defining heritage crime and awareness of partnerships to reduce heritage crime. Commonly, respondents defined heritage crime as being exclusively against historic buildings. Interesting responses included the following:

- Only crime against property and/or managed through English Heritage or buildings which are Grade I, II* or II listed;
- Damage caused to properties/artefacts deemed to be of historical value;
- Crime concerning our cultural heritage. Theft to memorials, e.g. theft of lead from church roofs.

Two respondents defined it specifically as an 'offence against a person's origin', thereby highlighting the holistic, interpretive, nature of heritage.

Only one respondent was aware of ARCH, findings that are consistent with the interviews undertaken in which all HPMs were unaware of ARCH's existence.

Experiences of heritage crime and resources for tackling the problem. Over 75% of respondents had not heard of heritage crime occurring in their force area, although 20% had – an unexpectedly high number. A second surprising result was that 9% of respondents said that they had personally responded to instances of heritage crime, including: 'theft of church bell and theft of lead from church rooves', 'theft

of lead from Grade I listed building' and 'theft of metal plaques from the war memorials on Trent Embankment'.

Despite heritage crime not being an exclusively rural phenomenon (Coombes et al., 2012), of the six NPTs that participated in this research, the three NPTs that were situated in rural areas or largely covered rural areas, had all heard of, or responded to, incidents of heritage crime. In comparison with NPTs situated in rural areas, practitioners in one urban NPT had heard of heritage crime occurring, but had not responded to such crime personally. Finally, whereas 15% of all practitioners believed they could recognise different forms of heritage crime, 85% believed they could not.

Just as some HPMS felt that limited resources greatly hindered police response to, and engagement with, heritage crime, 72% of practitioners felt that they did not possess the resources to combat it. This said, 28% disagreed, believing that the resources they currently had in place were sufficient. Responses to this question revealed an undertone of frustration with police funding. Indeed, it was conveyed by some that not enough funding was available to appropriately combat any crime: 'We don't have the staff to respond to any types of crime!' and 'We have insufficient resources to deal with any crimes currently'.

Police understandings in the face of myths surrounding heritage crime. It is a common myth that heritage crime occurs exclusively in rural areas (Coombes et al., 2012), however at face value, the responses from NPTs did not reflect this. In total, 75% of respondents believed that heritage crime was both an urban and rural problem, 19% believed heritage crime was a rural problem, and 6% declined to answer. However, a breakdown of the total statistics revealed that the three NPTs situated in rural areas had the highest percentage of practitioners who believed that heritage crime was both an urban and rural problem: 100%, 100% and 91% respectively. Conversely, the three urban NPTs all had practitioners who believed heritage crime was only a rural problem: 22%, 25% and 31% respectively.

Another common myth is that heritage crimes are victimless (Grove, 2013), however, 71% of respondents in this study either 'disagreed' (45%) or 'strongly disagreed' (26%) that heritage crime was a victimless crime. Indeed, one NPT was resounding in its belief that it was not victimless, with every respondent ticking either 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree'. However, 25% answered 'don't know' and 5% believed that heritage crime was victimless. Despite this small percentage, the implications are concerning, in a period in which heritage crime is increasing and criminals are adapting (Doward, 2015). Furthermore, the percentage who answered 'don't know' may be of concern, for arguably the word 'crime' automatically infers a victim.

Prioritising heritage crime and heritage crime training. Fifty per cent of all practitioners either 'disagreed' or 'strongly disagreed' that heritage crime should be a priority policing issue in their force area. These results may seem discouraging, however, because 35% of practitioners answered 'don't know', it is possible that they felt unable to answer this question as they did not know what heritage crime was. Interestingly, a correlation was found between practitioners in an NPT that had encountered lead theft regularly, and a high percentage (45%) of practitioners who felt that heritage crime should not be prioritised. This may reflect a misconception that other heritage crimes can be dealt with similarly to lead theft.

When asked whether heritage crime was less important than other crimes, very different results were elicited. Some 42% of respondents either 'disagreed' or 'strongly disagreed' with this statement. However, 31% either 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' that heritage crime was less important than other crimes. The high percentage of those who selected either 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree' is encouraging. Although many practitioners are unwilling to prioritise heritage crime, there appeared to be a reasonably strong belief among officers that heritage crime was not less important than other crimes.

The results of this questionnaire revealed that no police practitioner had been offered heritage crime training or an educational programme by a heritage body. Practitioners were asked if introducing such a programme would be useful to their role. An equal percentage of practitioners answered 'quite useful' and 'don't know' (both 34%). Some 9% of practitioners believed a heritage crime training programme would be 'very useful'. However, 20% and 3% respectively, felt that such a programme would be 'not very useful' or 'useless'. Overall, most respondents believed that a heritage crime training programme would be useful in their role. The reasonably large number of practitioners who answered 'don't know' may suggest that they felt unable/unqualified to offer their opinion.

When asked about their views on the following statement 'Introducing a heritage crime education programme and placing more priority upon heritage crime in the current economic climate is a bad idea', 9% 'strongly disagreed' (29% answered 'don't know'). Although small, the 9% result was positive, considering the funding issues and apparently limited engagement with heritage crime within Nottinghamshire Police. This said, 61% of practitioners either 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' with the statement, suggesting that heritage crime should not be given more priority at this moment in time.

Mechanism for recording heritage crime. There is neither a system currently in place to record heritage crime, nor an option to distinguish it from other crimes in existing police

databases. Therefore, respondents were asked if they felt that a mechanism to record heritage crime would be a good idea. Some 61% of respondents answered 'yes', 34% answered 'no' and 5% did not respond. Reasons for 'yes' responses included:

- Other partnership agencies can view and update and share information;
- Would be able to see links/motivations in relation to heritage crime;
- Would help raise awareness of the seriousness of crime and how to use best practices to tackle this issue;
- It would show crime patterns and MOs, e.g. recent high value art theft from museums and stately homes around the country;
- It would help to understand the extent of heritage crime.

Respondents who answered 'no' added comments such as:

- Databases detailing previous mainstream priorities such as burglary and robbery have had no significant impact on the issues causing them.

Further comments agreed that a method of identifying heritage crimes in existing police databases was a good idea, although one practitioner did add that 'Additional recording would be a wasted time resource', speaking of wider issues in the force as a whole, such as a lack of funding and staff shortages, echoed throughout responses to this questionnaire.

Discussion

This research aimed to compare and contrast understandings and perceptions of heritage crime displayed by HPMs and police practitioners in Nottinghamshire, and, crucially, to examine how these understandings and perceptions may have influenced attitudes and responses to heritage by both parties. A number of key themes emerged from the results of this study. These are detailed below.

Police practitioner and HPM understanding of heritage crime

As predicted, it was found that understandings of heritage crime differed greatly between HPMs and police practitioners. The responses received from HPMs in this research indicated a lack of understanding and in some cases, care, from the police practitioners who attended instances of heritage crime. These findings are consistent with those of the Nighthawking Report (Oxford Archaeology, 2009),

in which HPMs reported similar experiences when encountering police in this regard. Indeed, disinterest from police practitioners reported by one HPM in this research produced a comment that was almost identical to one made by a HPM in the Nighthawking Report. The HPM from this research was told by an attending police officer '... here's a crime number and your insurance will cover it...', whereas a HPM in the Nighthawking Report said: 'The police claimed that it was not their responsibility and suggested the landowner contact his solicitor'.

Police practitioner and HPM perceptions of heritage crime

Similar to the differences between police practitioners' and HPMs' understandings of heritage crime, the interviews undertaken in this study demonstrated that perceptions of heritage crime differed significantly between both parties. Indeed, all HPMs interviewed had a personal connection with their heritage sites, and this was, naturally, unmatched by police respondents. Perhaps it is worth considering that if police practitioners had a more personal connection to and/or interest in heritage sites (particularly sites local to them), they may respond more positively. Interestingly, one questionnaire respondent noted that their history degree may be useful for identifying heritage crimes. It is arguably crucial (and indeed cost-effective) for forces to draw upon existing knowledge and interests possessed by their practitioners to change perceptions of heritage crime.

As mentioned previously, a common myth surrounding heritage crime is that it occurs solely in rural areas (Coombes et al., 2012), and a limited number of police practitioners in this research subscribed to this. Perceiving heritage crime to occur solely in a rural area contributes to what this researcher refers to as the 'othering' (not the 'othering' discussed by Sibley, 1995, which concerns exaggerating threats of crime) of heritage crime. By perceiving heritage crime to occur solely in rural areas, confining it there and 'othering' it to the rural, police practitioners may eschew their responsibility towards the problem, convincing themselves that it does not occur in the city. Indeed, such behaviour may be a reflection of discourses of denial (Cohen, 2001), which may be employed by police practitioners who perhaps do not wish to see what is directly in front of them. Arguably, discourses of denial in relation to heritage crime are inevitable in more urban forces, wherein the demands of the urban mean that very particular crimes are of high priority, and attempts to police heritage crime are likely to be extremely limited.

Numerous police forces segue heritage crime with rural crime (e.g. Sussex Police, Thames Valley Police). The segueing of heritage crime with rural crime may be an attempt to address the growing heritage crime movement,

while taking financial restrictions into consideration. However, as Yarwood and Cozens (2004) have noted, senior police practitioners have, in some cases, created idyllic representations of the countryside, suggesting that the latter is crime free, in order to perhaps justify limited policing resources to certain rural areas. In a similar way, by attaching heritage crime to rural crime, police forces can appear to be addressing the issue of heritage crime. However, by confining the phenomenon to the rural, police forces can spend limited resources on the policing of it, and may unintentionally utilise 'the rural idyll' to downplay how severe and widespread heritage crime truly is.

As we continue to draw upon the marginalised area of rural crime to inform our discussion of the similarly marginalised area of heritage crime, we turn to a concept commonly used to explain instances of rural crime: techniques of neutralisation (Nurse, 2013). This concept has long been employed by rural criminologists to explain why people harm animals or engage in activities such as illegal hunting (Hall, 2015). The product of Sykes and Matza (1957), neutralisation offers five methods with which offenders justify their criminal behaviour (to avoid feelings of guilt): (1) denial of injury (nobody suffered as a result of the crime); (2) denial of victim (offender accepts actions, but believes that the harm caused is not wrong in light of the circumstances); (3) denial of responsibility (offenders' actions are caused by forces beyond their control); (4) appeal to higher loyalties (internal and external social controls are neutralised, as offenders maintain loyalty to their small group rather than society); and (5) condemnation of the condemners (deviants shift attention from their own deviant acts to the motives of those who disapprove of their transgressions).

Techniques of neutralisation may also arguably be applied to explain police (and other criminal justice practitioners') responses to particular types of offending. As such, this research purports that techniques of neutralisation may offer a very plausible explanation as to why police practitioners often do not respond particularly well to heritage crime. For example, 'denial of victim' and 'denial of injury' are two methods with which a police practitioner may perhaps understandably justify limited or no response to an instance of heritage crime; as there is often seemingly no direct victim or injury (Grove, 2014).

Additionally, some police practitioners may be of the opinion that heritage sites and assets are private areas that they do not possess knowledge of, or the right to, police. Such an attitude towards heritage crime arguably mirrors the historic dismissal of particular crimes, such as domestic violence, wherein practitioners believed the latter to be a waste of time and money, and a private matter in which police intrusion was inappropriate (Harwin and Brown, 2000; Smith, 1989). The exclusive culture of heritage may further compound such problems (Pendlebury and Gibson,

2009). Framing heritage assets and sites as private places, which only heritage experts and HPMs can fully understand, would confirm to police practitioners that they have no place intruding upon them.

Experiences of, and responses to, heritage by HPMs and police practitioners

This research found that almost all responses to heritage crime reported by HPMs were negative. This said, one positive experience was reported. This was, however, due to the HPM taking it upon themselves to educate their local beat police (something a member of the public should arguably not be required to do in order to gain an improved response from their local force).

Many responses to heritage crime are based upon situational crime prevention, necessitating a proactive response to fighting crime (Grove and Pease, 2014). However, crime prevention is often perceived as not being 'real' police work by police practitioners (Dunham and Alpert, 2015) in comparison to reactive policing, which is action packed and utilises special skills. In reality, the exciting, so-called 'real' police work only constitutes a very small proportion of police practitioners' day-to-day activities.

Much police work includes public services duties, which many practitioners consider to be a waste of their time (Fyfe, 1992). A reported incident of heritage crime may perhaps be viewed as a rather dull public service duty to attend (Chatterton, 1989) with seemingly no direct human victim for the practitioner to help. The latter may, in part, explain the often less than satisfactory response which HPMs within this study reported.

A key finding of this research was that, having experienced a poor response from their local police practitioners with regard to heritage crime, a number of interviewees questioned the general ability of their local force and of Nottinghamshire Police as a whole. This finding supports the existing literature, which demonstrates that a singular negative experience with a police practitioner can have a hugely disproportionate effect upon individuals' perception of their local police force and the police as a whole (Skogan, 2009).

Improving police practitioners' understandings and perceptions of heritage crime

This research has highlighted that improving police practitioners' understandings and perceptions of heritage crime is somewhat pressing. All interview respondents in this study emphasised the importance of police changing their attitudes towards heritage crime. A crucial aspect of police understanding and perception of heritage crime that must be improved is the mistaken belief, observed in the data

collected for this research, that lead theft is representative of all heritage crime. The same measures and reactions that police practitioners offer in instances of lead theft bear little resemblance to other forms of heritage crime, as, for example, legislation has been passed to prevent lead theft (Home Office, 2013), and it is arguably far more quantifiable to police practitioners than other heritage crimes. It appears that in attempting to make heritage crime accessible and understandable to police practitioners, police forces across England have stagnated their focus upon heritage crime to that of lead theft. This may also be because lead theft fits into the managerial structure of police forces (McLaughlin and Muncie, 2006), as it is able to be quantified, unlike many other heritage crimes (Office for National Statistics, 2014). Furthermore, the police practitioners surveyed in this research who had dealt with lead theft believed that they could easily police other forms of heritage crime, and had the resources and knowledge in place to do so.

Additionally, this research found that although police practitioners were largely against the idea of a database dedicated to heritage crime, many did suggest that a method of categorising and identifying heritage crimes within existing database systems would be helpful. These findings support the existing literature which implores the need for the recording, categorisation and identification of heritage crimes in police databases (Grove, 2013). If practitioners are required to classify crimes as heritage crimes, this may lead to individual practitioners taking an interest in, or promoting enquiry into the area; thus leading to improved police understanding and perceptions of heritage crime.

One method of improving police understanding and perceptions of heritage crime, which appears to have been reasonably successful thus far, has been to introduce a practitioner who, alongside his existing role, undertakes the policing of heritage crime. Darryl Holter, of Sussex Police, was the first police practitioner in England officially to undertake the policing of heritage crime alongside his existing position (Sussex Police, 2016). The implementation of such a role appears to not only have increased police practitioner understanding and improved perceptions of heritage crime in Sussex Police, but is also likely to have increased confidence in the police among HPMs and members of the heritage sector. Implementing heritage crime officers across England and Wales would be a direct, quick and effective method of improving police practitioner understandings and perceptions of heritage crime. However, the latter is, of course, at the discretion of the force in question; and may be difficult in the current socio-economic context.

Resourcing issues

It has been highlighted repeatedly that the austerity-led environment has profoundly affected forces in England

(and Wales), resulting in their having to make difficult decisions regarding which areas of crime will be prioritised. Monetary restraint means that many ideas for improving police understanding and perceptions of heritage crime may be considered ambitious. The Conservative-led coalition government reduced police funding by 20% between 2010 and 2014 (Fisher and Phillips, 2015). More widely, such cuts are fracturing the relationship between the police and the Conservative Party (Newburn, 2011). The implications of this fracturing relationship are yet to be observed in their entirety, but it is believed that 'post-austerity policing' will be characterised by '... a preserved front line' (Millie, 2014). As such, directing resources towards heritage crime initiatives, even if they are cost-effective, may not be reflected in government policy papers or chief police officers' agendas.

In summary, the findings of this study suggest that there is significant room for improvement in understanding and perceptions of, and engagement with heritage crime by Nottinghamshire Police; however, the difficulties involved in achieving this are most certainly acknowledged.

Conclusion

It should be noted that although the response to heritage crime from Nottinghamshire Police was not entirely positive (and may appear to portray some officers negatively), this research did not aim to vilify the force. Nor did it aim to extort their shortcomings with regard to heritage crime, which HPMs reported. As this research has maintained throughout, a limited number of force areas in England engage intensively with heritage crime, and a myriad of factors influence and aid a force's engagement with it. Therefore, a similar study conducted in other force areas that have not benefitted from such factors may well produce similar results. Nottinghamshire Police are not herein singled out as the exception. Rather, they are most likely to be just one example among many police forces. Additionally, it should be reinforced that Nottinghamshire Police are making progress and working towards better practice with regard to heritage crime, as observed in their revised Police and Crime Plan (Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner, 2016), which has clearly acknowledged the phenomenon.

Police practitioner understandings and perceptions of heritage crime are unlikely to change with ease. There is discordance, it appears, between response and reaction. Heritage crime elicits a traditionally rational response from police practitioners, but a significantly emotive reaction from HPMs. As this research has shown, it was when police practitioners understood the emotional bond that HPMs had with their assets that their response to heritage crime improved. Furthermore, it is also arguable that heritage

crime will never be a policing priority. Indeed, most practitioners in this research believed that it should not be prioritised, although many simultaneously believed that heritage crime was not less important than other crimes, (perhaps reflected in the fact that Nottinghamshire Police has recently begun to engage with heritage crime). With the latter in mind, it is therefore vitally important that heritage crime does not become victim to the fate of the myopic focus that other marginalised areas of crime, such as rural crime, have become (Nurse, 2013). As observed earlier, heritage crime has already been mistakenly labelled as a preserve of the rural by some police forces across England. Confining heritage crime to the rural not only increases the possibility of further marginalisation to the area, but also undermines the real threat of crime to the thousands of heritage assets in urban settings (Coombes et al., 2012).

Of course, the onus is not only upon police forces to champion the fight against heritage crime. The heritage sector itself has an important role to play in improving attitudes and understandings of heritage; by opening up its' exclusive culture (Pendlebury and Gibson, 2009) and reaching out to communities across England who feel that their heritage is being neglected.

Despite much needing to be changed, it is clear that progress is being made slowly. Recently, Historic England (2017) finished producing an e-Learning heritage crime scenario. This is a cost-effective and easily accessible method of educating numerous police officers on the processes to take when encountering heritage crime. Collaborative partnership working, a contemporary buzzword these days, appears also to be making a difference in the case of heritage crime, with projects such as Heritage Watch emerging throughout England (e.g. Hertfordshire Constabulary, Essex Police).

Heritage crime is, undeniably, a tricky area of crime to both police and prevent. The odds are stacked against police practitioners, and HPs, as funding continues to be cut for policing and the heritage sector. Yet, if both parties continue to reach out to each other, forge strong links and further the collaborative work already in existence in some areas; the future of heritage assets, sites and objects across England will, hopefully, be improved.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Adams R (2013) The V&A, the destruction of the country house and the creation of 'English Heritage'. *Museum & Society* 11(1): 1–18.
- Babbie E (2016) *The Practice of Social Research*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Brisbane J and Wood W (1996) *A Future for Our Past? An Introduction to Heritage Studies*. London: English Heritage.
- Carlen P (2012) Criminological knowledge: doing critique, doing politics. In: Hall S and Winlow S (eds) *New Directions in Criminology Theory*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 17–29.
- Chatterton M (1989) Managing paperwork. In: Weatheritt M (ed.) *Police Research: Some Future Prospects*. Aldershot, UK: Gower, 107–136.
- Cheshire Police (2016) Heritage crime. Available at: <http://www.cheshire.police.uk/advice-and-support/heritage-crime/> (accessed 14 June 2016).
- Cohen S (2001) *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Coombes M, Bradley D, Grove L, Thomas S and Young C (2012) *The Extent of Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Facing Designated Heritage Assets*. London: English Heritage. Available at: <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/content/imported-docs/p-t/researchpaper.pdf> (accessed 27 June 2016).
- Doward J (2015) Stone thieves are dismantling Yorkshire's heritage, warn police. *The Guardian*, 27 June. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/jun/27/yorkshire-stone-thieves-region-heritage> (accessed 30 July 2016).
- Dunham R and Alpert G (2015) *Critical Issues in Policing*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- English Heritage (2013) ARCH members Sept 2013. London: English Heritage. Available at: <http://content.historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/legal/archmembers-sep13.pdf> (accessed 12 June 2016).
- European Commission (2011) *Study on Preventing and Fighting Illicit Trafficking in Cultural Goods in the European Union*. Brussels: European Commission. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/doc_centre/crime/docs/Report%20Trafficking%20in%20cultural%20goods%20EN.pdf (accessed 11 June 2016).
- Fairclough G (2008) *The Heritage Reader*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Fisher A and Phillips J (2015) Quo vadis: a new direction for police leadership through community engagement? In: Wankhade P and Weir D (eds) *Police Services: Leadership and Management Perspectives*. London: Springer, 29–44.
- Francioni F and Gordley J (2013) *Enforcing International Cultural Heritage Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fyfe N (1992) Space, time, and policing: towards a contextual understanding of police work. *Environmental Planning D* 10(4): 469–481.

- Graham B and Howard P (2008) Introduction: heritage and identity. In: Howard P and Graham B (eds) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 1–18.
- Grove L (2013) Heritocide? Defining and exploring heritage crime. *Public Archaeology* 12(4): 242–254.
- Hall M (2015) *Exploring Green Crime: Introducing the Legal, Social and Criminological Contexts of Environmental Harm*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Harrison R (2013) *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Harwin N and Brown J (2000) Domestic violence and social policy: perspectives from Women's Aid. In: Hanmer J and Itzin C (eds) *Home Truths about Domestic Violence, Feminist Influences on Policy and Practice: A Reader*. London: Routledge, 205–227.
- Hawdon J (2008). Legitimacy, trust, social capital and policing styles: a theoretical statement *Policing Quarterly* 11(2): 182–201.
- Heritage Alliance (2013) Police set up group to tackle heritage crime. Available at: <http://www.theheritagealliance.org.uk/update/police-set-up-group-to-tackle-heritage-crime/> (accessed 18 June 2016).
- Historic England (2015a) Heritage and the economy. Available at: <http://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/heritage-and-the-economy/> (accessed 29 June 2016).
- Historic England (2015b) Heritage counts: 2015. Available at: <http://historicengland.org.uk/content/pub/2015/heritage-count-s-2015-england.pdf> (accessed 2 July 2016).
- Historic England (2015c) What is heritage crime? Available at: <http://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/heritage-crime/what-is-heritage-crime-and-what-is-being-done-about-it/> (accessed 13 June 2016).
- Historic England (2016a) Memorandum of Understanding. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/heritage-crime/memorandum-of-understanding/> (accessed 13 June 2016).
- Historic England (2016b) How to get involved. Available at: <http://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/heritage-crime/get-involved/> (accessed 12 June 2016).
- Historic England (2017) Heritage crime e-learning. Available at: <http://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/heritage-crime/what-is-heritage-crime-and-what-is-being-done-about-it/heritage-crime-elearning/> (accessed 12 June 2017).
- Home Office (2013) Scrap metal laws to stop metal theft come into force. London: Home Office. Available at: <http://www.gov.uk/government/news/scrap-metal-laws-to-stop-metal-theft-come-into-force> (accessed 3 July 2016).
- Hough A and Beckford M (2012) 75,000 'heritage crimes' committed in a year. *The Telegraph*, 19 March. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/crime/9149420/75000-heritage-crimes-committed-in-a-year.html> (accessed 11 June 2016).
- Howard P (2003) *Heritage: Management, Interpretation, Identity*. London: Continuum.
- Kila J and Bellcells M (2015) Conclusion: cultural property crime. In: Kila J and Bellcells M (eds) *Cultural Property Crime: An Overview of Analysis of Contemporary Perspectives and Trends*. Leiden: Brill, 366–379.
- Kindred B (2011) Current initiatives to address heritage crime in the UK. *Journal of Architectural Conservation* 17(2): 43–58.
- Maddrell A, della Dora V, Scafi A and Walton H (2014) *Christian Pilgrimage, Landscape and Heritage*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Mawby R (2016) Plural policing in rural Britain. In: Mawby R and Yarwood R (eds). *Rural Policing and Policing the Rural: A Constable Countryside*, UK: Routledge, 57–67.
- McLaughlin E and Muncie J (2006) *The SAGE Dictionary of Criminology*. London: SAGE.
- Millie A (2014) What are the police for? Re-thinking policing post austerity. In: Brown J (ed.) *The Future of Policing*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 52–63.
- Newburn T (2011) Cuts to police numbers. London: London School of Economics. Available at: http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/38112/1/blogs_lse_ac_uk-Cuts_to_police_numbers_proposals_for_directly_elected_Commissioners_and_the_wooing_of_US_supercop_Bil.pdf (accessed 1 August 2016).
- Newburn T (2015) What's happening to police numbers? BBC. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-34899060> (accessed 13 July 2016).
- Nikjamp P and Riganti P (2009) Valuing urban cultural heritage. In: Nikjamp P and Girard L (eds) *Cultural Tourism and Sustainable Local Development*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 57–74.
- Nistri G (2011) The experience of the Italian Cultural Protection Unit. In: Manacorda S and Chappell D (eds) *Crime in the Art and Antiquities World: Illegal Trafficking in Cultural Property*. London: Springer, 183–192.
- Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner (2016) Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Plan (Refreshed) 2016–2018. Available at: <http://www.nottinghamshire.pcc.police.uk/Document-Library/Public-Information/Police-and-Crime-Plan/Refreshed-Plan-2016-2018/Police-and-Crime-Plan-2016.pdf> (accessed 17 July 2016).
- Nurse A (2013) *Animal Harm: Perspectives on Why People Harm and Kill Animals*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Office of National Statistics (2014) *Property Crime: Metal Theft*. London: Office of National Statistics. Available at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160105160709/http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171776_386943.pdf (accessed 10 August 2016).
- Oppenheim A (1966) *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement*. London: Heinemann.
- Oxford Archaeology (2009) *Nighthawks and Nighthawking: Damage to Archaeological Sites in the UK and Crown Dependencies Caused by Illegal Searching and Removal of Antiquities*. Oxford: Oxford Archaeology.

- Patton M (1990) *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Pendlebury J and Gibson L (2009) *Valuing Historic Environments*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Pendlebury J, Townsend T and Gilroy R (2004) The conservation of English cultural built heritage: a force for social inclusion? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. Available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1352725032000194222?journalCode=rjhs20> (accessed 17 July 2016).
- Poyser S and Poyser B (2016) Social deviance theories: can they explain rural vandalism in the 21st century? *Journal of Deviant Behaviour* 20(1): 1–15.
- Punch K (2000) *Developing Effective Research Proposals*. London: SAGE.
- Reiner R (2000) *The Politics of the Police*, 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shelbourn C (2014) Improving the treatment of heritage crime in criminal proceedings: towards a better understanding of the impact of heritage offences. In: Grove L and Thomas S (eds) *Heritage Crime: Progress, Prospects and Prevention*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan, 188–205.
- Sibley D (1995) *Geographies of Exclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Skogan W (2009) Concern about crime and confidence in the police: reassurance or accountability? *Police Quarterly* 12(3): 301–318.
- Slocombe M (2013) Can heritage survive another hammering? *The Guardian*, 26 June. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/culture-professionals-network/culture-professionals-blog/2013/jun/26/heritage-cuts-government-spending-review> (accessed 18 July 2016).
- Smith L (1989) *Domestic Violence: An Overview of the Literature*. London: Home Office. Available at: <http://library.college.police.uk/docs/hors/hors107.pdf> (accessed 3 August 2016).
- Smith L (2006). *Uses of Heritage*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Sørensen TF (2007) Special review section: urban exploration as archaeological engagement: a review of <http://infiltration.org/> - 'the zine about places you're not supposed to go'. *European Journal of Archaeology* 10: 89–91.
- Stefano M, Davies P and Corsane G (2012) *Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Bury St Edmunds, UK: Boydell Press.
- Sussex Police (2016) A heritage crime officer's year in Rother. Available at: <http://www.sussex.police.uk/news/a-heritage-crime-officers-year-in-rother/> (accessed 3 August 2016).
- Sykes G and Matza D (1957). Techniques of neutralisation: a theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review* 22(6): 664–670.
- Thames Valley Police (2016) Crime prevention. Available at: <http://www.thamesvalley.police.uk/heritage-crime> (accessed 10 June 2016).
- The Collection Museum (2016) *Heritage Crime*. Lincoln, UK: Collection Museum. Available at: <http://www.thecollectionmuseum.com/?/exhibitions-and-events/view/heritage-crime> (accessed 14 June 2016).
- Thomas S and Grove L (2014) Introduction. In: Grove L and Thomas S (eds) *Heritage Crime: Progress, Prospects and Prevention*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan, 1–13.
- Travis A (2015) Theresa May to tell police: you've still got years of budget cuts to come. *The Guardian*, 8 December. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/dec/08/theresa-may-police-years-budget-cuts-come> (accessed 30 June 2016).
- UNESCO (2016) *Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Property: Specialised Police Forces*. Paris: UNESCO. Available at: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/illicit-trafficking-of-cultural-property/partnerships/specialized-police-forces/> (accessed 15 June 2016).
- Waterton E (2010) Branding the past: the visual imagery of England's heritage. In: Waterton E and Watson S (eds) *Culture, Heritage and Representation: Perspectives on Visuality and the Past*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 155–172.
- Waterton E and Watson S (2011) *Heritage and Community Engagement: Collaboration or Contestation?* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Wilson P and Harrison M (2013) Three years on from 'The Night-hawking Survey': innovations in heritage protection. *Journal of Internet Archaeology*, 28 February. Available at: <http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue33/7/toc.html> (accessed 10 June 2016).
- Yarwood R and Cozens C (2004) *Constable Countryside? Police Perspectives on Rural Britain: Geographies of Rural Cultures and Societies*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.

Author biographies

Bethan Poyser is a Lecturer in Criminology and a Researcher in Legal Studies at Nottingham Trent University (NTU). To-date her research has focused primarily on the much-marginalised area of heritage crime. Having graduated from NTU with an MA in Criminology (with Distinction), she is now embarking on doctoral studies. Her research interests include heritage crime (and the law surrounding this area) rural crime, policing and crime on the railways.

Sam Poyser is a Senior Lecturer in Criminology at York St John University. She has conducted research in the fields of criminology, criminal justice and policing. Her research topics are linked by a focus on victimisation, most particularly the issue of 'voiceless victims'. Sam has published in a variety of areas relating to policing, including criminal investigation and miscarriages of justice but is currently involved in research examining rural crime in Cyprus and criminal justice responses to the problem.