

The 47th Academy of Criminal Justice Science Annual meeting in San Diego was the venue for the announcement of this year's winners of the *Police Practice and Research* (PPR) best paper award. At a reception for the journal, Editor in Chief Dilip K. Das and Managing Editor John A. Eterno reflected on PPR's publishing mission, how the award reflected its aims, and celebrated the research they continue to welcome as submissions.

Since its tenth anniversary, *Police Practice and Research* (PPR) has presented annually an award for the best paper published in the preceding year's volume, which carries with it the prize of \$300, and \$200 for a second paper awarded an honourable mention.

The aim of the award is not just to recognise excellence in police research published in the journal, but to celebrate the purpose of PPR. As PPR always looks to encourage research which furthers our understanding of the operational practices of the police, and actively seeks submission of papers which do this from new and old contributors, it is worth re-stating these:

PPR is '...a peer-reviewed journal that presents current and innovative police research as well as operational and administrative practices from around the world. Articles and reports are sought from practitioners, researchers and others interested in developments in policing, analysis of public order, and the state of safety as it affects the quality of life everywhere. *Police Practice and Research* seeks to bridge the gap in knowledge that exists regarding who the police are, what they do, and how they maintain order, administer laws, and serve their communities. Attention will also be focused on specific organizational information about the police in different countries or regions. ...A specific goal of the editors is to improve cooperation between those who are active in the field and those who are involved in academic research; as such a relationship is essential for innovative police work...'

For the best paper award, a panel from the editorial team are asked to consider the papers published in the previous volume, and consider to what extent they exemplified these aims. In particular, they were asked to consider:

- To what extent does the paper provide new and/or important findings in the field?
- To what extent do the methods meet the needs of the study?
- To what extent is the paper useful to police practitioners?
- To what extent does the paper relate to an international audience?

For the 2009 volume, the panel gave an honourable mention to the following paper from issue 10:3:



**Amanda Robinson and Nick Tilley: 'Factors influencing police performance in the investigation of volume crimes in England and Wales.'**

This paper examines the investigation of volume crimes cases and the processes of attrition through the investigative process using quantitative and qualitative data. More than 3,000 burglary and motor vehicle cases in eight Basic Command Units in England and Wales, along with interview and



documentary data, were analyzed to identify the factors related to detection.

This was a brilliant paper that triangulates methods. It goes beyond the typical data-gathering exercise and expands into unstructured interviews. Many journals eschew such work, but PPR is open to new ideas and methods.

Published in issue 10:5-6, the winning paper selected by the panel does

just that, deploying new methods of study to produce something entirely innovative:

**David Bradley and Christine Nixon: 'Ending the 'dialogue of the deaf': evidence and policing policies and practices. An Australian case study.'**

In this article Bradley and Nixon identify two police research traditions, critical and policy, and explain why neither has been wholly satisfactory. They liken the situation to a 'Dialogue of the Deaf' between police and police researchers, accounting for chronic tension and misunderstanding. They then describe a more collaborative third option currently being used in Victoria, Australia with promising results - participatory action research.

Such collaboration is central to the aims of PPR. It suggests new methods of study, not just repeating older ideas. The paper contains something all of us can learn from. It contributes to the literature, discovers new knowledge, poses intellectual challenges, and facilitates a dialogue between scholars and policing professionals. Indeed, this paper was so inspiring that a future Special Issue edited by Gary Cordner is devoted to responding to issues developed by the Bradley Nixon manuscript.

PPR extends its congratulations to the authors of these papers. The journal continues to seek contributions such as these, and encourages researchers to submit their papers to the journal. Information on how to do this is available [here](#). PPR and Routledge are pleased to offer the 2009 PPR best papers free to access until July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010 and they can be accessed at the following links:

Factors influencing police performance in the investigation of volume crimes in England and Wales  
[www.informaworld.com/10.1080/15614260802381091](http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/15614260802381091)

Ending the 'dialogue of the deaf': evidence and policing policies and practices. An Australian case study  
[www.informaworld.com/10.1080/15614260903378384](http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/15614260903378384)