

# Pearls in Policing

## Future policing, policing the future

Discussion paper IALG 2009-2010  
by Professor Dr. W. Bruggeman<sup>1</sup>

*“The only certainty you have is the fact that the future will be uncertain”*

### I. The police organisation and its functioning

#### *1 Standing at a threshold of fundamental change*

It has become very clear from the above mentioned that we stand at the dawn of a fundamental shift in the way in which public and quasi-public places are policed, with significant implications for styles of policing, community engagement, civic renewal, social inclusion and citizenship. ‘Tackling insecurity’, ‘crime control’ and ‘criminal justice’ are shorthand terms that describe a complex set of practices and institutions, ranging from the conduct of house owners locking their doors to the actions of authorities enacting (criminal) laws, from community policing to sanctions in prison and all the processes in between. Each of these aspects is subject of new developments. In this chapter we take a closer look at them.

#### *2 Research & Knowledge Development*

Research on police organisation and functioning indicates a plethora of policing systems. Much of the early research on policing focused on the nature of the police role and of police culture. A recent development is the emergence of a forum of policy-oriented criminology focussing on the main police activities, operations and performances. This sub-discipline of police studies and police science is now well established, mostly beyond criminology.

Nowadays most police services have some form of internal research capacity and most of them focus upon encouraging research and knowledge development in order to support search for better analyses, future strategies and their implementation. It also becomes more natural to build upon experiences from the for-profit world and to have an active exchange with other (academic) partners in society.

#### *3 Police (re-)organisation*

Successful police have, probably based upon the growing need to be an anticipatory organisation, built two features into the police organisation: revitalisation and innovation.

In many (especially European) countries some significant changes have been made to the nature of the police organisation including both the development of more central organised policing structures and increasing emphasis on a local orientation with basic command units<sup>2</sup>. There have been times

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on several documents issued by A. Hazenberg MA, MCM and her team.

<sup>2</sup> In Austria, Denmark, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Norway and the United Kingdom the police services have been or are in a process of re-organisation. Centralisation is a focus point in all countries. See also ‘Closing the gap’, a British paper describing the fact that a police service should at

when politicians assumed that increased expenditure would lead, almost automatically, to greater effectiveness in crime control but this is no longer the case. The focus is now: better police instead of more police. In several countries local policing teams are now working with local residents through the introduction of community support officers.

#### *4 The police function*

The police function includes both basic and specific tasks, the latter being conceived differently in respective countries and organisations. In a world where security and safety are increasingly defined as fundamental values in peoples' lives, law enforcement organisations become entrusted with a greater span of responsibility and control. At its core, policing consists of the judicious application of coercive force in the maintenance of social order. It is peace-keeping, peace-making and, if need be, peace-enforcement. Police officers are charged with responsibility for maintaining a general or specific social order and they do so with the ultimate recourse of coercion.

Policing has adapted and responded to the late modern world and to its political and cultural values. Policing also appears to become increasingly fragmented and complex. Today it does more than just supply solutions to manage problems of crime and anti-social behaviour; it also institutionalises a set of responses to these problems, themselves consequent in their social impact. The development and implementation of any policy will always raise difficult dilemmas and stir complicated controversies, not only when it comes to policing measures, but also in relation to long-term internal and foreign policies, aiming at the so-called causes of terrorism and crime. This results in a shift in the balance of power between the state and the rights and liberties of the individual. The creation of a police service ethic within a transnational civil society predicated on human rights norms is an issue of global importance.

New practices typically emerge as local solutions arise to the immediate problems encountered by individuals and organisations as they go about their daily routines. What they add up to is a process of institutional adaptation in which the whole field of crime control gradually adjusts its orientations and functioning. Over time (police) practise of controlling crime and doing justice has had to adapt to:

- An increasingly insecure economy that marginalises substantial sections of the population;
- A hedonistic consumer culture that combines extensive personal freedoms with relaxed social controls;
- A pluralistic moral order that struggles to create trust relations between strangers who have little in common;
- A 'sovereign' state that is increasingly incapable of regulating a society of individual citizens and different social groups, and
- Chronically high crime rates are able to exist when low levels of family cohesion and community solidarity occur.

Against this background sometimes obsessive attempts to monitor more frequently risky individuals, to isolate dangerous populations and to impose situational control on otherwise open and fluid settings takes place<sup>3</sup>. The limitations of traditional systems of justice have led to a greater willingness to experiment with new developments (or modernised forms of traditional techniques) such as restorative justice and administrative sanctioning. The police service is one of the few organisations that operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This makes them the eyes and ears of society. How can this unique role be used in signalling and advising partners and decision-makers?

#### *5 Privatisation of the police function*

The upsurge of private security fits within a wider pattern of multi-lateralisation. Both trends (privatisation and civilisation) are part of an active "responsabilisation" strategy, by means of which state agencies encourage actions by non-state organisations and actors. Because of high crime cultures, the problem of personal security, crime prevention and penalty provisions has created commercial opportunities that have been rigorously explored by the private market forces. Ensuring lasting and sustainable change is only possible by empowering people to take greater responsibility

---

least consist of 4000 members of staff in order to be able to provide both local and (inter)national police care. In other countries like France and the South of Europe questions are raised about the merging of the different police organisations within a country (e.g. Gendarmerie en Municipal police).

<sup>3</sup> D. Garland

for the strength and well-being of their own lives and communities in a way that establishes a different relationship between governments and the governed. The different social, constitutional and cultural characteristics have influence on how problems are perceived, who is held responsible for what, and which political and professional responses are preferred. Much greater emphasis should be placed upon partnership or multi-agency cooperation and broader alliances should be regarded as supplementary to state action. Close cooperative relations between plural policing providers can encourage innovative styles of delivering security and order; a 'cross fertilisation' of good practice and greater awareness and responsibility for crime on the part of businesses, groups and individuals.

Five models of policing are identified by A. Crawford<sup>4</sup> in describing the relationship and interaction between public and private police organisations:

1. *Monopolistic model* whereby forms of policing are integrated within hierarchical state police organisations (the favoured model of the current Metropolitan Police commissioner Sir I. Blair, 2003);
2. *Steering model*, whereby the police seek "to govern at a distance" the policing activities of others; what we might call "third party policing" in which state agencies seek to further public order objectives through mobilising non-state resources. A key element in this strategy is the accreditation of policing activities by others;
3. *Networked or nodal modal* whereby plural policing providers connect in horizontal partnerships in the co-production of security;
4. *Market model* whereby competition (and conflict) structures relations between divergent providers;
5. *Private government model* where state policing is shut out or has relinquished authority - only to enter where invited or called upon to do so.

Nowadays the aim is to regulate "self-regulation", compelling people and organisations to behave in the desired manner. In reality, in the field of policing, recourse to command and control remains (too) often not only a resource of last resort, when all else fails, but also one that is symbolically and culturally distinct. What seems to become a significant trait of contemporary regulatory developments is an increasing distrust of both hierarchical forms of "command regulation" and of traditional forms of business or professional self-regulation.

## 6 Police strategies

Today's police strategies need to have congruence, a certain 'fit' with the structures and processes of modern society. They represent a particular kind of response, a particular adaptation to the specific problem of social order produced by modern social organisation, but such strategies are not created without a conscious effort. The public demands that something be done about crime and security, that property and persons should be protected, that offenders should be adequately punished and controlled and that the system should operate reliably and efficiently. The recurring concerns can be met in a variety of ways<sup>5</sup>. Efforts to share responsibility for crime control, nodal orientation, to embed social control into the fabric of every day life, to reduce the criminal effects of economic transitions, to protect against repeated victimisation, to focus upon repeating offenders, to support young people and to prevent crime in communities, are adopted by most law enforcement agencies.

However, there are still possibilities and opportunities that already exist which could be given a greater prominence in law enforcement policy. To mention a few:

- a) Community policing is still the most prominent strategy but should be adapted to the modern world in all its aspects. The empowerment of citizens is an important part of this. The relationship between citizens and all partners in the community is a key condition for local, regional and (inter)national security.<sup>6</sup> There are increasingly more regional examples of successful initiatives of involvement of civil organisations in the relationship between private

---

<sup>4</sup> A. Crawford

<sup>5</sup> For example, the US, where concerns are growing about the possibility of being locked into new "iron cage" (e.g. mass incarceration)

<sup>6</sup> M. Roerink, B. van den Ploeg

and civil society.<sup>7 8</sup> It should be linked to 21st century technology to make the biggest impact on crime and on the public's fear of crime.

- b) It is of utmost importance to involve the younger generations and to understand that they are developing their own culture, with their own language, their own behavioural codes. Potential crime scenes become virtual, abuse becomes digital. Are traditional law enforcement instruments still equipped to respond adequately? Who knows the answer?<sup>9</sup>
- c) Promising for the police is the introduction of anti-social behaviour orders and other administrative sanctioning systems such as administrative sanctions, local dispersal orders, house closure powers for example, creating the possibility for a more extensive follow up of police actions.
- d) More recent is the introduction of intelligence-led policing. Today some countries are striving to integrate strategies, combining community policing and intelligence-led policing with organisational development towards a global strategy. This opens up the opportunity for tailor-made policing<sup>10</sup>. Strategies should not only apply for volume crime or organised crime in a separate way, but be more generalised and integrated in order to cover all forms of crime.
- e) The increasing automatisisation and technology creates high visibility and traceability of persons and (criminal) activities. This means that especially crime will further develop outside of view. Criminals will go to great lengths to ensure digital invisibility and to make sure that they leave no electronic traces. This demands a fitting counter-strategy from Police.<sup>11</sup>
- f) Media is of great influence on modern day society. It has a major impact on the way police is perceived by citizens. This usually has a negative impact on perception of police, but is it a realistic perception, does it agree with reality? Communication strategies can also be used for positive ends such as crime prevention and have a major impact on criminal behaviour when used in an inventive and effective manner. For example, when the real chance to be caught for a crime is just 20%, but the perceived chance to be caught is over 80%, criminals will be deterred to commit these crimes. How can we incorporate this strategy in police communication as an effective tool of preventing crime?<sup>12</sup>

### *7 New tactics and techniques*

One of the major criticisms on traditional crime assessments is that they are no more than a description of previous law enforcement activity, even when they initiate trend analyses and crime prognoses. More accurate is the measurement of the number of times that the police is called upon, showing similar tendencies.

To support all these new developments, and to stay ahead of criminality, the police will have to harness new tactics and technology. Spatial controls, situational controls, managerial controls, system controls, social controls and self-control give rise to the imposition of more intensive and changing regimes of regulation, inspection and control. It is not very hard to imagine that within the next ten years there will be moves to integrate the (EU) passports, ID card, driving license and health card into one single biometric chipped card<sup>13</sup>.

Considerable work is also being done on several fronts in order to search for the best methods to initiate and further develop trend analysis and prognoses, "forecasting"<sup>14</sup> techniques, threat assessments, risk analysis and scenario thinking. These should include not only traditional, but also non-traditional elements such as analyses of counter measures developed by criminal organisations and scans of legal and illegal markets. New methodologies such as the Organised Crime Threat Assessment<sup>15</sup>, the Pest and Swot analyses and the development of an 'organised crime outlook'<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> M. Roerink: [www.urban-europe.net](http://www.urban-europe.net)

<sup>8</sup> M. Roerink: Curt Taylor Griffiths, Ph.D., School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University, Canada

<sup>9</sup> G. van den Burg, M. Roerink

<sup>10</sup> P. Slort

<sup>11</sup> J. Beekman and D. van Putten

<sup>12</sup> A. Sanders

<sup>13</sup> T. Bunyan

<sup>14</sup> P. Slort

<sup>15</sup> A relative new instrument used by the European Police Office ([www.europol.eu.int](http://www.europol.eu.int))

<sup>16</sup> Tom Vander Beken, Professor of Criminal Law and Director of the Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy, Ghent University, Belgium

have been introduced. On other continents, such as Australia, the establishment of the Office of Strategic Crime Assessments (OSCA) underlines the need for coordination between law enforcement agencies at different levels and a development of a joint future strategy<sup>17</sup>. Industrial and commercial networks are well versed in risk-analyses and risk-control initiatives as well, and it is advisable to promote more intensive interaction between official/governmental and non-governmental organisations.

Scenarios which portray the future as a multi-faceted but essentially unpredictable reality are considered to be a good tool for use in (organised) crime assessments. Scenarios do not claim to predict the (inevitable) developments of certain criminal phenomena but provide a tool to think about future possible threats. As such, scenarios allow policy makers to anticipate a variety of plausible challenges and assess the preparation for each of them.

## *8 Police governance, accountability, legitimacy and trust*

### *Governance*

Policing traditionally has been essentially reactive. In addition, policing used to focus primarily on local affairs. Both anchors have come to loose. In addition many new strategies, tactics and operational procedures have been introduced over the past three decades (community policing, intelligence led-policing and reassurance policing, to name a few). There is ample supply for new concepts, policies and visions, but which of them actually make a difference in policing? And what is policing? The function (and structure) of police systems differ, with political policing and centralised organisations at one end of the continuum and community policing and decentralised organisations at the other end. Of course there are all sorts of combinations in between, but one of the basic differences is whether the political interests of the government determined policing or that public interests do so as in democracies.

From that we can derive three imperatives. The first is for policing to become truly global. The second is for local policing to be continuously aware of how global trends impact on the local situation. The third is that we have to learn from best practices and from bad practices?

Subsequently central questions are: how to utilise in the best way possible the powers that we have been entrusted with without losing the trust of our communities and how do we bring about a focus on both local and global issues within the police?

Anyway police organisations must move forward to become more adaptable and flexible and we need a "thinking police". In the main time sustainability is becoming a prime concern for the police.

### *Accountability*

Great strides have been set in many countries in the field of police accountability. Accountability involves a number of facets. There is political accountability which involves elected officials who carry policing matters in their portfolio and are answerable to the parliament. There is accountability to partners working together to reduce crime and maintain public order. There also is, or there should be, accountability directly to citizens. It is vital that here are complaint procedures and other structures of accountability that are robust and independent. They will only inspire confidence if they are equitable thorough and swift. We expect the behaviour of police officers to be of the highest standard; it is most imperative to be able to identify those whose behaviour falls below that standard and have means and ways in place to deal with that, either as a criminal matter, a civil issue or one of occupational nature. It requires active involvement of other parties and independent citizens as well. Accountability and transparency refer to trust. Only when the police are a locally trusted and nationally respected body can there be confidence that the police indeed will be able to play their part in addressing the problems related to legitimacy. The issue of police accountability is of central importance to contemporary debates about the politics of policing. The focus of these debates is on how to ensure the delivery of adequate policing and make policing acceptable to highly differentiated communities. It is about the means to control police actions, especially in the light of their considerable discretion and rights to employ force. In recent years control issues have lost in many countries some of their urgency, except when specific cases ignite debate, because the focus of the discussions has shifted more to police accountability in terms of performance and effectiveness. Accountability however remains important because there is a need to balance the coercive powers of the police and because

---

<sup>17</sup> G. Van den Burg: Australian office of strategic crime assessments (OSCA)

policing remains a very political matter. Moreover, the police need to be held accountable for their use of public resources while also striving for legitimacy to achieve the cooperation and trust of the policed<sup>18</sup>. The arrangements for police accountability are not a matter of simple subordination to the government; more complex systems of accountability should be in operation, entailing various aspects: legal, financial, organisation accountability; accountability through consultation, performance monitoring; redress of grievances complaints procedures; oversight bodies; external (informal) NGO's + the media; tripartite partners.

Accountability in the public has a huge impact on legitimacy of policing and is not a peripheral issue. Changing political circumstances have also led to debate on governance and accountability, leading to more emphasis on performance management on the one hand and to a consideration of ethics and human rights on the other. There is a need to explore and determine the best governance mechanisms to ensure that policing is delivered in accordance with the democratic values of justice, equity, accountability and effectiveness<sup>19</sup>.

Many police organisations are (too) frequently confronted by far-reaching implications of waves of normative and instrumental interventions. These include the emphasis on integrated chain management, the introduction of a (national) quality policing model, the formation of safety regions where emerging services are interlinked through common emergency plans, integrated call centres and privileged cooperation with commercial or private organisations. Many public services, including the police services, are now subject to an increasingly bureaucratic system of performance management. The drift towards centralisation<sup>20</sup> and formation of national police services has become irreversible.

Whereas the ideal of democracy holds that governments are accountable to the people, surveillance-based techniques of governance are transforming this relationship: making people accountable to governments while widening the gap (the so-called demographic deficit) between political elites and those they have been elected or, in appointed to serve.

#### *Legitimacy: public trust in police*

It is an accepted fact that dealing with police corruption will involve more than identifying a few "rotten apples" within the organisation. In his global literature review, London School of Economics professor Tim Newburn<sup>21</sup> concluded that police corruption is both widespread and pervasive. He also found that the boundary between "corrupt" and "non-corrupt" activities is difficult to define. The causes of corruption include factors that are intrinsic to policing as a job: the nature of police organisations; the nature of police culture, the opportunities for corruption presented; and, the nature and extent of the effort put in to controlling corruption. Eight years on, corruption remains identified as a major problem that erodes public trust, and prevents the establishment of the rule of law in post-conflict areas. Police corruption and the identification of key measures to tackle it will remain a focal point for international police leadership.

It is clear that fears and concerns about local safety are increasingly influenced by wider, global insecurities and generic risks. Police services feel more and more that they lack the powers and the manpower to help them and they feel the need to develop new policing strategies which contribute to a 'trust society'<sup>22</sup>. The worst case scenario is when state-based police services no longer enter certain "no-go areas", are faced with corruption within the own organisation or are no longer putting energy in knowledge development & learning. Businesses, organisations and the public have increasingly lost confidence in the capacity of the police to deliver community-based and locally tied patrol officers as part of routine police provision and have begun to experiment with diverse forms of additional security<sup>23</sup>, although this differs in individual countries.

---

<sup>18</sup> Mawby, R. and Wright, A. , Policing accountability in the United Kingdom, written for the Commonwealth human rights initiative ([www.humanrightsinitiative.org/programs.aj/police](http://www.humanrightsinitiative.org/programs.aj/police))

<sup>19</sup> A. Crawford

<sup>20</sup> The Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) in the UK; Homeland Security in the USA

<sup>21</sup> Newburn, T., Understanding and preventing police corruption: lessons learned from literature, London, Home Office, 1999

<sup>22</sup> A. Sanders

<sup>23</sup> A. Crawford

Old and new democracies are very much concerned with respect of human rights by police services. Traditionally human rights organisations concerned with policing, crime control and associated activities, such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, have tended to focus almost exclusively on instances of police wrongdoing. The need for monitoring of this type of wrongdoing has not disappeared, indeed, globally, the abuse of police coercive powers (extra-judicial killings, disappearances, torture) and their misuse (bribery and corruption) seems to be growing.

Tom Tyler<sup>24</sup> did research on "Enhancing police legitimacy". First the police need public support and cooperation to be effective in their order-maintenance role and they particularly benefit when they have voluntary support and cooperation of most members of the public, most of the time. Second, such voluntary support and cooperation is linked to judgments about the legitimacy of the police. A central reason people cooperate with the police is that they view them as legitimate legal authorities, entitled to be obeyed. Third, a key antecedent of public judgments about legitimacy of the police and of policing activities involves public assessments of the manner in which the police exercise their authority. Such procedural-justice judgements are central to public evaluations of the police and influence such evaluations separately form assessments of police effectiveness in fighting crime. Tyler's findings suggest the importance of enhancing public views about the legitimacy of the police and suggest process-based strategies for achieving that objective.

What is needed is a kind of policing that puts social justice an human rights above and beyond all other values.

### *Dirty business*<sup>25</sup>

One wonders what values make the police acting as it is today and what will be the values 10 years from now? The simplicity of the question is an indicator of the difficulty of the answer. Police is or should be a "chained institution": this means that is not the police that can or should define itself in terms of values. It is up to the society and its representatives and leaders to define and refine the so called transfer of values. Polices leaders have the first responsibility to "manage the chains", to influence these that govern them, instruct or push them. Police chiefs are expected to be loyal, but this loyalty creates some rights as well. This leads to differentiation and pluralism, also in policing. It is interesting to examine the dark side of policing, with a special focus on the negative values of the police such as cynicism, insufficient societal impetus, racism and corruption.

Police forces should not hide their dark side but be transparent. This will at the end lead to be recognised as a positive institution.

Review of dirty business is not new and the privilege of police organisations<sup>26</sup>. As well the individual, the organisational as he systemic levels have been analysed. This means analyses of individual misbehaviour, the culture and the structure of the organisation and the larger political and economic framework in which that organisation functions.

### *9 Police leadership and effective management*

High profile examples of apparent "failure" have led to renewed scrutiny of police leadership and effective management. There is an almost inevitable tension between quantitative performance management and a focus on the quality of service being delivered.

Recruitment, training and career development within the police service have changed with greater emphasis being placed on formal educational qualification, life long learning and the skills of the individual leader, perhaps the most obvious illustration of increasing police professionalism. Training for all ranks is being reorganised and new training bodies have been created (nationally and internationally). Diversity (gender and ethnicity) within the police is a basic requirement not only for being accepted in the communities but also as a business issue. But excellent police governance,

---

<sup>24</sup> Tyler, T., Enhancing police legitimacy, The annals of he American academy of political and social science, 2004, nr 1, 84-99

<sup>25</sup> Based on the lecture of professor Doctors van Leeuwen, during the 2009 PearsI in policing conference.

<sup>26</sup> Punch, M., Exploring corparate misconduct, Saga publications, 1996

outstanding leadership and management of diversity often remain of a problematic nature<sup>27</sup>.

Perception management is based on the acknowledgement of more effective and more intelligent communication with the outside world. Law enforcement can use the potential of new media to tell their own stories independently of the official media outlets, as well as to hear directly from citizens about what they expect from the police. This too, will help shed light on the future and may be vital to improving levels of mutual confidence between the public and the police. Which in turn may ultimately create a more interactive relationship, thereby allowing citizens to play a greater role in enforcement and detection. Although most of this may be some way in the future, there are already a number of promising experiments being conducted in this area.

#### *10 Police and social science (research)*

In the seventies there were many conflicts between critical researchers and the police, because empirical studies show the more negative sides of police work (discrimination, violence). Since then a closer co-operation between criminologists in studying organised crime, offenders and so on, is welcomed by both because each benefits from these co-operation. But nowadays evaluation and fundamental studies in the field of police studies are still observed with distrust by the police, like in the sixties. Despite this existing distrust, all kinds of social research have more or less contributed substantially to the police practice the last decades<sup>28</sup>.

Although it is in the interest of both the police and social science to maintain as good mutual relationships as possible, the situation has to be prevented that the police prohibits the publication of research findings because of their sensitivity, especially when dealing with matters related to accountability. Researchers also should be more aware of the fact that the intertwining of the roles of researcher and advisor puts pressure on their independency and integrity.

#### *11 Conclusion*

Professionalism seems to be the key word in future policing. Recruitment, training and career development within the police service has changed with greater emphasis being placed on formal educational qualification, life long learning and the skills of the individual leader. Most police services have some form of internal research capacity and encourage research and knowledge development to ensure better analyses and improved future strategies. The police have realised the necessity to harness new tactics and technology and search for the best methods to further develop trend analysis and prognoses, "forecasting" techniques, threat assessments, risk analysis and scenario thinking. These should include not only traditional, but also non-traditional elements.

Policing has adapted and responded to the late modern world and appears to have become increasingly fragmented and complex. Diversity has become part of every day life. In many countries significant changes have been made to the nature of the police organisation centralising policing structures. A greater emphasis should be placed upon accountability, police partnerships and multi-agency cooperation; broader alliances should be regarded as supplementary to state action. The real solution does not lie in increased competition, but in partnership in law enforcement, nationally, internationally, publicly and privately.

The development and implementation of any policy will always raise difficult dilemmas and stir complicated controversies, not only when it comes to policing measures, but also in relation to long term internal and foreign policies. But as the limits of traditional systems have led to a greater willingness to experiment with new developments (or modernised forms of traditional techniques) such as restorative justice and administrative sanctioning, public policing is becoming part of a broader, more complex and diversified new security architecture. Security must now be taken to refer to a whole range of technologies and practices provided not only by public bodies such as the police or local authorities, but also by commercial concerns competing in the marketplace.

Global policing will have to be linked to a futuristic orientation in which future developments are anticipated, conceptualised and their effects predicted and modelled, so that both police practice and police training can be ready in any event.

---

<sup>27</sup> P. Stort: L. Human

<sup>28</sup> Bruinsma, G. and van der Vijver, C., Police and (social sciences): co-operation and opposites, Justitiële verkenningen, 1998, nr 8

## II. A critical view on current strategies

### Introduction

Over the last decades policing has gone through a period of significant change and innovation. While there is a rich diffusion history, with a voluminous amount of literature, the diffusion of innovation conceptual framework has only recently been utilized by criminologists.

In what is a relatively short historical time frame the police began to reconsider their fundamental mission, the nature of the core strategies of policing and the character of their relationships with the communities that they serve. More generally, the turn of the last century was a period of tremendous changes in police practices. This openness can be traced to the crisis in police legitimacy and effectiveness.

For decades the police have assumed that the main task of policing was to fight crime, and that the police could successfully carry out their tasks with little help and preferably with little interference with the public. Community oriented policing (COP) represented a radical departure from the professional model of policing that was dominant in the post-world war II period. Wilson and Kelling argued that concern with disorder was an essential ingredient for doing something about crime problems. COP continues to ask officers to think and act in new and unaccustomed ways and many of its presumed benefits do not show up in police information systems.

Together with D. Weisburd and A. Braga several major innovations which emerged during the last three decades can be distinguished : community policing, broken windows policing, zero base policing problem oriented policing, pulling levers policing, third party policing, hot spot policing, intelligence led policing, Compstat and evidence –based policing and reassurance policing, restorative justice. This is of course not an exhaustive list of innovations in policing. Many of these changes have originated in the United States.

The introduction of these strategies has been subject of cultural and historic traditions, the political system, the structure and way of policing, the judicial system, etc. Such transfers have been in several cases rather soft and limited to “words and symbolism”.

Often these new strategies are presented as a fundamental change, but in many cases one can categorise these changes as “new wine in old bottles”. Advocates and critics of each of these changes have tried to assess the evidence (strengths and weaknesses) on impacts of police innovation on crime and public safety/security, the extend of the implementation of these new approaches in police departments and the dilemmas the approaches have created for police management. The critics often identify promising elements of innovation while pointing out the difficulties that have been encountered in the application of innovation in the field.

The advocates note the drawback of particular strategies, while arguing that they should be widely adopted. While these extreme models may be useful to describe futurist organisational structures, they leave unanswered fundamental needs that have traditionally been addressed by the vestiges of pyramidal hierarchy.

While the depth of innovation remains a matter of debate, it is certainly the case that police agencies have become open to the idea of innovation, and that new programmes and practices haven been experimented with and adopted at a rapid pace over the last few decades.

Some studies have documented the “shallow” implementation of police innovations, and have suggested that in the end the police tend to fall back on traditional methods of conducting police tasks (Clarck, Eck). But the 21<sup>st</sup> century is still in its infancy. The wide-ranging effects of globalisation, rapid technological advances , word political and economic shifts, security challenges and the implications of climate change, have all served to influence the crime environment and make the job of policing the community more challenging then ever before (AFP Commissioner M. Keelty).

Moreover, the main practices of the standard model of policing continue to dominate the work of most police agencies. Police chiefs often face a political reality that often serves as a constraint for implementing innovation or collaboration.

Provincialism has survived the tough fiscal times in the post 9-11 era and individual units of government still cling to their own unique and hierarchical police departments. Even though a variety of “task forces” and multi-agency endeavours illustrate the force multiplication of teamwork, they still remain constrained by overall hierarchy.

Top managers decide what a success is and hold mid-level managers to their standards. The accountability process is about harnessing the hierarchy to achieve top management objectives, which are in return driven by the data they have at hand, and those data mostly say little about community priorities. As a result, there is a risk that the focus of departments will shift from CP, back to the activities that better fit a centralizing management structure driven by data on recorded crime. COP calls for the bottom-up definition of problems. Overcoming the resistance of local geopolitical entities to provide for complete networking within policing could well extend beyond 2020. It is likely that police leadership must develop means to adapt, and loosen the bureaucratic ropes that bind police agencies under traditional hierarchies. What is left for research is how to implement such networked, flexible organisations without abandoning the key principles of effective policing and losing the ability to hold the police accountable for outcomes and conduct. Even with the potential growth of a myriad of less-lethal force options, police officers in 2020 will still be using force to gain compliance and mitigate risk, and will still be taking away the liberty of freedom that is surrendered upon arrest. If there is no network chief, can the cluster-based team supervisors successfully take the broadest view in ensuring fairness, consistency, and the highest standards of conduct for their teams? Barabasi suggests that all nodes within a network must be aware of “how the actions of one do affect other nodes”. Perhaps the accountability answers lie within the need for managers to understand the consequences of interconnectiveness. These remain the nagging philosophical question however, of “who is in charge?” Even if everyone working in this enlightened, modern networked environment understands the disbursed leadership concept and actions in a highly self-directed manner, external customers oriented toward the hierarchical paradigm are likely to demand answers from “the boss”. Anyway we believe that it is both possible and useful to attempt to reconcile the insights provided by studies coming from the broad global/convergence and local/divergence vantage points. Normally, globalisations and increased interdependency would lead to greater convergence. But R. Kagan is warning: “Ideologically, it is a time not of convergence but of divergence”.

### **”New wine in old bottles” or “Nothing works”?**

The verdict of Greenwood et al for example on the police service is absolutely devastating. These authors are of the opinion that the supervision is faulty and police officers have been abandoned to their fate. Administrative duties, public relations and so-called crime prevention take up most of their time. Professional publications are not being read and officers rely solely on the daily “trial and error” method. There is a lot of “on the job training”. They do not work hard and there are few operational operations. Solutions just happen, routinely by coincidence.

Choogn is of the meaning that the social disciplinary model results in the police operating with a set of attitudes and convictions geared to punishing, controlling and humiliating others. Police officers can put on their own show and develop their own rhetoric. Furthermore, the vagueness of the law enables them in most of the countries to develop their own informal and manipulative working rules. They take no account of legal restrictions and often use force without justification. Yet policy makers continue to give the police more powers: they think that the police need it. Nothing could be further from the truth according to Choogn: they are solely occupied with maintaining order, so-called targeted policing.

Ericson states that police officers have too much autonomy. If more regulations are imposed (what is the case in several especially EU countries), the police will know them so well that they could once again use (or abuse) them. Ericson advocates increased visibility and control. He also advocates more internal control and therefore more professionalism in the form of better training and stricter selection and recruitment to improve quality. However Ericson concedes that this will result once again in corporatism, more autonomy and a tendency to look after their own needs. Moreover, it will also give rise to even more “public relations” efforts on the part of the police to acquire external legitimacy and at the same time filter information given to the outside world.

Skolnick likewise takes the view that moral consensus is sought in a heterogeneous society by means of punishment. However, this does not appear to be working and punishment is of little use in trying to achieve social cohesion.

And so the police develop an “operational code” which is at odds with law. The police have developed such a rigid outlook on public order that increases their perceptions of all sorts of dangers. Furthermore, the police themselves want sufficient discretionary scope to enable them to undertake an exploratory investigation. The police regard procedures as something to be considered rather than obeyed. The police honour the letter of the law, but not the spirit. Their working philosophy is that the end justifies the means. The police talk constantly about professional standards, but it is never clear what they mean by this. In fact, this is all a dilemma: on the one hand, the police can be called upon increasingly to achieve social stability, yet on the other hand that social instability reflects weak links to society.

Black searches for some alternatives. Western societies do everything differently to more primitive societies in which all sorts of arbitration was provided and there were responsible representatives for groups of equals. Nowadays, there is a gap between the police and the people, and the result is indifference and discontent among the parties concerned. The police are being called upon increasingly, but at the same time increasingly varied forms of mediation and arbitrations are also emerging. Will these alternatives replace the police more and more? Self-help in society means “de-policing” first of all and self-help (resolving conflicts independently) enables a (different) form of social control. The presence of centripetal instead of centrifugal forces affects sociability and the level of social contact and this carries a lot of influences.

Hoogenboom makes the difference between “fictional” and “factual policing”. The question is if policing can be changed? Policing is tough work and its most important characteristic is continuity rather than changes.

### **Back to the roots of COP**

Community (oriented) policing (COP) emerged in the 1960s under the influence of changing views on policing. At that time a sort of “policing realism” sprouted up, which was based on the finding that the police do much more than merely apply the criminal law, issue summons, or make arrests. Policing is mainly about so-called peacemaking. Crucial is therefore to have a daily presence among the people, which involves speaking to people, informing them, warning them, and in fact, paying attention to many things besides committed crime. The police had to take a different approach towards the “problematic” sections of the population and restore the broken relations or, if there had never been any relations, to establish them. In all studies attention was paid almost exclusively to routine, daily policing and no longer to the myth of the “great” law and order, large-scale order maintenance and to tackling serious and complex crime. At best, some attention was paid to somewhat petty crime. The idea gained ground that if the police were to strive for greater effectiveness (impact on social problems), efficiency and fairness would be achieved naturally (Eck and Rosenbaum). COP arose as a criticism of the myths and parables about “real” police work and COP became a type of organisational strategy.

Rosenbaum sees the following common elements within the COP model:

- a broader definition of police work;
- a new order of priorities with more attention given to soft crime and disorder;
- a focus on problem-solving and crime prevention, rather than on incidents;
- a recognition that the community plays a crucial part in solving neighbourhood problems;
- a recognition that policing needs to be organised for this purpose;
- decentralisation of local policing;
- new training programs and new evaluations mechanisms.

Friedmann added that COP developed out of the need to improve relations between the police and the community. The fact whether COP may have arisen from within or from outside the police or from the legislator is strongly disputed. Firstly, a desire to eradicate an excessively bureaucratic (military) organisation was noticeable. In the latter style of organisation, the work was managed too centrally, special sections and specialisations were constantly on the increase, there were countless rules and regulations, and the hierarchy continued to grow, including ponderous middle management. This produced an internal chain of responsibility with formed a buffer against any external political intervention. The decision makers had centralised far too much away from the people.

In the 1970s, it was felt both within and outside the police service that the former bureaucratic organisation principles from the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century were no more valid, and that the objectives of the police, especially solving community problems were no longer being achieved. However this is not to say that there was a call to return to the strongly politicised, decentralised, informal and undifferentiated organisation of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The primary aim was to propose a new sort of professionalism, but especially a move towards democratisation in the sense that citizens would play an important part in managing the police service and police work itself, and the integration of other services. Thus the police service was too autonomous, too obstinate and too rigid, and so the COP principles were developed by the outside world.

### **Diversification of the COP-principles**

#### *1. Broken windows*

This approach, as launched by Wilson and Kelling in 1982, was actually based on the idea and conclusion that the police cannot solve many problems alone and that a good deal of public disorder actually lies at the root of a lot of crime and deviant behaviour. Indeed the broken windows thesis was that serious crime developed because the police and citizens did not work together to prevent urban decay and social disorder.

The degeneration of a residential area which is not tackled quickly soon leads to a breakdown in norms. Many problems can be avoided by taking more preventive measures. The police have often withdrawn altogether from problematic neighbourhoods.

#### *2. Zero tolerance*

The zero tolerance approach, which has been tested in New York, is associated with the mayor Giuliani and Superintendent Bratton, who also appealed to the idea of COP. Their main aim was to restore "peace" and take action against all sorts of "incivilities". For this purpose, rules and regulations had to be applied strictly and the police had to act firmly, but not necessarily judicially and repressively.

Zero tolerance includes the following ingredients:

- strict maintenance of the law against hooligans and criminals, resulting if necessary in arrests;
- greater visibility and assertiveness on account of the professionalized police service within a decentralised zone organisation and operation;
- taking advantage of greater observance of the law by citizens;
- interdisciplinary and interdepartmental approach to the problem.

Some police chiefs are full of praise for the zero base tolerance approach, despite the fact that some wonder whether the aggressive zero tolerance is beneficial as a long-term policy.

#### *3. Problem oriented policing (POP)*

H. Goldstein, generally acknowledged as the father of POP, stressed the difference between COP and POP. POP is an approach to develop crime reduction strategies. It highlights the importance of discovering the situations that produce calls for police assistance, identifying the causes which lie behind them, and designing practices to deal with these causes. POP is about a general approach: a strategy for the entire police force to encourage long-term engagement. It distances itself from incident-driven policing, a so-called fire brigade police and alludes inevitably to management by objectives. Problem solving calls for examining patterns of incidents to reveal their causes and to help plan how to deal with them proactively. This is facilitated by the computer analyses of "hot spots". One must not hesitate to tackle a wide range of social problems and maintain close relations with the local population in order to identify problems.

Police must be part of a broad system of services rather than part of the only criminal law administration. Polices must be assessed by the population: not on the basis of crime statistics, but on the basis of how they tackle problems (Eck and Spelman). Crime mapping and hot spot analysis are key concepts. POP advocates are of the opinion that with COP too much attention is paid to the means by which problems are tackled. The help of informed citizens, experts and other services must be called upon. According to Skogan the police must tackle problems and achieve results.

#### 4. *Compstat and Reassurance policing*

Compstat was only developed as a programmatic entity in 1994. In the turn of the century more of a third of the American police agencies had claimed to have implemented the programme.

#### ***Perversion of COP?***

First there is the degeneration of the concept: from maintaining order and peace in a residential area, zero tolerance is now understood to be the merciless and repressive intervention of the police. The idea regains ground that only the police can make a difference. In the final analysis, zero tolerance relies merely on a symbolism of crime control for its powers of attraction, a “meta-narrative” with symbolically powerful terms which do relate to the wishes of some sections of the population.

According to G. Kelling (the father of the broken windows theory) is the liberal left criminology establishment held prisoner by “a radical individualism”. Tolerance of what “cannot be tolerated”, has become the litmus test of true involvement in social justice. The criminological establishment refuses to recognise that poor neighbourhoods are being disrupted by disorder and irresponsible acts. Their ability to defend themselves against crime and serious disruption is thereby undermined. At the same time, this is why security policy has been put in the hands of conservatives.

Critics of the broken windows vision is all about a silent revolution within the field of criminology in which rejection of the idea that crime is the product of social circumstances is combined with a lack of interest in aetiology. It is precisely the deeper causes of crime which prevent the emergence of a social order and stability. Citizens, especially those from ethnic minorities, who are dealt with disproportionately severely for minor offences harden their attitudes towards the police and lose faith in them (Sherman). Stigmatising “troublesome” groups like the homeless certainly does not provide a structural solution.

In reality, neighbourhoods are confronted with further individualisation, social fragmentation and the blurring of social networks. Although the broken windows approach adheres to co-production policies by trying to involve communities, it endorses aggressive policing and taking back the streets. As a result, the broken windows theory tends to supplant progressive versions of COP as the dominant reform movement (Herbert).

Additionally a basic question is which communities are we serving: resident communities, work communities, travel communities, e-communities and what means community policing?

#### ***Opposition to COP***

##### *Internal opposition*

The enthusiasm amongst the official authorities and community activists for COP generates extreme suspicion amongst police officers. Police officers are not used to listening and being accountable to citizens and they think that community beat work is social work, soft policing. The initial burst of enthusiasm soon ebbed away. Middle managers are command- and control-oriented and insist that their subordinates follow the book. They are now seeing some of their authority transferred to people in the ranks. The hierarchy is being reduced and decentralised. Senior staff also fears a loss of authority, are afraid of corruption within the ranks and prefer to keep new units under their own supervision. Trade unions are also often opposed to the introduction of a COP approach.

##### *External opposition*

The public helps to determine the priorities of police work and citizens have to do things they do not like doing. It is also conceivable that the public will still be indifferent and not participate to any great extent in so-called beat meetings, especially not in problem districts.

It must also be acknowledged that the population has to be empowered to recognise and define problems and look for solutions in different terms to those of traditional police work.

##### *No unequivocally positive results.*

Neither the cooperation between police and citizens nor the citizens themselves can prevent crime. However, the evaluation researchers are of the opinion that the quality of the service is generally improving. Likewise trust in the police and relations between police and local people seem to be

improving.

Furthermore research shows that only a minority of local residents are capable of trying to solve their own problems and providing representative participation. Lower police management exerts great influence in this respect (Skogan). Reducing the fear of crime is achieved somewhat more easily.

#### *The problem notion of “community”*

Live community, work community, e-community, sport community, free time community ..... People lead fragmented lives and the connection with the neighbourhood is not so intense. Therefore a pure geographical approach is by definition incomplete. The notion of community is often presented in a normative manner: it is a whole body of norms and values that bring unity and cement society. The hegemony of the police threatens to become manifest in this respect COP ends up looking like a concept which is concentrated mainly around the police and their interests. As Van den Broeck argues, COP seems to have opened Pandora's Box involuntarily: society has become more policed.

#### *Motions of withdrawal*

In some countries local police are making motions of withdrawal, but not withdrawing completely. There is talk of national priorities, performance contracts and measurable aims. As a result, activities in the sphere of prevention may be forced out and the same applies for cooperation with other parties and participation in local safety. The ongoing core task discussions and the increasing reduction in communalisation of police work could put the local police under heavy pressure.

Nevertheless the police have to “go local” and to reassure citizens in their social environment and avoid appearing unfriendly. Reassurance policing would make it possible for local police to focus on the social environment of the citizens, close the reassurance gap and restore confidence in the police. Reassurance policing comes in for severer criticism (Crawford): neighbourhood residents often formulate needs and requirements which are emotionally charged, extremely parochial in nature, sometimes unjust, prompted by antipathy towards “others”, or often are unachievable fantasies of a sort of “absolute safety”. These critics actually point out that reassurance policing involves overkill, an expansive, proactive and visible form of police presence. The bottom line is that good policing can be equated with “minimal policing”.

Others make a plea that it is precisely in marginalised districts that forms of “maximal policing” are needed and stress that such programmes have to be applied selectively. The fact that in some countries COP was accepted by the government makes it much more difficult to switch from one police hype to the other.

#### **Is there a “correct” level of order?**

Whilst COP has already put more focus on the maintenance of order than ever before, reassurance policing does this in an even more pronounced manner. Safety and security are no longer problems related to crime and its aetiology, but are primarily problems of public order. And this problem of order is no longer the exclusive domain of the police. This, however, does not rule out the fact that the police are being increasingly equated with “those who maintain order in society”.

First and after all certain realism is called for: providing more police or more supervisors cannot prevent breaches of the peace, and those who believe the contrary believe in utopia. Secondly the community has to deploy the police as an instrument and not vice versa. And thirdly those who are favourable towards COP are still faced with a paradox: whose order does it concern? In relatively homogeneous communities, there are perhaps shared norms and shared expectations with regard to a certain form of preferred order. Within the increasingly heterogeneous communities of modern times this is not clear at all. And which communities is (and should) the police (be) focussing on: resident communities, work communities, sport communities, e-communities, etc.? Lastly the notion of public order is essentially a political concept.

In this sense, disorder policing is possibly allotted a very broad discretionary scope, within which administrative governments are given an endless ocean of possibilities and power. As long as public servants act on behalf of the general interest, this power needs not really to be a problem. However, the risk of abuse and arbitrary application lurks just around the corner. It is to be feared (Kelling and Coles) that limiting and controlling police discretion by means of guidelines is insufficient.

## **Disorder and decline in marginal neighbourhoods**

Some divide neighbourhoods lack shared understandings, normative codes and reciprocal expectations, and there is no impetus to associate with each other. Rather crime and the fear of crime are a signal or symptom for the real threat, which is social disorganisation (Van den Broeck). Residents in dilapidated neighbourhoods have a poor opinion of police and other municipal organisations and do not believe they are able to solve problems. Public professionals are faced with considerable resistance.

To break through the negative spiral of urban decay a policy is required that might restore order promptly, and might promote conditions to revitalise social life. Disorder policing is highly important to restore trust and stability: keep up every day interaction, regular school attendance, investments in shops, etc. When social order is more or less restored residents may stand up for themselves, resist unacceptable behaviour and report crime to the police. It is also relevant that representatives of disadvantaged groups and ethnic minorities are invited to cooperate, and involved in local safety policies.

### **Fighting social disorganisation**

Reassurance policing aims to rebuild neighbourhoods and to break through (Loader) the well-known patterns of “over suspicion” and “under protection” that have long characterised police relations with disadvantaged groups.

*.... Only in key neighbourhoods....*

Many proponents of reassurance policing exemplify that such far-reaching strategies should not be implemented in all areas. Implementation only seems indicated in high crime and disorder neighbourhoods where everyday public interaction is experienced as threatening, the so-called key neighbourhoods. Innes states that the concept of “situation needs” contrasts with the often unrealistic and unnecessary aspirations of community engagement.

But in neighbourhoods that suffer from social disorganisation, the police alone cannot make a difference.

*.....and through integrated safety policies....*

A policy strengthening cooperation between all relevant public organisations would require strong political coordination and support, so that each public organisation will deliver its own agenda, and would also require considerable financial injections. Concern about the “deeper causes” of crime and disorder is not superfluous! And, although facing populist rhetoric and zero tolerance strategies, local safety policies have obtained a strong social integrative function (Boutellier, Crawford).

### **A maximalist safety approach. Virtue or vice?**

Maximalist safety policies in key neighbourhoods have far-reaching implications: the police and other professionals are allocated broad tasks which could pervade everyday social life. Pragmatists think that it is a gain when prevention policies discharge or manage problem that otherwise would be relegated to the criminal justice system.

Sceptics on the other hand think that these prevention policies introduce new forms of social control, disciplining and stigmatising, and will generate new social anxieties. They also believe that intrusion in family-life, tenements and schools should be avoided to upkeep privacy and protect individuals. But the aims of “minimal policing” and “minimal prosecution” – which sound good in middle-class milieus- may easily generate maximalist control and patrol policies when the development of civil society partnerships and networks is ignored. Only a vital society may adequately reproduce moral standards and informal social control.

Reassurance policing has also to deal with its “maximalist” image, embedding the police in everyday life as the symbol of security and control, and claiming to address social anxieties. Innes called reassurance policing as a “total policing philosophy”, encompassing crime management, public order strategy, intelligence gathering, etc.

But we live a complex, rapidly changing world where exposure to and the negotiation of a panoply of

risks is now an ineradicably feature of everyday life, and profound uncertainty and insecurity are increasingly prevalent conditions.

Furthermore, Innes recognises that increasing police visibility is not always and everywhere going to have a positive influence upon public perceptions of security. Indeed, the engagement of “shock and awe” policing tactics, such as high profile raids conducted by officers in full public order kit, can raise community fears and concerns, and have a detrimental impact upon neighbourhood security.

And reassurance policing, although “maximalist” in key neighbourhoods, is fully in line with demands for democratic governance and accountable policing. So can “beat meetings” deservedly be seen as a democratic boost, and hardly as bodies which contribute to pervasive control? Police officers have to underline that not all claims of citizens are legitimate or can be acceded to. A professional police service has to deal with all sorts of people, and must beware not to forfeit its impartial position, all the more because the police may execute power and coercion during all kind of tasks, whether these relate to emergency relief, advise, correction, control or investigation. Nevertheless, the problems that are tackled in co production do vary highly in terms of situational context. The added value of the police may be characterised as its capacity to develop “living arrangements” that respond to contextual problems and citizens needs. Thus, one group of residents with specific interests points to certain problems which may not be relevant for other groups.

Of course there are many other complexities. Reassurance policing contains many (over)ambitious goals. The concept of reassurance is susceptible to “keeping up appearances”. But for the moment, findings of both Chicago policing and English reassurance policing point in favourable directions. Although the positive results of the Home Office studies might be somewhat overrated, reassurance policing seems to be promising.

### **A surveillance society?**

Technology provides a major opportunity to strengthen public service delivery and should be used to meet changing expectations of the individual and the community. Technological capabilities continue to expand, increasing our means both of generating information about ourselves and of using that information for different purposes.

Even as a society confronts its most serious threats it must protect its liberties. The fight against crime in general does not provide sufficient justification for information-sharing which might have impact on privacy. A government should not be interested in “fishing” for information about individuals. However, it should not underestimate the lure of new technological capability and new ways of sharing and matching information from a range of source, which might appear to offer benefits in the fight against crime. A distinction has to be made between the degrees of intrusion caused by the interception of communications and access to communications data. Under camera surveillance in public spaces, individuals have very little control over whether or not their images and movements are captured and over how they are stored and used. This lack of choice intensifies the obligation on camera operators and regulators to behave responsibly and to deploy surveillance technology only where it is of proven benefit in the fight against crime and where this benefit outweighs any detrimental effect on individual liberty. The continued value and popularity of CCTV depends on continued public confidence that camera operators are acting responsibly and the government, in regulating CCTV schemes, is mindful of concerns about privacy. Also the national identity register need full account of the potential of advanced privacy-enhancing technologies to reduce the amount of information it is necessary to collect in order to authenticate transactions and prevent fraud and unauthorised access. A national DNA database is a valuable investigative tool heightens the degree of responsibility borne by the government.

The risks associated with surveillance increase with the range and volume of information collected. Every system for collecting and storing data is susceptible to unauthorised access, misuse and theft. The weakest aspect of a system may be the establishment and enforcement of protocols for access and use rather than any technological safeguard. But in seeking to maximise the benefits of increased information, government’s will have to ensure that this approach is proportionate, open and transparent as there is a need to ensure the right balance between the rights of the individual and maintaining a safe, secure society.

The potential for surveillance of citizens in public spaces and private communications has increased to the extent that ours could be described as a surveillance society unless trust in the government's intentions in relation to data and data sharing is preserved.

The characterisation that we live in a surveillance society where the state is engaged in a centralised network of collecting and analysing information on the individual should be rejected. Loss of privacy through excessive surveillance erodes trust between the individual and the government and can change the nature of the relationship between citizen and state. The decision to use surveillance should always involve a publicly-documented process of weighing up the benefits against the risks, including security braches and the consequences of unnecessary intrusion into individuals' private lives.

"NeoConOpticon" is an initiative<sup>29</sup> emphasising both the central role played by the private sector in "delivering" surveillance-based security policies and the inherently neo-conservative appeal to the "defence of homeland" against threats in the domestic way of life. The convergence of these ideologies is accelerating the development of a surveillance society in Europe, enhancing the potential for governments to subject the lives of their citizens and non-citizens to incredible scrutiny, transforming the relationship between them and undermining fundamental principles of democracy. In the UK, the Government should adopt a principle of data minimisation: it should collect only what is essential, to be stored only for as long as necessary.

### III. Policing the future

Police forces will not only to become more innovative in identifying ways for future policing, and whenever possible policing the future. Basically there is need to develop a future vision and to identify future strategies, based also on a critical assessment of current strategies (see annex B).

When implementing future policing, a coherent change strategy is necessary, including:

- the creation of an innovation think tank, within the police force;
- the introduction of change agents and change strategies;
- the full commitment of and where needed direction by the police chiefs without killing innovative initiatives and creativity originated by other force members;
- follow up of best and bad practices and benchmarking;
- using landscaping models and methodologies in use within other security organisations;
- identification and study of critical future innovations impacting on police activities (e.g. RFID techniques);
- cooperation at international level;
- scientific support;
- initiatives promoting overall coherence (with partner organisations, with the authorities
- without losing contact with the population we serve.

What police organisations have to do (A. Graham, School of police studies, Canada) anyway is:

- get smarter;
- get friendlier;
- step up to the plate;
- be your own first critic: look at internal controls and adequacy;
- get ready, it's to happen again.

#### *1 Looking into the future*

Anticipating the future is a challenging process. The very nature of forecasting involves a certain risk of error. Many forecasts, predictions and ideas, will be correct; other will be wrong, either because unexpected forces emerge or because expected forecast do not materialise in the expected manner.

At the onset, it is important to note that studying the future is not merely a process designed to forecast future events (the probable future). Future research also seeks to identify a range of events and circumstances that could occur (the possible) and to make choices about events we hope will occur (the preferable, maybe even becoming a dream). Future's research seeks to answer what is going to happen, but is also seeks to consider how we can shape what is going to happen. This provides us with a much more dynamic view of that future and our ability to shape the future.

The future is not a static state. There are many possible futures and many ways in which police

---

<sup>29</sup> See: Stawatch

leaders can act to influence the future of their organisation. First, we should seek to understand the trends and forces that could influence police forces and end the way of policing. Second, we should attempt to determine which of the trends and forces are more likely to occur. Third, we can use the now available scenario study. Fourth, we should attempt to identify the future we would like to bring to fruition.

Increasingly the police will have to provide services to manage a range of public risks and threats, and the perceptions of the same are as well at neighbourhood, national as at international level. This will require them to take account of news forms of intelligence data in order to attain a "richer picture" of what problems matter to people, now and even more in the future.

## *2 Criteria*

It is not good enough to share the fact that the future is uncertain and that we all have to deal with the uncertainty: instead of the future coming to us, there is a need of looking at the future without neglecting things from the past that will catch up with you. This however forms an important starting point. It was agreed by all delegates participating in the first conference, that in order to achieve quantifiable success it is best to focus on a small number of important issues. These issues must meet a number of criteria:

- First, they must be both important and must be perceived as major issues across the world;
- In addition the topics selected must be of global calibre, relevant today, and increasingly so in the future;
- At the same time, ensure that these issues are not exclusively police concerns. Too often, the police are accused of being inward looking and overly concerned with matters pertaining to police organisations themselves. Every semblance of "navel gazing" must therefore be avoided;
- Thus the themes to be tackled must have resonance in the world, outside the confines of the police. Finally, the issues to be confronted must have the capacity to generate momentum and tap into the passion police executives have for them. In doing so the convergence between the operational measures of national police forces is essential by "pooling of sovereignty".

## *3 Look ahead rather than behind*

Despite reluctance for change, however, things will continue to change. Tomorrow's policing world will be fundamentally different than the one we know today. Both academics and police authorities have been publishing a rich variety of ideas about policing. Most available is research on the police, rarely for the police and only more recently by the police. Police leaders themselves are following mostly a chronocentric approach, indicating that what is now is better than what was before, lacking sometimes the seriousness to analyse what works and what doesn't. Too often well functioning thinking methods are getting lost.

The IALG is strongly encouraged to look ahead rather than behind. But policing the future can't be based on only current present security developments. We know that crime and police work is and will be influenced by globalisation, leading to new forms of criminality and a high sophisticated crime culture. A basic question is: what is the potential of current strategies and plans in order to be sufficiently prepared in handling future possible scenarios and what is more needed in order to ensure sufficient creativity and adaptability?

It is very clear that the police stand at the dawn of a fundamental shift in the way in which public and quasi public places are policed, with significant implications for styles of policing, community engagement, civic renewal, social inclusion and citizenship. Today's and future police strategies need to have a certain "fit" with structures and processes of modern society. In appendix B an overview is provided how different professors in the world are experiencing these shifts and strategies.

As a profession, policing has a choice: it can attempt to understand and prepare for the future or it can remain more or less as it has, with perhaps a few new toys. One way offers hope, the other leads to sure irrelevance. The preferred path forward seems obvious. Therefore landscaping future public policing is not only useful, but necessary. Mapping (future) policing should be based on environmental scan and mapping (future) threats and risks.

## *4 Using the 2020 scenarios*

We should start on the basis of the existing 2020 scenarios. This can involve back casting based on

normative scenarios<sup>30</sup>, unlike explorative scenarios.<sup>31</sup> This doesn't exclude that we will have to develop new scenarios and to operate concept mapping<sup>32</sup>, but then by further developing some of the key issues from the previous scenario study 2020. Not all the items identified to get a particular focus, need a scenario approach and for some of them there are other ways to come to the expected outcome by the police chiefs attending the 2009 *Pearls in Policing* conference. Let us look at the different topics mentioned in the assignment in more detail.

#### 1) Public or private policing

It is clear that fear and concern about (local) safety are increasingly influenced by wider, global insecurities and generic risks. Police services feel more and more that they lack both the legal powers and the manpower to deal with this. Certain businesses, organisations and sections of the wider public have lost confidence in the capacity of the police to deliver an effective community-based presence via local police officers. Agents from numerous sectors in the field of law enforcement have become significant players in their own right. A danger is of this is that policing might become de-coupled from an overarching sense of public good and degenerate into a selective police that weaves particular interests of specific power groups. In other words: a shift away from public policing to private policing, and thus policing for some and not for all.

Private policing is developing fast. Therefore there is a need to first identify what is the core business of public police forces, to identify the universal and overarching core role and tasks of the police and to what extent should police strive to "monopolise" (some) of these tasks? Some police chiefs are of the opinion that all what can be done by the police should be done by the police. There is also an urgent need to strengthen what we think the identity of the police in a globalising world should be. Of course there is a need to build on regularity coherence and cooperation between jurisdictions, industry bodies and private police organisations and with communities of interest to promote equitability, network integrity, interoperability, e-government and e-government networks. More emphasis on cross-jurisdictional relationships is necessary.

Here we can easily scan existing studies on this subject and it might be possible to show already existing scenario studies on this specific item. One idea could be that the IALG scenario exercise of this year develops specific scenarios for public or private policing in 2020 based on the previous scenario study: e.g. which scenarios for public/private policing are possible in a "big brother world" or in a "jungle situation". An additional question is: to what extent is the police capable to influence the future balance between public and private policing.

#### 2) Police leadership

According to Long (2003) leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena in the world. Police leaders are under threat nowadays and some of them are even in trouble. As a result and in line with the scenario approach, there is a special demand for renewed scrutiny of police leadership and effective management.

A more explorative approach could be appropriate in order to identify the type of leadership we need for each scenario 2020. An important question closely linked to the leadership question is 'what kind of police do you have in the different 2020 scenarios'? Once these different police models are identified, it will be easier to study the required leadership requirements for each of the scenarios. So the main questions are: what type of leaders do we need and what can be done in order to optimise their career path as an important element of continuous organisational development.

Leadership in policing is often discussed, but seldom focused usefully toward the future. The police service of the future must allow and support opportunity management. It must develop tailor-made leadership and management. Police leaders should facilitate tailored approaches to different types of crime and incidents and different offenders and be prepared to handle the

---

<sup>30</sup> When a single desirable end state is specified and back casting creates a sequence of events from their structure end state backwards in time, usually to the present.

<sup>31</sup> Seek to look forwards, into the future, to explore a range of scenarios that describe future uncertainties.

<sup>32</sup> In the UK (SOCA) is using concept mapping to help understand complexity in the environment, with multiple variables and uncertain directions of causality.

unexpected. Flexibility and adaptively will be key assets in the future of the police. During the last IALG seminar in Australia, Professor P. in 't Hart made a distinction between:

bureaucratic leadership	charismatic leader
entrepreneurs	despotic leadership

A useful distinction can be made between leadership in terms of organisational processes involving more management assignments, tasks and responsibilities and operational leadership. Several police chiefs excel in management skills, but do not always show the required leadership.

A key challenge for police organisations is modern leadership. Modern leadership requires a learning attitude and strategy and the development of future leaders in any police force will require continuous learning. There is a growing need for executive "reflective practitioners" throughout the world to search for new ideas, realities, risks, threats and opportunities. Leadership is about anticipating challenges. Therefore, police leaders must be able to "think outside the box" and be comfortable with the contradictions and pressures of late modern society. They must be able to think global but act local at the same time. They must have a grasp of international law enforcement and how the local affects the global and vice versa. There is a need for leaders rather than managers. Leadership requires vision but also the realisation that small steps all the time are sometimes more realistic than big revolutionary reforms. Occasionally you have to be tough, sometimes you have to be lenient en flexible; some times, you need to deploy concrete measures yourself, at other times you need to direct and connect people. This requires complex and dynamic sets of skills, stimulation of scenario-thinking, new ideas, creative thinking, discussions and imagination. Therefore, the police chiefs need to not only analyse the current situation, but also anticipate future developments.

Police leaders have to act in their authorising environment, but there are two somewhat divergent pathways upon which police leadership could travel. In the first, leadership that focuses on decision making through intelligence and information management might place technology and analytical skills as the highest order. In the second, leadership that focuses on the interpersonal element of policing might place people skills as the highest order. These divergent paths may or may not be mutually exclusive, but may also argue for a shift from hierarchy to networked structures for police organization. These paths should be studied in respect of the scenarios 2020.

It is also clear that agencies will need to be looking for recruits who are capable of developing strategic leadership, forward thinking, a learning attitude and a bias toward change, and willingness to take calculated risks. The present focus on management and administration in steep hierarchies must yield to a focus on leadership in team environments. What are needed are appropriate skills such as sense of innovation, creativity, trust, sense for accountability, defensibility and out of the box thinking. Rewarding doesn't seem to be the essence.

Change readiness, change management, change preparedness and change capabilities are key success factors.

### 3) Values

Policing involves the exercise of power. Policing by its very nature is a contested job carried out in sometimes troublesome situations. Norms and values are considered to be very important. The topic of values has been very much welcomed during all *Pearls in Policing* meetings so far. Also the Royal Patron, Mr. Pieter van Vollenhoven has indicated to pay attention to this topic during his speech for 2009. The common bond or culture of policing is an important factor in effective and responsible policing.

The rationality principle is a kind of public mental super-ego, surrounded by a lot of emotions, values, makes –belief and plain self-interests, which come to the fore as soon as they get connected to perception of threats and related fears. Therefore best police values are to be studied and evaluated and it is useful to study what do the IALG participants identify as needed, expected or required global police values looking at the 2020 scenarios?

The scenario study makes clear that (re-)new(-ed) values such as ethics, availability, transparency, accountability and legitimacy are key success factors in modern policing and formal control will go down. Centrally national values are likely to weak and some classic and new values will be reinforced: freedom, justice, fundamental rights, integrity, and solidarity. Interesting is to list changing perceptions, beliefs, values and attitudes as also resulting from the scenario approach:

- increasing social freedom and more choice for the individual;
- increasing standard of education literary, and more widespread education;
- increasing deferment of politics and institutions;
- growth of individual values at the decline of traditional values: more enforcement for the individual;
- more stress of the individual;
- shifting social structures: decline of the family and increasingly remote (virtual) communities;
- continuing importance of the media and shaping perception;
- declining feelings of national identity;
- growing interest for integrity and ethics;
- greater focus on credibility and reliability;
- a more dynamic and proactive required attitude;
- dialogue based cooperation;
- innovative leadership and coaching;
- greater international focus on availability and solidarity;
- democratic enforcement and renewed sense of legitimacy;
- privacy swapping away by “digital tsunami” and by the surveillance state.

Some authorities think that privacy will be less valuable in the future. Old and new democracies are very much concerned with respect of human rights by police services. Police are accountable for both their outcomes and how they achieve them (both internal and external). It is not enough to say: I’m accountable. There is political accountability for elected official who carry policing matters in their portfolio and are answerable in parliament; There is accountability for partners working together to reduce crime and maintain public order; There also is or there should be accountable directly to citizens. But it is also expected that the security-industrial nexus will bring more and more technology, and less values and morality drive changes.

#### 4) Generational change

By even the most conservative estimates, the world in 2020 will look much different than the world of today. On a global scale, it is expected that world population will increase between now and 2020; the rate of increase, however will slow from the current rate, primarily as a result of disease in the third world and lower fertility rates in developed nations. In fact, many experts believe that demographic changes in the next ten years will dramatically differ between first and third world societies. In the former, native born populations will continue to age through better medical care and improved diet and lifestyles. This, in turn, will necessitate an influx of labour that may well be provided by regions experiencing youth bulges (e.g., the Middle East and Africa). By and large, it is expected that richer countries will continue to prosper while the poorer ones will fall deeper into poverty. The factionalism, war, and religious and social strife that disproportionately afflicts the poorest countries will only exacerbate this situation.

Friedman (2000) notes that globalisation will likely be the most pervasive global influence for the first part of the 21st century. The global economy will continue to profoundly affect the manner in which individuals, companies, and nation-states do business. It must be remembered, however, that in many endeavours where there are winners, and there are also losers. The winner in the next several years may be the global economy itself, which is projected to grow to record proportions (National Intelligence Council 2004). If that is the case, the big loser will likely be the nation-state.

In conclusion, we could explore studies of existing demographic 2020 scenarios and select the study fitting the best with the existing scenarios 2020 as worked out by the previous IALG and look at the to be expected implications for future policing.

#### 5) Future police work force

The futurist respondents expect significant changes in personnel recruitment and selection. As we face far more competition from the private sector, both for recruiting and service delivery, we will need to modernize our human resources processes. Recruiting must concentrate more on the “eyebrows up” than on physical traits, since policing will become an information management profession. We know a fair amount about the effects of training and education. In general, the better the training and the more education, the better the cop.

A key challenge for ever-changing police organisations is without any doubt workforce. As police organisations are not so frequently in change, but because policing will develop dramatically in the future the key question is: who are our future police officers? This is often discussed in terms of diversity. But there is more: futuristic human resource management includes items such as attraction, retention, ageing workforce, mobility, skill development and retention. It is frequently said that the police service should resemble the society it polices. The service should be gender balanced and welcome members from all faiths, ethnic backgrounds and strata. But there more: police members need specific skills, values and attitude fitting with future changes. In addition, a sustained effort is required to make sure that those recruited remain in the service, feel at home within the police and are offered the chance to develop themselves and receive career development opportunities, without excluding mobility ensuring the fact the new member join in the force when as appropriate. In that regard diversity is not so much about numbers per se, but more about occupational culture and attitude.

Based of the existing scenarios 2020, and taking into account available future oriented police HRM strategies, also this topic could very well serve for a scenario study for this IALG group. Workers in the near future will have to function effectively within increasingly virtual and fluid organizations. While technical and professional knowledge, skills, and abilities will continue to be important, even more important will be adaptive capacity

#### 6) Impact of “wildcard” events

Futurists describe a wild card event as a low probability, high impact event. Very unlikely to happen, but if it does you won't forget it soon. Wild cards have the power to completely upset many things and radically change many people's thinking and planning. We all carry around in our heads many unconscious forecasts about what we expect to happen in the future. When something happens that does not match these unconscious forecasts, we experience surprise. Commissioner Khoo from Singapore suggested paying attention to the impact of 'wild card' (black swan) events.

#### 7) Police planning process

In today's increasingly networked world with its underlying information technology the bureaucracy once necessary to control and coordinate human actions can be increasingly eliminated. Debates rage over the extent to which traditional bureaucracies will ever be entirely transformed to networks that are more open but over the next fifteen years, it is likely that a range of hybrid organizations will emerge with increasing levels of network centrality and less centralized bureaucracy.

As hierarchies become more dysfunctional, the chain of command will lose its grip on both the line and mid-managers. There will be increased organisational transparency and fewer secrets. New principles would apply to all areas where closer relations are possible: police organisations, practices, equipment and legal frameworks + to further legal harmonisation so that “obstacles “to gathering, accessing and transferring data and intelligence are removed.

By 2020 there simply will be too much seemingly disparate information flowing from the thousands or millions of randomly scattered digital nodes and stored within millions of decentralized databanks to make sense of it, or even be aware of all the data that is available using traditional methods. Getting the most from available information is one of the biggest

challenges facing us today and into the future. Creating the tools for *information fusion* – the acquisition of data from many sources, the integration of these data into usable and accessible forms, and their interpretation (Hennessy, Patterson and Lin, 2003) – such as data mining is essential to future law enforcement success. The corporate world, the healthcare industry, the military and others are all facing the same onrush of data and are actively developing ways to handle new demands and opportunities. Law enforcement could benefit greatly from these developments but we must ensure special emphasis is placed on security of the information and protection of privacy.

One area of development is focused on improving the flow of information between humans and machines. We have available to us much more data than we can assimilate, particularly through the traditional means of reading text from a computer monitor. Improving the human-machine interface is critical to using information in more productive and useful ways. One of those ways has already been mentioned, Augmented reality technology, overlaying digital information on our real-world view. There are other technologies that will take the human-machine interface even farther and speed the flow of information between a network centric organization cannot be achieved simply by the application of new technology to current police structures and methodologies. To occur, network centric policing will need new organisational structures based upon human social networks that are facilitated by information technology, a streamlined and unified structure that comes from the greatly increased ability to exchange information in real-time.

Before a network centric model of policing can be developed the law enforcement community has to choose to work together in more positive and productive ways. The existing barriers between law enforcement organizations today, as well as barriers between the police, other public safety and public service professions and the public, are the result of choices made by the police themselves. The cultures within many departments still tend to foster attitudes of exclusivity, superiority, and independence through bureaucratic rules, regulations, policies, and training that perpetuate organisational stove pipes and impede broad communication and deep collaboration across organisational, jurisdictional, governmental, and professional boundaries.

The RCMP Task Force has observed a number of attitudes and values that affect the way in which individual police decisions are made. Principles providing guidance for making the determination about where authority for any particular decision should reside are:

- delegation of authority and decision making must take into account a reasonable assessment of the risks involved while recognising that not all risks will be apparent;
- decisions must be made in accordance with thoroughly considered and approved policies and protocol;
- the line of accountability must be clear and unequivocal;
- a recognition that from time errors in judgement may occur;
- when reasonable errors do occur, they should be treated as a learning opportunity for the individual and not as a reason to increase the bureaucracy around the decision making process or to move the decision making process or to move the decision making authority to a more senior level;
- where a pattern of errors occurs, the policies should be reviewed to determine their adequacy and/or the individual responsible should be provided with remedial training/assistance.

Reinventing the way police officers interact and organise is critical to effectively using information in the future. Policing is undergoing a fundamental shift from being a reactive, routinised process (fill out the proper forms and move on to the next call for service) to becoming an information-driven, analysis-dependent problem solving enterprise. New forms, models and systems of international, regional and national interaction may arise. Evocation of rationality, namely, “evidence informed or evidence aware policy” or “knowledge based policy making” is a key issue. An integrated strategic approach to international interaction will be fundamental. It will be more and more important that policing decisions are evidence based if they are to be as effective as possible. In policing discourse, this means that their actions should be informed by intelligences, where the latter is understood as information that when analysed provides insight into some future situation and how to act in respect of it. The Signal

Crimes Perspective (SPC) and its associated conceptual frameworks, methodologies and processes afford a way of understanding from the point of view of the public, what incidents influence perceptions and experiences of security. An approach that is unresponsive to citizen needs and that is concerned with the whole range of issues that impact upon public conceptions of security is not inherently inimical to the kinds of disciplined and systematic approach to service delivery operationalised under the doctrine of intelligence-led policing and problem-oriented policing. Through the auspice of “intelligence models”, intelligence has become an important driver of police decision-making in respect of many social problems, although its limitations and constraints are increasingly manifest. More recently increasing interest has been shown in the concept of community intelligence and systematic community engagement.

In my opinion the police have to further develop and invest more in knowledge, research and exchange but there is also an obvious need for realism, rationalisation, simplification, deepening instead of broadening and reducing bureaucracy. Our current organisational structures, bureaucracies and methodologies, with or without technology, are vestiges of the industrial age and largely incompatible with an increasingly networked world. Planning processes depend on what the construct of the police could be and about the proofing of police professionalism. It is a challenge to move away from a bureaucratic style of organisation: less bean counting, more creativity; less focus on structure, more focus on content; less focus on meeting targets, more focus on achieving excellence.