

Owing to shortage of space, the following article will be printed in two parts — part one appears below and part two will be printed in our next edition — ED.

# DO POLICE FIGHT CRIME?

## PART ONE

by CHRISTINE F. LIDGARD B.A.

At the time of presenting this paper to the ACPC Biennial Conference in Melbourne, the author was Senior Constable C.F. Lidgard of the Queensland Police. She was, and remains, well qualified in her subject. After commencing her secondary schooling as one of the first students of McGregor State High School, she completed her secondary education at the Queensland Police Academy. After entering the Force, she completed a Diploma of Police Arts and Science at the Brisbane College of Technical and Further Education. Later again, she was awarded a Bachelor of Arts at the University of Queensland. Indeed, academic study has become a habit with her as she is nearing the completion of the work to entitle her to become a Master of Social Science.

She spent more than sixteen years in the Police Force. She had many and



varied duties including seven years in traffic operations. Her last four years was spent as research officer in the legal section of the Queensland Police Department. Her primary research was in police health and in the quality of police work life. She also did studies for the Department on such matters as Aids, Hepatitis B and stress de-briefing.

For the last six months, Mrs. Lidgard (for she is married) has been working in the Division of Accident Prevention. Her brief now is, broadly, the health and welfare of all of Queensland's workers. She works in the Council's Secretariat on Inter-government Services.

Her paper is interesting and informative. She does point out that the remarks presented in it are her sole responsibility and that, except where expressly stated, her remarks are not to be taken as a statement of policy or practise in the Queensland Department.

Firstly, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Organising Committee for inviting me to present a paper at this Conference. Since I was initially invited to offer a police perspective on the theme of this Conference in July, 1987, I have found this theme: **Crime: Preventable or Inevitable**, a challenging and thought provoking selection. It has stimulated much discussion between my husband and I, as well as amongst various of my colleagues. The purpose of my paper today, is to present **one police officer's perspective**. I emphasise this point, since my analysis suffers from the incompleteness of my limited experience of policing. Nevertheless, I believe that at least, the following points should encourage thoughtful discussion of the issues raised by the conference theme, in the context of Australian policing.

### WHY THIS TITLE?

It seems to me timely to address the first part of the theme, by returning to first principles and testing that most basic of assumptions, hence the title of my paper: **Do police fight crime?** Some of my colleagues would probably respond to this title by saying, something like: "She has been in policing 16 years and still doesn't know what we do." It is my belief that the crises presently confronting many Australian police departments can only be addressed by thoughtful reflection and analysis of the fundamentals of our role as police officers and organisations. The need for such a philosophical re-evaluation to many presently serving members, who have for so long worked in response oriented organisations, such as policing is something that does not come easily, but is in my opinion, long overdue and needs to be on-going, after the first, sometimes painful undertaking.

To begin, some of this thoughtful reflection that I am calling for, I have undertaken within this paper, to present a crude, preliminary analysis of my investigations to date. My analysis, although as yet incomplete represents the synthesis of many ideas, that I have been exposed to during my sixteen years of participant observation of policing and most intensely, in the four years plus, that I have been

involved in conducting research, developing policies and strategic planning for the Queensland Police Department. It was during my first exposure to strategic or corporate planning in 1987, that focused my thinking, about the true mission of policing, within my own Department. Although my intense focus was on the Queensland situation, I attempted to find illumination by considering historical as well as the perspectives of other Australian Police Departments, other public sector organisations and even some police organisations beyond our shores.

### MY OWN JOURNEY

When I was initially asked to serve on strategic planning committees, especially in the personnel areas, I was presented with a number of documents, some of which were drawn from the **Savage Report** [1]. One of the Savage recommendations was for each public sector department in Queensland to produce a corporate plan. Amongst the other documents, I found something similar to Figure 1. When you examine this figure, you will probably notice, as did I, the disparity between the mission statement or statement of purpose in this instance, goals and objectives. I asked the secretary overseeing the development of the corporate plan, if we could firstly rectify this disparity and then we could proceed more effectively. I was simply told that the contents of that document were not negotiable. I am happy to say that since that time, this document has indeed been the subject of considerable revisions. However in the interim period, I was asked to develop an alternative document. I found this very puzzling, as I believed, perhaps too idealistically, that the mission of any organisation must be something shared by all, or at least the majority of employees, regardless of their status within that organisation. Furthermore, it should not only be developed by reference to internal expertise, but also the client group serviced by that organisation. After some months of wrestling with the issues involved in such a restructuring, I attended a co-strategies committee meeting and found that I was not alone in my struggle with resolving these inconsistencies. I

## DO POLICE FIGHT CRIME?

participated in an inter-departmental personnel practitioners working party covering most Queensland public sector organisations and found that many of these people had been undertaking similar exercises for their respective organisations. After lengthy discussions with both groups, it was agreed, that in the same way, our organisations should develop better individual performance reviews; we should, in this era of increasing emphasis on public sector accountability also undertake similar activities for our organisations, as a whole. Bearing in mind that the most effective individual performance reviews require a top-down, bottom-up and lateral collection of reviewing data on the subject. We attempted an application of this model within an organisation-wide context, we initially proposed that our most senior managers consider a retreat for them to "thrash out" any revisions of their organisation's mission statements, etc. I am sorry to say, that to the best of my knowledge, such an exercise was never undertaken by senior Queensland police managers. But my search for similar exercises was being facilitated by a visitor to the Queensland Police Department (2).

### THE JOURNEY OF OTHERS

I feel sure that Professor Caiden won't object, if I retell and enjoin a couple of his illustrations of just such an exercise that he undertook with senior Israeli police administrators. Caiden, in his consultancy role insisted on a retreat aimed at a top-down analysis of their organisation's mission.

He asked the group to consider a simple question: "What does your Department do?" The senior managers moved into a syndicate session and after some time returned with this response: "We fight crime". They were asked to reconsider and once more returned with: "We fight crime", as their consensual response. By the third round, they were beginning to mutter amongst themselves, but in an attempt to be compliant, they expanded their mission from "We fight crime" to "We fight crime and help people".

It now came to be Caiden's turn to earn his fee, he started by working backwards. To paraphrase him, you claim that you help people. You may remember that my research team has been taping and analysing incoming telephone requests for police assistance at one of your stations. Amongst those calls came three regarding the same incident, the first two calls went along these lines; Woman — "My husband's beating me up"; Police Officer — "Do you want to press charges, Madam?"; Woman — "No"; Police Officer — "Sorry madam, we can't help you". The third phone call did not come from the woman, but her neighbours, since she was dead in her front yard. A tragic story, because you did not help that woman and she is now dead.

You claim that you fight crime, what about privacy? Is privacy a crime? Yes, but it's not in our jurisdiction. Ah, so you fight some crime, or is that selected crime?

(Now holding their own Department's equivalent to their Annual Report in his hand,) if you fight crime, by your own assessment you have lost the war.

Needless to say, this seemingly simple exercise was turned into something rather harrowing, that is making the discovery that an organisation of their size was operating, without clarity of mission, even amongst the most senior managers.

### SOME OF OUR HISTORY

For Australian policing, the lessons of our history can bring with them some renewed understanding of our true mission. "In early societies, (families and sometimes) the whole community was responsible for apprehending law breakers. A breach of tribal law was a threat to everyone and each individual had a duty to intercept offenders ...

The term police is derived from the Greek **polis**, meaning 'city state'. Policing once referred to all non-ecclesiastical administration. Only in comparatively recent times has it been associated with law and order. The Greek **politeia**, like the Roman **politia** meant 'the art of governing the city'" (p. 4)[3].

In ancient Roman times, the militia carried out police duties, which included "keeping the population loyal to the government

and under control (rather than combating crime)". Vigiles were the non-military police forces formed by Emperor Augustus for "keeping the peace and fighting fires in Rome" (p. 4) [3].

By the eleventh century, Anglo-Saxon society had developed "a tithing system to maintain order. (Herein) every adult male had to belong to a tithing or group of 10, each member of which was responsible for the others' behaviour. The groups were obliged to bring offending members before a court and each would pay part of any fine.

Later, a head tithing man was appointed to act as an unpaid policeman. He was supported by the community and responsible for the ... pursuit of criminals.

By the thirteenth century, the office of tithing man was replaced by that of constable. The constable was elected by his neighbours for one year (however, increasingly) the position was not a popular one, as it involved many duties for no reward and often incurred the hostility of offenders.

The Watch was implemented in England and France to protect people in growing towns. (Unfortunately,) the Watch were amateurs and no match for (the) rogues and ... they became a target for satire.

Nonetheless, constables and the Watch did increase security. Relatively few people were convicted and English authorities imposed harsher penalties as a crime deterrent.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the system of policing in England remained much as it had been in the Middle Ages.

Cromwell, however, made use of military police to achieve his political aims and enforce laws relating to morality. Although his methods were efficient in suppressing crime, they were brutal and led to a general distrust of organised police forces. With the restoration of the monarchy, the old system was re-established.

Lawlessness reached a peak in eighteenth century England. Organised gangs terrorised London streets, highwaymen plagued the roads and riots resulted in mob violence and looting. Unemployment and an increase in the population of towns as a result of the Agricultural and Industrial Revolutions led to further crime" (p. 4)[3].

It is likely to be well known to a group such as yourselves, that the roots of modern policing can be traced from 1748, when Henry Fielding, author and magistrate, who formed the Bow Street Runners (3). Followed in 1829, by the formation of the Metropolitan Police which is often "defined as the customary threshold" (p. 12) [4]. By way of analysis, Allan K. McDougall has argued: "... to unravel the ancestry of modern policing (you must make) reference to two major variables — the state and the community. Only when one recognises the place of agents of social control in the context of state power and community tolerance can one understand the traditional role of the constabulary and other peace officers. That evolution (has produced) the confused traditions which we have inherited and which form the substance of the police mandate today" (p. 10) [4]. He continued that within the history of policing: "the use of state power preserve the peace thus has a constant theme of protecting the structures of governing and the fundamentals of commerce" (p.12) [4].

### WHAT IS THE POLICE MANDATE?

Following that albeit brief historical analysis, let us now return to that vexed issue of the present police mandate, drawing firstly from the North American perspective, before moving back into the Australian context. "Cardinal Carter of Toronto defined the police role as 'guardians of life', (while at the nearby) University of Toronto, Richard Ericson ... concluded that the job of the police was to 'reproduce order'" (p.12) (4). Yet "since the 1940's (policing has) become less personal and more law enforcement oriented" (p. 13)[4]. The Task Force on Policing in Ontario suggested:

Modernization of policing ... has shifted the role of policing from that of **peace officer** to that of **law officer**. The change has taken place at the point of contact between police officer and citizen. It is characterised by a reduction in personal contact... between the

# DO POLICE FIGHT CRIME?

citizen and his policeman (or policewoman and) is characterized by a greater emphasis on law enforcement than on the service aspects of police work (p. 13) [5].

"Over the last decade, students of policing (such as) G.L. Kelling and James Q. Wilson [6] (have) reflected a new concern for integrating the police with the community in contrast to the pendulum swing to impersonal policing" (p. 13) [4]. In Australian policing, "the implications of this addition to the traditional police mandate of the maintenance of order and law enforcement are closer linkages to the community, a more open management style, and the continual redefinition of police objectives so that they reflect social change (7)" has become evident since the early 1980's (pp. 12-13) [4].

## SOME POSSIBLE ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES

Before discussing the Australian outcomes to date, let us reconsider some of the theoretical underpinnings. As I have previously mentioned, I would propose the use of sound individual performance review strategies to assist senior police managers in working through the bureaucratic maze, so that they could gradually build up a proper organisational performance review by consulting: (1) with the top-down sources, themselves and their political masters; (2) the bottom-up interest groups, namely the public they serve and their own employees; and (3) laterally, by conferring with other public sector and police organisations. I would also simultaneously propose the consideration of a marketing model. You may wonder how marketing theory could have a place in improving police management strategies, but consider the definition of marketing provided by Kotler et al: "Marketing is human activity directed at satisfying needs and wants through exchange processes" (p. 7) [8]. It is my contention, that policing is a human activity directed at satisfying the needs of the public that each police officer swears on oath to serve. What's more, most modern marketing theories place the client or customer, as the central focus, this will be discussed along with the other key issues of: (1) product; (2) place; (3) promotion; and (4) price radiating from this central focus (see Figure 2) [9]. Essentially, I have been drawing on the fundamentals of a marketing and private sector orientation espoused in Bob Ansett's most recent book, **The Customer**: "... an overdue look at business's most important person" [10] into a public sector and in particular, the policing context.

## WHAT DO POLICE ACTUALLY DO?

Furthermore, I would contend that the principal product offered by police organisations is service, which should be directed at satisfying the needs of our client public. Sandler and Mintz have argued that in the USA, since the 1960's:

It (has been) recognised that 80-90 percent of (police) work is not directly related to law enforcement. Rather, it consists of helping services and order maintenance. Police represent the first line of government when dealing with personal emotional crises of individual citizens. They provide aided services, make referrals, maintain peace and order, and provide short term solutions to insoluble social problems (p. 460) [11].

Within the Australian context, Paul Wilson has analysed the nature of Brisbane operational policing tasks and found that at least 50 per cent of their tasks comprised a human service, with a further 20 per cent for peace keeping or order maintenance activities compared with less than 30% of tasks fitting the law enforcement model (p. 102) [12]. If then these are the realities of operational policing, why do some Australian police departments present a quite different mix of law enforcement to human service training? [cf. 13].

Having given considerable space to the issue of product from policing, either historically or more recently, the next radiating arm to be considered is place. In Queensland, following the "leaking" of sections of the Andersen Report [14] to the media, there were lengthy published debates about the merits of closing down some no longer economically viable police stations. This enterprise has

long been recommended by my Department's Management Services Branch, but has never apparently made it 'past first base' politically, in spite of hearty support on economic grounds. I would be willing to suggest, if this marketing model were adopted, with our client group, the public placed centrally in our management of police services, then realities of pricing for such services, in particular places could be promoted to our client group. The Australian public already contributes through their tax burden, something approaching two billion Australian dollars per annum [15] for the services of between 37,000 [15] and 40,000 [16] police personnel, depending on whose data you rely upon.

## Some present mission statements for Australian police organisations

Let us now consider what it is that the taxpayer is receiving for their large investment, by firstly examining the mission or goal statements of the majority of Australian police organisations. Where only objectives were available these are outlined in their stead. (p. 15) [17]. Figure 3 includes similar data from overseas police organisations.

## Australian Federal Police

### Role

The Australian Federal Police (AFP) is the principal law enforcement body of the Commonwealth Government. It is required to respond to Government initiatives in law enforcement and to counter the increasing number of offences against Commonwealth law ...

The broad statutory functions of the AFP, as prescribed in section 8 of the Australian Federal Police Act 1979, are:

- the provision of police services in the ACT;
- the provision of police services in the relation to the laws of the Commonwealth and the property of the Commonwealth;
- the safeguarding of Commonwealth interests; and
- to do anything incidental or conducive to the performance of the foregoing functions.

### Objectives and Priorities

"... the objectives in order of priority are:

- a. Drug Trafficking. To increase the effectiveness and scope of investigations into drug trafficking ...
- b. Organised Crime. To increase the effectiveness and scope of investigations into organised crime.
- c. Large scale fraud against Commonwealth revenue. To maintain an appropriate capability to investigate large scale fraud ...
- d. Specific references from Government (for example corruption). To maintain a capability to respond quickly to Government directions to investigate specific matters, often of a sensitive nature.
- e. ACT policing. To provide ... an effective and efficient police service within the ACT ...
- f. Commonwealth responsibilities. To maintain the necessary capacity ... Commonwealth's particular national and international responsibilities ...
- g. Coastal surveillance. To maintain — and enhance as resources become available — an efficient coastal surveillance and response capability.
- h. Counter-terrorism. To maintain an appropriate level of counter-terrorism capability ..." (pp. 1-2) [18].

## New South Wales Police Mission

"To provide for, and with the assistance of the people a high quality, ethical and cost effective Police Service in New South Wales as defined by the Parliament, Government and relevant legislation, including —

1. Protecting life
2. Preventing crime
3. Enforcing law
4. Maintaining peace and good order
5. Safeguarding property

## DO POLICE FIGHT CRIME?

6. Facilitating safe and free movement of people and traffic  
To perform all these functions with impartiality and integrity and engender a feeling of safety and security within the community" (in the Preface pages to) [19].

### Queensland Police Mission statement (or purpose)

"The purpose of the Police Department is to contribute to the security and well being of people in Queensland by working cooperatively with the public and within the frame work of the law.

#### Statement of Departmental Goals

To ensure that the purpose is fulfilled, the following goals have been defined. They reflect the major functions of various areas of the Department.

1. To ensure, wherever and whenever possible, the safety and protection of the public and its property.
2. To enforce the law judiciously and fairly.
3. To encourage the public to accept its responsibility in the overall policing role.
4. To develop and maintain information bases which will help guide police strategems, policy and operations" (pp. 2-3) [20].

### South Australian Police

"To provide a service in South Australia for the protection of life and property, the maintenance of law and order, the prevention and detection of crime, and assistance to the public in circumstances of personal emergency" (p. 18) [21].

### Victoria Police

#### Philosophy

The police are part of the community and act for the community in maintaining law and order. Each member of the Victoria Police carries the responsibilities and privileges attached to the office of constable, which is one of honour and dignity. Its origin dates from antiquity and its history is bound up with the historical development of peace, order and good government in England.

Maintaining a high standard of peace and order in the community depends to a great extent upon the loyalty, dedication, intelligence, integrity and courage of members of the Police Force.

The functions of the Victoria Police Force are to:

- (i) protect life and property
- (ii) preserve the peace
- (iii) prevent crime
- (iv) enforce legislation
- (v) help those in need of assistance.

These are responsibilities of all police, but modern policing also requires a social contact between police and the community and the active co-operation and support of the public.

Police must be aware of the changing nature of society, so that Force goals are consistent with society's goals. Police should contribute their expertise to debate on social changes, to ensure that debate serves the public interest.

A police force is drawn from the community, so its members should be representative of that community.

The Victoria Police serves society 24 hours a day, not just to enforce the law. The Force is the only agency which is always available to protect life and safeguard property, to care for the weak, the sick, the helpless, the socially disadvantaged and the homeless, to comfort the injured and distressed, or those in trouble of any kind, to search for those reported missing, and help those who are in trouble or need of advice.

In the process, police are expected to exercise discretion and to exhibit qualities of intelligence, integrity and dedication, commonsense, courtesy, compassion and courage — both moral and physical" (p. 10) [22].

### Western Australia Police Mission

"To preserve the peace within the community of Western Australia. ('Peace meaning the Queen's peace, that is, the preservation of law and order' (p. 18) [17].)

#### PRIMARY FUNCTIONS

To assist in upholding the mission, three primary objectives have been determined.

- To protect life and property
- To prevent crime or detect and prosecute offenders against those laws which confer duties, powers or authority upon members of the Western Australia Police Force.
- To maintain and improve close police/community relationships" (p. vii) [23].

Unfortunately, I was unable to locate similar data from either the Northern Territory or Tasmania Police. Even so the comparative analysis possible from that available, at least to me emphasises our links with the past. On reading these mission/objective statements, I am reminded of the Oath of Office that I swore to on joining the Queensland Police Department, which reads as follows:

I, (FULL NAMES INCLUDED) swear by Almighty God

That I will well and truly serve

Our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second

And Her heirs and successors

According to law

In the office of constable

Or in such other capacity

As I may be hereafter appointed

Promoted, or reduced, without favour or affection,

Malice or ill-will, from this day forward

And until I am legally discharged,

That I will see and cause Her Majesty's peace

To be kept and preserved,

And that I will prevent

To the best of my power

All offences against the same;

And that while I shall continue

To be a member of the Police Force of Queensland

I will

To the best of my skill and knowledge

Discharge all the duties

Legally imposed upon me

Faithfully and according to law

— So help me God

This leads me to question, as to whether these mission statements indicate the present or future directions of Australian police organisations or focus principally on our past? The contents of Figure 3 may reflect something of our future possible directions. Therein are three North American police organisations' mission statements that contain elements that I found personally appealing.

These three are: Halton Regional Police Force; Metropolitan Toronto Police; and Redondo Beach Police Department. Let us consider some of their particular merits in reverse order: Rendondo Beach Police Department has developed a clear and concise general statement of purpose, namely: "To provide a service to the community to make the city a better place for its people and visitors" (p. 21) [17]. Such a statement can be easily understood and appreciated by all employees within that organisation, who can direct their work efforts towards contributing to this statement of purpose. Secondly, the Metropolitan Toronto Police objectives demonstrate that the marketing and community policing models can be translated from theory into practice. The product focus, namely community service as well as consultative interaction with the client group they service represented in their clearly spelt out organisational objectives are certainly worthy of further consideration by Australian police organisations, particularly those claiming the community policing paradigm, as their principal

## DO POLICE FIGHT CRIME?

service mode. Finally, the Halton Regional Police Force mission statement integrates the key elements of preventive, proactive and reactive policing into one clear statement with obvious potential to be translated into action by their employees.

I trust from this brief attempt at developing a comparative analysis of mission statements, focusing only on police organisations provides some demonstration of its merits, as a tool to assist senior police administrators, as they review their own organisation's mission statements. I labour the need to develop, clarify and review mission statements since: "An efficient and effective organisation knows its purpose (and) the functions to be carried out .... To provide competent services, a law enforcement administrator must first know what services are to be provided" (p. 14) [17]. Holden asserted that in the past, law enforcement management has failed the public and police personnel in three ways: the inability to identify the police mission, improper training, and inadequate policies. He acknowledged that the lack of a clear mission statement for law enforcement agencies may be partly explained by the alarming rate, at which such agencies have accumulated new and varied responsibilities. Society has added each new responsibility to policing, while forgetting its shared social responsibilities. Holden contended that instead of protestations about their increasing duties, Australian police management has used this situation to request increased budgets and more personnel from government [24]. In the present political and economic environment found in Australia, the prospect of significantly increased financial or human resources for police organisations is becoming increasingly remote. For those jurisdictions, such as N.S.W. and W.A., which have seen real staffing increases, I would suggest that these advances are only likely to be available in the short term.

### IS THIS UNIQUELY A PROBLEM FOR POLICING?

Before concluding this section addressing mission statements of Australian police organisations, I believe it is important to place these problems in the wider context of the Australian public sector. I have chosen education, as another example of a service enterprise, largely centred in the public sector, which is also in a state of crisis, or at least within a state of transition, regarding its true mission, direction and future. At a recent conference organised by the Institute of Public Affairs, there was a reported consensus amongst the participants that "education reform was important, even though there is room for disagreement about the nature of what reforms are needed" (p. 2) [25]. McGuiness reported: "It is clear that most school systems are realising that excessive centralism has been a harmful force in education. Much more authority, from budgeting to decisions about organisation of teaching and peripheral activities, has to be devolved on schools, both principals and parents' bodies, if they are to have the incentive to perform satisfactorily" (p. 2) [25]. Mr. Kenneth Baker, the British Secretary of State for Education and Science provided and international perspective to the problem, when he stated:

"For a long time what we did, as other countries were doing also, was to concentrate on the fabric, on the structure of the system. Of course, expansion brought improvements in quality. But we did not ask the basic questions about the nature of our curriculum. What constitutes an effective science course for example. Nor about how we could ensure that all pupils got proper access to that curriculum.

Performance was questioned, but not in any determined or systematic way. What curriculum reforms there were, were to piecemeal.

With the end of the long post-war boom in the 1970's we started to ask those awkward questions about the value of the output of education and not just the scale of the input.

The mood for reform grew only gradually. Education has had

decades of producer domination" (p. 2) [25].

This discussion of education in Australian and international contexts bears uncanny parallels to the situations that I have been observing in Australian policing. I take the position that policing has also had decades of producer domination, instead of consumer domination or centring, such as I have been proposing in this paper.

### LAW ENFORCEMENT VERSUS COMMUNITY POLICING MODELS

#### *Product versus market orientation*

As a reflection of this producer domination, let me illustrate this situation by reflecting further on marketing theory and the resulting comparisons of the two dominant paradigms or modes of police service, namely the law enforcement versus community policing models. To paraphrase McCarthy and Perreault (pp. 36, 37) [9], the focus of law enforcement modes of policing have often been associated with police managers, who maintain a producer domination or "a **product orientation** — making (police) products which are easy to produce (and assess,) then trying to sell them. They think of customers (in this case, the public) as existing to 'buy' the(ir) output — rather than the (police organisation) existing to serve customers.

In well-managed (organisations), this production orientation has been replaced with a marketing orientation. A **marketing orientation** means trying to carry out the marketing concept. Instead of just trying to get customers to (accept) what (services are) produced, a marketing-oriented (organisation) tries to produce what customers need.

Three basic ideas are included in the definition of the marketing concept:

1. A customer orientation.
2. A total (organisation-wide) effort.
3. (Service) — not just ('crime fighting') as an objective ...

'Give the customers what they need' — this may seem so obvious that it may be hard for you to understand why the marketing concept requires special attention. However, people don't always do the logical and obvious — especially when it means changing what they have done in the past, (so although) the marketing concept may be obvious, ... its very easy to slip into a product-oriented way of thinking" (pp. 36-37) [9].

#### *Paramilitary versus humanistic styles of policing*

Sandler and Mintz have provided a more traditional comparative analysis commencing firstly with police organisations operating in a principally law enforcement servicing model, which "are most frequently characterised as paramilitary organisations ... They typically consist of:

centralised (mechanistic,) command structure; one-way downward communications in the form of orders; rigid superior-subordinate relationships defined by prerogatives of rank; impersonality; obedience; and stress on the repressive nature of the work. The purpose of such a structure is to produce strict and unquestioned discipline for rapid mobilisation in the emergency and crisis situations with which police typically deal. At the same time, it is a structure designed to reduce inefficiency as created by the personal/emotional involvement so easily generated by the many non-ordinary situations to which police are exposed.

All this is well and good as a rationale, (but there can be a range) of serious negative consequences both within and without the organisations" (p. 458) [11]. A sense of organisational powerlessness can engender a demoralisation within the lower ranks, who often perceive senior management as having 'lost touch' with their 'coalface'. Cynicism becomes the hallmark of middle management as well as the rank and file. The "us and them" phenomena becomes obvious within as well as beyond this style of police organisation (p. 392) [26].

The rigidity of such an organisation can result in "various

blockage(s) to change ... as the lower ranking members have no stake in their success. Thus, programs are often sabotaged at the level of execution" (p. 459) [11]. As an aside, marketing strategies can be applied within as well as beyond such an organisation.

Rigidity also prevents the upward flow of ideas. The management ethos is "cover yourself", thus producing "a chronic fear of the risk-taking which is so essential to good management, (as) members anticipate a lack of support for any risks they do take" (p. 459) [11].

My husband, Harry has often identified the clash of expectations faced by police officers operating within a paramilitary structure, with his quotable quote: "You're god on the street, but treated like a child in the office". Such in-house frustrations must inevitably spill into police-public interactions. In many cases, this precipitates complaints, or at the very least minimises public support for their police officers and organisations.

"Despite the problems cited in this admittedly one-sided exploration of paramilitary organisation structure as it affects style (and servicing), many police officers and departments continue to cling to it" (p. 460) [11]. Even so, there are signs of change within various Australian police organisations, for example the Australian Federal Police has recently formed in-house National and Regional Consultative Councils and "crushed" their rank structure from eleven to five levels between Constable and Assistant Commissioner [27].

This reform may have been covered with the short-term gloss of industrial relations-productivity 'trade-offs', nevertheless broadbanding and 'diluting' of the rank structure may have additional positive consequences in the long term. One of my colleagues has even proposed the complete dissolving of all police rank structures. Such proposals may seem to some, very radical in the present climate of Australian policing. I would suggest that just because we have traditionally had a paramilitary, rank-focused structure does not necessarily mean it will be so for eternity.

#### ***Are we in transition between both models?***

Aside from these early indications of major reforms, the changing emphasis toward community policing, as the ascending model within Australian and North American police organisations brings with it, a 'humanizing' of the police image, "and reduce(s) distance between administration and operations, police and civilians" (p. 460) [11]. Sandler and Mintz suggested that such change firstly "manifests itself ... in (the) nomenclature" (p. 461) [11]. For example, the move away from the organisational description of Police Force to Police Department or Police Service. Surely, Commissioner John Avery's book, **Police: Force or Service?** signposted this changing terminology within Australian policing [28].

During the transition phases between the full law enforcement to increasing a community policing model, there have been other modifying thrusts. Such as team policing [11], increasing civilianisation [29], and increased numbers of women police [30], who are undertaking a "fuller range of police duties has important implications for the development of alternate styles in law enforcement.

Cultural stereotypes and socialization patterns define women as 'humanising' forces who are empathetic, service-oriented, and inclined to settle issues verbally rather than physically. This is almost a direct opposite of the masculine stereotype of which military structures are the ultimate manifestation" (p. 462) [11].

As crime prevention and/or community policing and education projects, such as Stranger Danger, Safety Houses, Neighbourhood Watch, Adopt-a-Cop, Blue Light Discos, etc. took their place amongst other products of policing services, issues of participative management, both within and beyond police organisations were pushed onto their agenda. Organic or 'participative management has long existed in the private sector (and is) generally defined, (as) a method of improving services by utilising the abilities,

experience, and talents of **all** personnel levels by soliciting their inputs and permitting decision-making at the lowest possible level" (p. 462) [11] and sometimes, including those outside the full control of the sponsoring police organisation (e.g. Neighbourhood Watch co-ordinators).

The NSW Police have taken this community participation a step further, beyond simply special projects into day-to-day general policing priorities, with their community consultancy committees. When I first heard of this initiative, I thought what a wise move, because here the local commander could have access to public's views of policing priorities. As an aside, evidently some US police organisations have benefited from public hearings debating their budgets, in adjusting their policing priorities to better enmesh with their community's needs and expectations. Just prior to writing this paper, one of my colleagues mentioned an ABC-TV recorded example of community consultation in action, with the NSW Police. Evidently, the people of that most liberal of communities, Nimbin decided that drug users "shooting up" and discarding their needles in the town area was unacceptable. The residents called a town meeting, inviting local police representatives to attend, where they outlined their concerns. Patrol and enforcement priorities were promptly adjusted and within a short space of time, this 'public offence' was at least minimised, if not completely eliminated.

These tentative steps towards placing "great(er) emphasis on the part to be played by the ordinary citizen in the policing of the community" have reclaimed both the ancient and modern histories of policing. By way of illustration, "in 1829, Sir Robert Peel .... asserted in his Principles of Law Enforcement — No. 7: — '... the police are the public and the public are the police ...'" (Preface) [19]. Even so the "characteristics of modern policing (were until recently in urban Australia,) the direct opposite to the original goals and 'style' of policing envisaged by the founders of the new police" (p. 360 [31]. Chris Corns has argued:

"The paradoxical situation has now arisen whereby extensive efforts are being made by the police to get closer to the community, to appear more 'human', while at the same time having to respond to structural pressures for greater efficiency as crime fighters" (p. 36) [31].

#### ***Marketing theory revisited***

For my last reference to marketing theory, I will address both models of policing, in terms of their utility, covering issues of form, time, place and possession, which leads me into an analysis of how these two apparently competing paradigms imply certain packaging of police services, training needs, resource implications — both in human and financial terms, and the consequent types of performance indicators used, or in need of development to support either law enforcement or community policing initiatives.

In both servicing models, there is an implicit assumption that the product is something that the public wants, otherwise "there is no need to be satisfied and no utility" (p. 8) [9]. There are basically four types of utility: "form, time, place and possession" (p. 8) [9]. **Form** utility is provided when something is produced, in our case, police services. However, such services must be provided at a **time** useful to the consumer, that is it is "available when the customer wants it" (p. 8) [9]. While "**place** utility means having the product available where the customer wants it" (p. 8) [9]. Lastly, "**possession** utility means ... gaining possession, so that one has the right to use a product" (p. 8) [9]. This last concept may seem to be of less relevance to policing services, unless you have experience as a member of a less powerful group within Australian society, such as aborigines and women, who have frequently claimed to be discriminated against where the provision and quality of policing services are concerned. Women, particularly as victims of crime, especially of sexual assaults or criminal assaults in the home have long complained. In recent years, their complaints have been heard and their concerns acted upon, so that they too have become increasingly more able to take possession of police services.

# DO POLICE FIGHT CRIME?

## ENDNOTES

[1] On 22 July 1987, the Queensland State Government released the *Public Sector Review Report*, also known as the Savage Report. This was the third in a series of reports produced by Sir Ernest Savage and his Committees. The first two reports related to a review of business regulations. However, so far as the Queensland Public Sector was concerned, it was this third report, which was of paramount significance. The reviewing committee was chaired by Sir Ernest Savage, who had a background principally in chartered accounting. Other members of his Committee for the third report included: two Company Directors, Mr. John Andrews, Chairman of the Sugar Board, and Mr. Gordon Douglas, and Mr. Russ Roberts, formerly Commissioner, Public Service Board, Queensland.

When the Premier on 9 October 1986 announced the formation of this Committee, he described their duties as "an independent review (which) will be undertaken of Government efficiency" (p. iii). Sir Ernest Savage described "the purpose of the Review to identify opportunities for improving productivity of the administrative machinery of the Queensland Government and make recommendations as to the appropriate measures to implement desired changes" (p. ii). This third Savage Report may still be available from the Queensland Government Printer, Brisbane under the title, *Public Sector Review Report*.

[2] Professor Gerald Caiden, University of Southern California spoke to selected members of the Queensland Police Department on 11 July 1988 on the topic of *Contemporary issues for police administrators of which corruption is one such issue*.

[3] Police. (1989, May). *Monthly Newsletter of the Police Partners Support Group of Victoria*. Ballarat, Victoria, 4-5.

[4] McDougall, A.K. (1988). The police mandate: An historical perspective. *Canadian Police College Journal*, 12 (1), 10-48.

[5] *Task Force on policing in Ontario* (1973). Cited in [4].

[6] See Kelling, G.L. (1987). Acquiring a taste for order: The community and the police. *Crime and Delinquency* 33, 90-102; and Wilson, J.Q., & Kelling, G.L. (1982, 29 March). Broken windows. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 38.

[7] Nordholt, E., & Straver, R. (1983). The changing police. In M. Punch (Ed.), *Control in the police organisation*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

[8] Kotler, P., Shaw, R., FitzRoy, P., & Chandler, P. (1983). *Marketing in Australia*. Sydney: Prentice-Hall.

[9] McCarthy, E.J. & Perreault, W.D. Jnr. (1984). *Basic marketing: A managerial approach*. (8th. ed.) Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

[10] Ansett, B., with McManamy, J. (1989). *The customer*. Melbourne: John Kerr.

[11] Sandler, G.B. \* Mintz, E. (1974). Police organisations: Their changing internal and external relationships. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 2 (6), 458-463.

[12] Wilson, P.R. (1987, July-Sept.). Future developments: The police and the future: Social trends and their implications for law enforcement. *Australian Police Journal*, 99-104.

[13] A definite statement of the attributes necessary for the performance of the office of probationary Constable. (1987). Paper No. 3 presented by the Victoria Police Department to the personnel Administration Conference held in Brisbane, Queensland from 3 to 5 November 1987.

In this paper, the following breakdown of initial academy training activities and the percentage of time involved was provided:

(i)	Law and Police Procedures	42.64%
(ii)	Human Behaviour	7.78%
(iii)	Drill and Physical Skills	28.50%
(iv)	Communication Skills	8.33%
(v)	Typing	8.06%

Note: The remaining percentage (4.69%) is taken up with administrative matters" (p. 2).

[14] Early in 1988, the Queensland Government called tenders for management consultants to review the following aspects or the Queensland Police Department:

"The Consultants are to identify opportunities for improving operational work practices. Particular attention is to be given to:

- reviewing processes for directing and controlling operational police;
- the rationalisation of the location and operating hours of police establishments/stations;
- duties of clerical and administrative police; and
- services to other Government agencies, extraneous duties and duties dealing with non-criminal activities" (drawn from the Consultants' Newsletter No. 1, p. 1).

Arthur Andersen and Co., probably better known for their accounting expertise were successful tenderers. Their project commenced on June 27, 1988 and it was expected to take about six months. However by 27 October, 1988, *The Courier Mail*, one of Brisbane's two metropolitan daily

newspapers was reporting the findings of the Andersen consultants (refer p. 3, an article entitled, *Morale of police at bedrock — report* reported by Tony Koch). It was interesting to note that it was not until 23 January, 1989, that their report was supposed to be presented to the Queensland Cabinet (refer P. 1, an article entitled, *Police stations cutback: Centralise and save, says report* again reported by Tony Koch and published in *The Courier Mail*). The Andersen Report was never publicly released. However most recent indications are, that the Andersen Report findings will be subsumed in the Fitzgerald Report timetabled for release on 3 July 1989.

[15] Wilson, P. (1989, March). Sexual and violent crime in Australia: Rhetoric and reality. *Current Affairs Bulletin*, 65 (10), 1117: "Currently Australia has 37,000 police with an annual budget approaching two billion dollars" (p. 16).

[16] Mahon, T. (1989, May/June). Extracts from General Secretary's report (to) 22nd Conference, 3rd-7th April 1989. *The Queensland Police Union Journal*, 20-22. In the section numbered 6 Affiliations, he noted that the Police Federation of Australia and New Zealand provided a "combined strength of approximately 40,000 Police Officers" (p. 21).

[17] Burke, D. (1988). *Police career management: Whose responsibility?* A research project sponsored by the Special Study Grants Scheme for members of Australasian Police Forces. Brisbane: Queensland Police Printer.

[18] Australian Federal Police. (1986). *Annual Report*. Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service.

[19] *New South Wales Police Personnel Policies and Practices Handbook*. (1987, July). Prepared by Chief Inspector M. Coughlan, Chief Inspector W. Martin, Chief Inspector R. White, Inspector D. Croke and Mr. A. Crellin. Sydney: NSW Police.

[20] Queensland Police Department (1988). *Introduction to planning*. Prepared by Inspector K. White. Brisbane: Queensland Police Printer.

[21] South Australia Police Department. (1987). *Annual Report*. Adelaide: S.A. Government Printer.

[22] Victoria Police. (1986). *Annual Report*. Melbourne: Government Printer.

[23] Western Australia Police. (1987). *Annual Report*. Perth: Government Printer.

[24] Holden, R.N. (1986). *Modern Police Management*. Sydney: Prentice-Hall.

[25] McGuiness, P.P. (1989, May 13-14). Parents: Be desperately worried about your children's schooling. *The Weekend Australian*, P. 2.

[26] Bahn, C. (1984). Police socialisation in the Eighties: Strains in the forging of an occupational identity. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 12(4), 390-394.

[27] The initiative to form National and Regional Consultative Councils within the A.F.P. grew out of the recommendations of the Joint Council Subcommittee on Industrial Democracy. Refer also Federal Government Policy Paper *Reforming the Australian Public Service*.

The rank restructuring developed out of Award Restructuring requirements emanating from the Naitonal Industrial Tribunal's rulings (1988) for the granting of productivity linked pay rises.

[28] Avery, J. (1981). *Police: Force or Service?* Sydney: Butterworths.

[29] Moore, C. (1987, October). *Police civilianisation*. Unpublished paper, N.S.W. Police.

[30] Lidgard, C.F. (1988). *Women policing in Australia*. Paper presented to the Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand, Canberra, A.C.T., 28 November-2 December 1988. Now (in press) *National Police Research Unit Review*.

[31] Corns, C. (1988, March). Policing and social change. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 24(1), 32-46.

[32] Bayley, D.H. (1986). Community Policing in Australia: An appraisal. *National Police Research Unit Review*, No. 2, 5-18.

[33] Petersen, D. (1989, June 3). In search of the community constable. *The Courier Mail*, P. 26.

[34] Das, D. (1986, May). Crime prevention: Cross-cultural approaches. *C.J. International*.

[35] Bolen, J.M. (1986, March 21). *Community policing means getting involved*. Adelaide: National Police Research Unit.

[36] Lidgard, C.F., & Burke, D. (1987, Sept. 15). *Strategic Planning*. Unpublished discussion paper for Strategy 10, refer to Appendix III, *The concept of organisational culture*. Refer also Deal, T.E., & Kennedy, A.A. (1982). *Corporate Cultures*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

[37] Hurd, J. (1988). Hurd counts the cost of coppering. *Police*, XX (8), 12.

[38] Anderson, P.T. (1985). "Increasing police strength to lessen crime is akin to increasing the number of clergymen to reduce sin." *N.S.W. Police News*, 65 (7), 14-16.

[39] Pilla, J. (1985). Crime statistics — the need for development. *National Police Research Unit Review*, No. 2, 51-54.