

SPRINGER BRIEFS IN CRIMINOLOGY  
TRANSLATIONAL CRIMINOLOGY

Jeff Rojek  
Peter Martin  
Geoffrey P. Alpert

Developing  
and Maintaining  
Police-Researcher  
Partnerships  
to Facilitate  
Research Use  
A Comparative Analysis



Springer

# **SpringerBriefs in Criminology**

## **Translational Criminology**

### **Series editors**

Cynthia Lum

Christopher Koper

George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA

### **Editorial Board**

John Laub, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

Laurie O. Robinson, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA

David Weisburd, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA

The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel

## **About this Series**

Has research made a difference to criminal justice practices and policies? Evidence-based crime policy is not just about rigorously generating a robust supply of rigorous research to find out “what works” in terms of justice interventions or “what explains” crime or offending. Evidence-based crime policy means that this supply should be attuned to the demand for research, and that research must be converted to meaningful forms and implemented with fidelity in order for practice to be receptive to science. But how does this actually happen?

An important concept in the field of evidence-based crime policy is translational criminology, or how, why, whether, and under what conditions research is converted to, and used, in practice. This Springer Brief series on translational criminology brings to both the academe and criminal justice world examples of how research becomes practice and policy, and whether research has made an impact. Each brief is written by top scholars and/or practitioners in the field who describe specific examples of how a body of research became practice (or didn't) and the lessons learned from the endeavor.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/11178>

Jeff Rojek · Peter Martin · Geoffrey P. Alpert

# Developing and Maintaining Police-Researcher Partnerships to Facilitate Research Use

A Comparative Analysis

 Springer

Jeff Rojek  
Department of Criminal Justice  
University of Texas at El Paso  
El Paso, TX  
USA

Geoffrey P. Alpert  
Department of Criminology and Criminal  
Justice  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC  
USA

Peter Martin  
Operations Support Command  
Queensland Police Service  
Brisbane, QLD  
Australia

ISSN 2194-6442

ISSN 2194-6450 (electronic)

ISBN 978-1-4939-2055-6

ISBN 978-1-4939-2056-3 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-1-4939-2056-3

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014949334

Springer New York Heidelberg Dordrecht London

© The Author(s) 2015

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media ([www.springer.com](http://www.springer.com))

# Preface

The practice of public administration has modified its approach during the last few decades and has seen the increase of governance in public institutions that has included stronger and more creative interactions with their communities (DeWitt et al. 1994; Grell and Gappert 1992; Vigoda 2002). This is a change from the traditional style of government that independently identified issues impacting the public, and subsequently provided responses that were deemed appropriate and helpful. Because the problems confronting public institutions have become more complex, the demands from stakeholders have increased, and resources have become more constrained, responses from public institutions have included different perspectives. These circumstances have inundated the independent and stand-alone capacity and resourcefulness of public institutions, and have prompted calls for organizational change and innovation to address more appropriately the present-day problems confronting communities and their members (Callahan and Holzer 1994). The solution for many public institutions has been the development of a governance framework based on shared responsibility between government institutions and stakeholders in identifying and responding to community issues and problems. The primary mechanism public institutions have used to foster such shared governance has been the formation of partnerships with private organizations, community members and organizations, and academic institutions (Vigoda 2002). The underlying goal of these partnerships is to combine the resources, skills, and knowledge of the entities in a way that will allow them to achieve better results in managing problems more effectively and efficiently than could be accomplished individually or by government agencies alone (Lasker et al. 2001). In short, governance aims to promote “synergy” whereby the mission statements of multiple agencies are realized through partnerships that pool resources and facilitate innovation.

In this monograph, we explore how, as a public institution, policing has changed and become more involved in partnerships. Here, we focus on the particular partnership between police agencies and academic researchers. Fortunately, there has been a great deal of attention paid to the partnerships formed between researchers and police practitioners. Unfortunately, the majority of the literature is from the

perspective, and perhaps bias, of the researcher. And while we may know something about the relationships, we do not understand completely why police managers lack the willingness to accept and integrate research findings into policing practice, let alone jointly pursue projects with the research community. There is little published research from the perspective of the police practitioner and presumably even less information from the combined perspectives of the researcher and police practitioner.

This monograph is both unique and fresh in that it examines the subject of research application from the perspective of both the researcher, and distinctly, the police practitioner. It examines the areas of interface and difference, and discusses a few examples where the engagement occurs at an optimum level. Case studies of excellent practice are identified and equally those examples where research has not worked effectively or failed to reach optimum levels of engagement are discussed. Our work discusses the history, development, and methods to maintain police-researcher partnerships. We provide information useful to police managers and researchers who are interested in creating and sustaining partnerships to conduct research, work together to improve policing, and to help others understand the linkages between the two. Specifically, the brief begins with a general overview of the literature on research utilization and practitioner–researcher partnerships in policing and other fields. Chapter 2 provides a review of research findings on the existence of these partnerships and nuances to engaging in them in the United States, which is then followed in Chap. 3 by a review of these relationships in Australia from the perspective of a long-time practitioner. Chapter 4 concludes with a discussion of these partnerships in general, where they have been and how they can improve. Although both countries experience similar issues of trust, acceptance, utility, and accountability between researchers and practitioners, the experiences in the countries also differ. In the United States there are somewhere between 17,000 and 18,000 agencies, the use of research findings by police agencies requires understanding, diffusion, and acceptance. In Australia with a small number of large agencies, the problems of translating research findings are different, but as in the USA, include acceptance and application of findings.

As long as police practitioners and academic researchers hold distinct and different impressions of each other, the likelihood of positive, cooperative, and sustainable agreements between them will suffer. Our work offers hope to researchers and law enforcement personnel that it is effective and efficient to work together to advance and apply research findings. Indeed, through the mutual understanding of the perspectives of each, the end result will be different and greater than the sum of the parts (i.e., Gestalt theory). Given the inherent challenges in law enforcement today around resourcing, the words of Ernest Rutherford, a famous New Zealander (who was awarded the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1908) are particularly relevant: “We’ve run out of money...It is time to start thinking.”

This monograph is rooted in the experiences and work of the authors. Peter Martin is an Assistant Commissioner in the Queensland (Australia) Police Service, and he is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Psychology and Counselling at the University of Queensland. Peter has long championed the use of research to

information police actions and fostered partnerships with the research community, efforts for which he was recently recognized by his induction into the Evidence-Based Hall of Fame sponsored by the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy at George Mason University. Geoff Alpert is a Professor in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of South Carolina, and has devoted his career to examining practical problems facing the law enforcement community, such as vehicle pursuits, use of force, the deployment of conducted energy devices, racial profiling, and officer involved traffic collisions. Through these efforts he has engaged and partnered with dozens of law enforcement agencies to conduct research on these problems. Jeff Rojek is an Associate Professor in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of South Carolina, and is a former police officer with the Los Angeles Police Department. He has also engaged in numerous partnerships with law enforcement agencies, exploring such issues as tactical responses, racial profiling, officer discipline, responses to youth and gang violence, and officer involved vehicle collisions.

Collectively, the authors have learned lessons about developing and maintaining practitioner–researcher partnerships through a process of trial and error. In addition, Alpert and Rojek have recently engaged in research funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) that examines multiple partnerships between police practitioners and researchers to identify barriers and facilitators to the development and sustainability of these relationships. The chapters that form this monograph thereby draw on this personal and vicarious knowledge and experience to discuss the evolution of police practitioner–researcher partnerships, contemporary issues, and recent research.

In line with these goals, the material in Chap. 1 introduces the police practitioner–research partnerships as a form of gaining knowledge and translating it to practice. Chapter 2 offers a literature review of police practitioner–researcher partnerships and experiences in the United States. The chapter also provides a review of findings from the above mentioned NIJ study to provide a current picture on the prevalence, nature, and issues with these partnerships in the United States. Chapter 3 reviews the research partnerships in Australia and reviews the problems and prospects that country has faced in developing and improving its police service. A unique feature of this chapter is that it gives voice to the practitioner perspective that has often been ignored in the pursuit of police research. Chapter 4 concludes with an outline for the path forward for supporting the growth and sustainability of these partnerships.



# Acknowledgments

Any project of this magnitude and complexity requires the coordinated effort of a large number of people who have worked with the authors, given advice, and pushed all of us to have a better product. We all have special people to thank for their help and assistance. We all want to thank members of our families who have supported our efforts, and especially Alli Rojek who read several versions of the manuscript and made a number of excellent suggestions as it was being developed. We would also like to thank Andy Hansen who was instrumental in the NIJ partnership research we cover in Chap. 2. There are people in two continents to thank for their help and support, and development of this monograph. Stateside, we go back to our roots and express appreciation to members of the (then) Metro-Dade Police Department (now Miami-Dade), and especially Chief Dale Bowlin (retired), who understood partnerships between researchers and practitioners before they were formally developed or even acknowledged. Since the 1980s, this agency has relied on research to guide its policies and practices and the current Director, J.D. Patterson continues to believe in the outcomes and outputs of the research community. Major Ed Hudak of the Coral Gables (Florida) police department and Roger Dunham at the University of Miami have been friends and colleagues for more than 30 years. More recently, Sheriff Leon Lott of Richland County (South Carolina) has been a friend and colleague who supports research partnerships and appreciates research findings. Our time spent with other police officials, including Gil Kerlikowski, Ed Davis, Clark Kimerer, Art Acevedo, Jeff Noble, and so many others has been invaluable to guide and direct our understanding of these partnerships. In addition to many of those mentioned above, Jeff Rojek's acknowledgments would not be complete without also thanking Geoff Alpert, Scott Decker, Mike Smith, and Dave Klinger for their friendship and insight on the police, particularly their mentorship of partnering with the police.

Down under, there are also many police managers and officers for whom we have great respect and to whom we owe our gratitude and appreciation. In particular, the original "pracademic," Inspector Jason Saunders, Senior Sergeant Damien Hayden and Senior Constable Sue Newton of the Queensland Police Service have all been gracious with their time, knowledge, and friendship.

Superintendents Mark Hiron, New South Wales Police, Mick Williams of the Victoria Police, and Graeme Adcock and Mark Walker-Roberts of the South Australian Police have all helped educate us about details within their departments. A special acknowledgment goes to Assistant Commissioner Bob Gee, Queensland Police Service and others within Queensland policing such as Kim Adams and the Research and Evaluation Team. Beyond the police, Griffith University, and Professor Paul Mazerolle, Pro Vice Chancellor for Arts, Education and Law has been a great advocate and friend who has opened doors and supported research efforts in Australia. Associate Professor Janet Ransley, Griffith University is also deserving of recognition for her theoretical insights and practical ability to encourage police—researcher relationships and facilitate collaborations. No book on policing in Australia could be written without mention of Lorraine Mazerolle, professor, University of Queensland. She has improved the research agenda in Australia, served as a mentor to Peter Martin, and a good friend to police and researchers alike, in Australia, the United States, and around the world.