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SUMMARY

The basic mission of the police is to prevent crime and disorder and this translates into measuring police efficiency by the absence of crime and disorder rather than the visible actions taken to deal with crime and restore the violated order. For almost two centuries now, crime prevention has been understood and approached as the core responsibility of the police as they are the active partners who are responsible to activate the community who is the passive partner towards crime prevention. Recently there are scholars, police scientists and researchers who are of the view that the police cannot prevent crime so crime prevention should not be the core function of the police.

The study gives a detailed analysis of the proponents and opponents of crime prevention as the core function of the police. This analysis has been provided in the context of the origin of policing through to the modern era in policing in an attempt to find out for which purpose the police had been established for. This is done in order to track down whether the initial purpose for which the police had been established for has changed in modern policing, with the ultimate aim of affirming or negating the proposition by some of the proponents of crime prevention as not the core function of the police, who are of the view that crime prevention should no longer be the core function of the police, as used to be the case.
The arguments and counter arguments on whether crime prevention is the core function of the police or not, as well as the response from the selected countries were analyzed. The golden thread that runs through the eras of policing is that crime prevention is and has always been the main function of the police. The relative ease of measuring police performance by reactive activities in comparison with proactive activities seems to indicate that the police might focus more working on these measurable activities as compared to crime prevention activities that could go unnoticed.
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CHAPTER 1: GENERAL ORIENTATION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The doctrine developed by Sir Robert Peel in England almost two centuries ago, that the primary responsibility of the police is to prevent crime and maintain social order, led to the emergence of a new era in policing. This new era led to the evolution of what we now call modern policing. In South Africa, one could argue that the police comprehensively embraced Sir Robert Peel's policing principles from 1994. The implementation of these principles by the South African Police Service led to a dramatic change in the manner in which the police interact with the public. This new philosophy further broadened the mission of the police from a narrow focus on law enforcement to a broader one of crime prevention. In terms of section 205(3) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996), one of the objectives of the South African Police Service is to prevent crime.

The envisaged study attempts to establish whether crime prevention is the core responsibility of the police as it was asserted by Sir Robert Peel, understood and embraced by many police agencies for almost two centuries, or whether crime prevention is not the core responsibility of the police as asserted in recent study by Dr Johan Burger - a senior researcher with the Institute for Security Studies (Burger 2007). The determination of whether or not crime prevention is the core function of the police, as well as the implication of this to policing, will be the core focus of this study.
1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

According to Sir Robert Peel’s principles of policing, the basic mission of the police is to prevent crime and disorder. This translates into measuring police efficiency by the absence of crime and disorder rather than the visible actions taken to deal with crime and restore the violated order (Leggett 2003:03). Peel’s assertion has been supported by various police researchers and scientists such as Skogan (1976:279); Van Heerden (1992:156) and Tilley (1995:19).

The Police Research Group in London states that although there is a move towards a multi-agency crime prevention approach, the police as the active partner have statutory responsibility to prevent crime (Liddle & Gelsthorpe 1994:11). In South Africa, Professor TJ Van Heerden states that policing is a form of coercive action, within the structure of formal social control, which is directed at the maintenance of internal order in conformity with the principles of legal jurisdiction and the constitutional rights of the individual (Van Heerden 1986:16).

For almost two centuries now, crime prevention has been understood and approached as the core responsibility of the police as they are the active partners who are responsible for activating the community, the passive partner in crime prevention (Van Heerden 1986:17). The inability of the social crime prevention component of the police to sufficiently mobilise the community towards crime prevention could still be attributed to the failure of the police to prevent crime.
According to Burger (2007:01), South Africa is one of the countries with high levels of crime and the manner in which the police could best deal with these crime levels continues to be the focus of debate and controversy. The same sentiments could also be detected from Scharf (2003:01), who stated that South Africa is not doing enough about crime.

Burger starts his argument by stating that to continuously blame the police for high levels of crime could de-motivate them. He concludes this argument by submitting that as the root causes of crime are socioeconomic in nature, crime prevention is and should not be the core function of the police (Leggett 2003:03). Burger’s assertion contradicts the assertion of Sir Robert Peel that views the basic role of the police as preventing crime and should they fail in preventing crime, they should investigate criminal cases.

According to Sir Robert Peel (Leggett 2003:03), crime investigation is the tacit acceptance by the police that they have already failed in their basic duty of preventing crime.

1.3 THE OBJECTIVE OF POLICING SOCIETY

Policing as we know it today has evolved over a long period of time. In order to understand what the main reason for having policing in society had originally been, with the ultimate end of determining whether crime prevention should or should not be the core function of the police, it is important to understand the evolution of policing within
the broader context of the spectrum of policing. According to Muluneh (2007),
throughout history, societies have established rules to govern the conduct of individuals,
and have devised punishments for those who broke these rules. Muluneh (2007) further
states that the earliest record of an ancient society’s need for rules to control human
behaviour dates back to approximately 2300 BC when the Sumerian rulers set down
standards for what constituted an offence against society. Since then policing evolved
slowly through the centuries to the stage at which we find it today.

According to Muluneh (2007), since its inception, modern policing has passed through
four operational approaches. Initially the police were highly politicized to the extent that
they were perceived as a tool to protect their political masters. Police operations in
Vlakplaaas in South Africa and the KGB (foreign intelligence and domestic security
agency) in the then Soviet Union bear testimony to this operational method (Coetzee
1994; KGB: 2009). It then moved on into the era of legality, in which police served as a
strong arm of the state to enforce law and order. Muluneh (2007) further states that this
gave rise to a policing system that was more reactive than proactive. From this
operational method, the police evolved to the hybrid of law enforcement and service
delivery that ensured that the police were responsive to the needs of the society, as well
as ensuring that the perpetrators were dealt with. Recently, the police service has
entered into the community policing era.
This is a new approach that is directed by the strong philosophy of police operations that are influenced by and responsive to local needs. According to Muluneh (2007), community policing philosophy is inspired by the following:

- An increasing awareness that police cannot shoulder the burden of crime alone;
- A growing demand for a more responsive and customer-oriented policing;
- A growing demand for greater police accountability;
- The effectiveness of traditional police responses to crime and disorder; and
- A requirement that the police show value for money in the services they provide.

1.4 THE ORIGIN OF POLICING

The origin of early policing can be traced back to Anglo-Saxon England. The kings demanded complete loyalty and obedience from each of their subjects. In exchange for this, the kings provided protection from attack by outside invaders or from overzealous lords under the kings’ control (Anonymous (a) 1996). It was under King Alfred the Great that a type of internal police force evolved. Alfred decreed that the various landowners throughout his kingdom were responsible for policing his territory, delivering criminals to the King, and settling civil litigation. Then, there was King William the Conqueror who realized that the Anglo-Saxon system of policing was good and worthy of maintaining. He modified the model with a few improvements. The Sheriffs were appointed to be responsible for policing the King, not the local people. The local people were policed by the Court Leet. The head of the Court Leet was the Comes Stable, which was a term
that means Master of the House. Over a period of time, this word became Constable, which is still used today by members of modern police forces/services (Anonymous (a) 1996).

The above system worked up until the late 1700s, but as the population grew, cities expanded and crime increased, it became apparent that changes were needed. The constables became corrupt, and fewer and fewer took the job serious. In the 1800s, many people began to eagerly press for reforms. The most notable was Henry Fielding, who wrote about various crimes and published descriptions of known criminals. In addition, Fielding set up the Bow Street Runners, who actively sought out criminals and brought them to justice (Anonymous (a) 1996).

As time went by, William Pitt submitted a Bill to the British Parliament, calling for the creation of a police force in London. Although this proposal was met with instant opposition, Pitt strongly argued that this new force would be responsible for apprehending criminals and preventing crime and that the presence of the police would be a deterrent to crime. Despite this strong argument, Pitt’s Bill was withdrawn. This setback did not end reform efforts, because the Bow Street Runners expanded in number to include mounted patrols, which policed the rural areas outside the City of London in an effort to increase police visibility and crime prevention (Anonymous (a) 1996).
Uchida (2004:02) states that during the past 30 years, scholars have become fascinated with the history of policing, which led to many studies in this field. Early writings were primarily concerned with descriptions of particular police agencies, as well as the concept of crime prevention. Uchida (2004:02) further states that in 1970, Richardson - a scholar - broke new ground in describing the origins of policing in Boston and New York. Since then other writers have followed suit by dealing with the origins of police departments in St. Louis, Denver, Washington D.C, Richmond and Detroit (Maniha 1970).

According to Uchida (2004:05), it was Eric Monkkonen - a scholar - who took an entirely different approach in 1981 by using quantitative methods to explain the development of policing in 23 cities from 1860 to 1920. Uchida (2004:05) further states that it is Monkkonen who pointed out the origin of the concept crime prevention.

In addition, these historical analyses revealed the challenges of corruption, brutality, and inefficiency in policing. The major emphasis of Monkkonen’s work was to examine the development in policing since 900 A.D. and to determine whether the role of the police in America and all over the world has changed over a period of about 300 years. This was not an easy task, as even Monkkonen himself acknowledged the difficulty of the debate to determine the true or proper police function (Uchida 2004:05).
To be able to understand the fundamental role of the police in society, it is important to explain the evolution of policing juxtaposing it to various social reforms. Table 1 below indicates the congruent social and policing reforms within a different time period.

Table 1: Social and Policing Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>10,000 BC — 1750 DA</th>
<th>1750 — 1950</th>
<th>1950 — Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FORM</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICE FORM</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Stansfield 1996)

1.4.1 Agricultural Era

The agricultural era, which was characterized by a small economic surplus, relatively scarce private property and uncomplicated community structures, used part-time policing (Stansfield 1996). Part-time policing was justified by the fact that the community could not afford and did not need a sophisticated and expensive form of policing based on the crimes that were being committed at the time (Masiloane 2007:331). According to Masiloane (2007:331), part-time policing was based on the fundamental tenet of policing, which allowed communities to take responsibility for their safety and security.
1.4.2 Industrial Era

The demise of communal value systems, the complexity of the community structure and the increase in economic surplus are some of the factors that led to the evolution of public policing. This was as the direct result of the time that the community could spend in doing policing work as they were more and more involved in economic activities and crime became more and more sophisticated, thus demanding some sophisticated agencies to deal with it (Masiloane 2007:331). Based on these complexities the state introduced public policing and gave the police powers that would enable them to provide safety to citizenry (Stansfield 1996).

According to Woods (1993:05), permanent police forces were created in metropolitan areas such as New York in 1853 and Philadelphia in 1856 to handle the increase of population and social problems that came with urban industrialization. Police officers were uniformed, making them easily identifiable on the street. Their core function was crime prevention. Interpersonal violence in Europe frequently resulted in vendettas that endured for years before coming to the cognizance of the authorities. As a result, citizens sought state intervention in the form of police involvement in solving their interpersonal violence.

Walker (1977:143) states that policing was introduced for an array of activities in different situations, but the predominant one was the preservation of order. Neocleous (2004:94) argue that some societies in the late 18th century and early 19th century structured the police for the protection of property.
1.4.3 Information Era

The information era is characterized by the rapid increase in economic surplus and private property and brought about a huge complexity in community structures (Masiloane 2007:332).

According to Reich (2006), the advent of capitalism led to the creation of a stratified society and this stratified society revealed that individual safety needs differ according to their personal wealth. An increase in personal wealth led to an increase in individual safety needs and forced some people to supplement public policing with private policing (Masiloane 2007:332).

What could be deduced from these various eras is that the policing primarily existed to prevent crime against the community. The evolution and sophistication of police forces through different eras were directed towards ensuring that the community is free from crime. This is also evident from the information era where wealthy people are enlisting the services of the private security companies to protect them against criminal activities, thus having crime prevention as their core function.

1.4.4 Policing in South Africa

Policing in South Africa went through various stages, the conspicuous period being during the apartheid years when the police were used to enforce various discriminatory
laws to sustain and crystallize the apartheid ideology of excluding Africans from the economic and developmental activities of the country (Lipton 1986; Shearing 1986; Joyce & Suzman 1990). According to Pinnock (1984: 260), having people whose job it is to coerce others to comply with the rules and norms in any society is inevitable. This is not different from South African society; the South African Police Service is tasked with this function. In terms of section 36 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996), which is called the limitations clause, allows the police to limit people’s rights. The examples are as follows:

- The police may arrest and detain a person (this is limiting the rights to freedom of movement);
- The police may obtain a warrant to search a person’s body, home or belongings (limiting their rights to property and privacy);
- The police may use minimum force where someone acts violently (limiting their rights to freedom and security of the person); and
- The police may ask the court to keep a person in custody before his/her trial (limiting their rights to freedom of the person).

Most of the limitations in terms of section 36 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa relate to actions taken in reacting to crime that had already been committed, not the prevention of crime.
1.4.4.1 Policing from 1652 to 1840

Six months after his arrival in South Africa in 1652, Jan van Riebeeck appointed officials to deal with growing crime in the Dutch settlement, especially stock theft and contraband (Brewer 1994:15). According to Brewer (1994:15), from the arrival of Jan van Riebeeck in 1652, the Boers made the control of race relations a feature of police work alongside ordinary crimes. In 1689 the first fiscal was appointed and given policing powers.

The fiscal was charged with the core function of protecting the resources, establishments, goods, and interests of the Dutch East Indies Company. Owing to the fact that the white settlers were living in urban settings that were experiencing the usual crimes associated with urban life, city burghers employed patrol and night watches for crime prevention. This was the model that was employed in Britain before they transformed town watches into the civil police force.

Drunkenness and theft were among the earliest offences recorded in the Cape and increased so rapidly that within five years after Van Riebeeck’s arrival it was deemed necessary to appoint the settlement’s first law officer, known as a Fiscal. The core function of Fiscal was to patrol the streets and to prevent crime.

However, the brutality and persecutory mania of the Fiscal and his men soon rendered them extremely unpopular, and it was decided to appoint a different type of law officer.
This decision culminated in the establishment of the Ratelwag on the 3rd of July, 1686 (De Witt Dippenaar 1988:02).

The duties of the Ratelwag were preventive in nature, as they were responsible for patrolling the streets to prevent crime rather than investigating crime. They were equipped with wooden rattles which emitted a clapping sound and were required to draw attention to any offences which came to their notice by swinging their rattles and shouting “murder,” or any other appropriate word describing the relevant offence. The first police station and place of detention was established in 1774 in Green Market Square, Cape Town, in a building known as the Wachthuis (De Witt Dippenaar 1988:03).

De Witt Dippenaar (1988:03) state that in 1835, the new police was formed and named Cape Constabulary, founded on the principles of the London Metropolitan Police. Inspector King of the London Police Force was appointed Superintendent of Police and put in charge of training and administration of the new Police Force in Cape Town. The core function of Cape Constabulary did not change from that of Ratelwag; they were still responsible for patrolling the streets and preventing crime.
In 1855, the colonial authorities set about reorganizing all existing rural units into a consolidated force under the command of a commandant (De Witt Dippenaar 1988:03). This force, known as the Frontier Armed and Mounted Police (FAMP), was almost constantly involved in skirmishes with black tribes. Although the FAMP had in fact been established to prevent crime and cattle theft, a virtually continuous succession of frontier wars and black uprisings prevented them from paying attention to these tasks (De Witt Dippenaar 1988:03).

As a consequence, the FAMP was disbanded in 1878 and reorganized to form a new force, the Cape Mounted Riflemen (CMR). The core function of CMR was to prevent crime and cattle theft. A well-organized police force, the Cape Police, was eventually established in 1882. However, De Witt Dippenaar (1988:03) states that in 1904 the Cape Police was disbanded and incorporated into yet another new organization, the Cape Mounted Police. In the meantime, various police forces and units had come into being in the Transvaal, the Orange Free State and Natal (De Witt Dippenaar 1988:03).

According to Brewer (1994:15), from 1873 there were thirteen urban police forces in the then Orange Free State that were only given legal status in 1895. The impetus behind the development of policing in urban areas was driven by an increase in crime rates and the fear of crime. Although crime levels were low in South Africa between 1652 and 1840 within Voortrekker communities on isolated Afrikaner farms, the big need for
policing was in the rural areas. This need was not to deal with crime and disorder, but to
defend settlers’ territory and regulate interaction with the overwhelming number of
Africans with whom they shared the territory.

According to Brewer (1994:16), policing during this era was a paramilitary system that
was conducted on an *ad hoc* basis by the Afrikaners who used force and brutality to
control Africans. Community policing as we know it today was used effectively in the
rural areas by the Afrikaners to defend their territory and protect their different cultural
and social habits from being invaded and absorbed by the Africans.

Potgieter (1974), states that the South African Police Service that we are familiar with
today had its origin after the Second Anglo-Boer War in 1902. Prior to the war, each
colony or Boer Republic had its own law enforcement organization. The core function of
these law enforcement organizations was not to prevent crime, but to defend settler
territory and regulate interaction with the overwhelming number of Blacks with whom
they shared territory. With the outbreak of the war in 1899 the Transvaal and Orange
Free State police forces were called to active service in the Boer army, while the Cape

Mounted Riflemen and Mounted Police, and the Natal Mounted Police were called to
support the British. In September 1900, Lord Roberts - commander-in-chief of the
British forces - ordered Major General Baden-Powell to develop a scheme for a
Constabulary Force. Their primary role was the prevention of crime in the Transvaal and
Orange Free State (OFS) that could begin to function in 1901, as he expected the war
to be over by then. The police force was to be divided into four divisions, three for the Transvaal and one for the OFS, but was not to be responsible for everyday policing function, as they had to be taking part in the expected conflict (Potgieter 1974).

At the cessation of hostilities, the Johannesburg and Pretoria areas were under the jurisdiction of the Transvaal Town Police, with the South African Constabulary being responsible for policing in rural areas. The core function of the Constabulary was crime prevention. These units were broken up in 1908 and replaced by the Transvaal and Orange River Police Forces with the same core function of crime prevention.

With the unification of South Africa on 30 May 1910, a need arose for a variety of provincial, municipal, and rural police forces, all of which were established in terms of a series of separate proclamations or acts. The existence of so many police forces in a unified country proved wholly untenable and the opinion was increasingly expressed that the various forces should be merged into one combined police force. Initial steps in this direction had in fact been taken shortly after unification in August 1910, when the Union Government had appointed an ad hoc committee to discuss the establishment of a national police force.

The committee consisted of the commissioners of the police of various provinces and a magistrate, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Justice in the Cape Province, Mr E.F. Lonsdale (De Witt Dippenaar 1988:06). The committee managed to come to a provisionally unanimous decision within a relatively short time. Their recommendations
included draft legislation for a national force along the lines laid down in the Transvaal Police Act 5 of 1908, which was still in force. The committee also drew up draft regulations which were tabled in Parliament together with the committee’s report, and referred to a select committee for consideration.

A conference for police commissioners of all four provinces was called in August 1910, and a Draft Police Bill and regulations were drawn up for the Union, Colonel T.G. Truter, former commissioner of police in the Transvaal, was made commissioner of the new South African Union Police Force, with Deputy Commissioners servicing several other forces, like detectives, who reported to Truter. Truter also became Accounting Officer for the police force in 1911, gaining financial control over the police force (Potgieter 1974). The core function of the new police force was crime prevention.

By the end of 1911 the police force was restructured and divided into two forces, namely the South African Police (SAP) and the South African Mounted Riflemen (SAMR). The South African Police was to carry out normal policing functions - including crime prevention - under the Police Act 14 of 1912, and only in wartime would they be conscripted in terms of the Defence Force Act 13 of 1912. The South African Mounted Riflemen was a regular military force that conducted police duties during peace times. The core function of the SAMR was to enforce law and order more effectively in black areas, particularly in Natal and the Transkei (De Witt Dippenaar 1988:08). Section 12(4) of the Defence Force Act 13 of 1912, defined the duties of the SAMR as follows:
“In times of peace the South African Mounted Riflemen shall be allotted the duty of maintaining order within the Union and when any member of such a regiment is carrying out that duty he shall be capable of exercising all such powers and shall perform all such functions as are by law conferred on or are to be performed by a police officer or constable and shall be liable in respect of facts done or omitted to be done to the same extent as he would have been liable in like circumstances if he were a member of a police force and shall have the benefits of all the indemnities to which a member of a police force would in like circumstances be entitled.”

1.4.4.3 Policing from 1913 to 1993

According to De Witt Dippenaar (1988:11) section 7 of the Police Act of 1912, defined the powers and duties of the new Police Force in the following manner:

“Every member of the force shall exercise such powers and perform such duties as are by law conferred or imposed on a police officer or constable, but subject to the terms of such law, and shall obey all lawful directions in respect of the execution of his office which he may from time to time receive from his superiors in the force.”

Crime prevention was not spelled out as the core function of the police in the Police Act of 1912. This Act nevertheless left no doubt concerning the military duties of the new
Police Force. Regulations in respect of the duties of the Police Force in times of danger were clearly specified in section 8 of the Police Act:

“The Governor General may, in case of war or other emergency, deploy the force or any part thereof to assist in the Defence of the Union within or outside South Africa, and may place the force or any part thereof, while so employed, under the orders and directions of such person as the Governor General may appoint. The force or part thereof shall, while so deployed, be subject to the law and regulations governing the discipline, command, and control when on active or military service of the permanent Defence forces of the Union.”

De Witt Dippenaar (1988:12) state that a step of particular significance was the compilation of Standing Orders, without which no effective control or proper policing could be exercised. An initial set of Standing Orders had been published in 1913, but the full instruction was only published in 1918. The Standing Orders were subjected to periodic adjustments and amendments as the Police Force expanded and crime escalated.

According to De Witt Dippenaar (1988:10), the history of policing shows that the police have from early years been involved in conflict management in South Africa. He states that through the use of minimum force, they had time and again succeeded in changing conditions of anarchy and unrest to a state of peace and order. De Witt is contradicted by Brogden (1993:18), who is of the opinion that policing in South Africa was tasked
with maintaining apartheid and that resistance to this maintenance led to increased use of force.

According to De Witt Dippenaar (1988:46), the year 1920 represents an important milestone for the South African Police and those who, prior to 1913, had worked towards and cherished the ideal of establishing a national police force. The diligent campaigning and hard work to ensure that the South African Police would have authority and be able to prevent crime in the country had lasted for more than seven years. De Witt Dippenaar (1988:46) state that the ideal was achieved only after the Government had finally realised that in the interests of efficacy, uniformity, manpower for crime prevention and savings of funds, it will be more effective to combine the South African Police and the South African Mounted Riflemen into a single police force.

De Witt Dippenaar (1988:46) further state that the amalgamation of the two forces necessitated an immediate permanent reclassification of duties, as well as the establishment of two divisions; one in the Transkei, and the other one in Natal. Few problems were encountered with the reclassification and reallocation of duties. By that time the South African Police Force had been in existence for six years and was thus familiar with the powers and duties of the police as defined in section 7 of the Police Act of 1912. According to De Witt Dippenaar (1988:46), from an organizational point of view the force had already been functioning smoothly and the amalgamation was effected without any problems. However, owing to differences in the promotion systems of the two forces, a measure of discontent arose among members of the South African Police.
Promotion was achieved more rapidly in the South African Mounted Riflemen and, furthermore, any rank could be promoted directly to the rank of commissioned officer. This resulted in low morale among members of the South African Police (De Witt Dippenaar 1988:46).

Policing in South Africa has always relied on civil society for support. After the outbursts of resistance to government’s suppression in the 1960s, the then Minster of Justice – Mr B.J. Vorster created a reserve police force to assist the police in their crime prevention duties when officers had to take care of other essential services. Legislation on the utilization of reservists in policing was passed and recruitment began in earnest (Potgieter 1974).

During the 1970s the Criminal Investigation Department of the South African Police Service was divided into sub-departments covering commerce, diamonds, gold, house-breaking and theft, murder and robbery, internal security, drug-trafficking, prostitution, drinking and gambling. Over the years these divisions have been renamed or restructured to suit the social and criminal environment of the country (Potgieter 1974).

In 1978 the South African Police was subsequently restructured into 18 divisions, 80 districts, and 1 040 police stations. The restructuring was based on efficacy, uniformity, trained manpower for crime investigation and savings of funds (Potgieter 1974). A fingerprinting office was established in Pietermaritzburg in 1900, a year before Britain’s Scotland Yard followed suit, and by 1925 several offices had mushroomed,
necessitating the creation of the South African Criminal Bureau. This organisation
employed experts on firearms, fingerprints, handwriting, photography, and medicine,
and in 1954 developed its own compound for lifting fingerprints from objects. It was also
the first in the world to use colour photography for police purposes and kept a record of
every convicted criminal in the country (De Witt Dippenaar 1988:40).

South Africa had four independent states (Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda, and
Ciskei) and six self-governing territories (Gazankulu, KaNgwane, KwaNdebele,
KwaZulu, Lebowa, and Qwaqwa). These territories had their own police agencies,
which were allocated fewer resources for local policing and crime prevention than the
aim of the South African Police was to maintain law and order. This maintenance was
characterized by the enforcement of oppressive laws that served the political needs of
the Apartheid state (Brewer 1994:169). The other 10 agencies were also set up to
ensure the survival of the minority government, although they were regarded as being
police forces for the then independent and self-governing territories, they were funded
by the then government of white South Africa, to assist in maintaining of Apartheid laws

The 11 agencies had varying selection and recruitment criteria, training practices and
operational standards. Owing to the focus on the maintenance of the political system
through maintaining law and order, the police organizations relied on a paramilitary style
of operating, with little emphasis on crime prevention; and almost no attention was paid
to the development of sound management practices or an effective organizational infrastructure to operate within (Brewer 1994: 285).

1.4.4.4 Policing from 1994 to 2010

After the advent of democracy, the new Constitution established a single National Police Service by amalgamating all 11 police agencies. The core functions of the South African Police Service as stipulated in section 205(3) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996 are:

- Crime prevention;
- Crime combating;
- Crime investigation;
- Maintaining public order;
- Protecting and securing the inhabitants of the republic and their property; and
- Upholding and enforcing the law.

Certain municipalities have also been empowered to establish municipal or metropolitan police services toward preventing crime. Most of the major cities in the country have set up metropolitan police services, or are in the process of doing so (Klipin and Harrison 2009:09). These metropolitan police agencies have the responsibilities of enforcing local by-laws and traffic laws, as well as preventing crime (Klipin and Harrison 2009:09).
Most important has been the shift in philosophy to a community policing approach. Much effort and expense has been put into spreading the ideas of community policing and crime prevention techniques. Both the South African Police Service, Act 68 of 1995 and the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996, call for community policing and it is a legal requirement that each police station in the country has a community police forum (Klipin & Harrison 2009:09).

One of the most important policy pieces to be written during this time was the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS), which was released in 1996 (National Crime Prevention Strategy 1996). This document emphasizes the importance of a long term, problem-solving approach to crime prevention, and also places the concept of social crime prevention firmly on the safety and security agenda. The NCPS calls for co-operation and joint planning between government departments to enhance the success in the fight against crime. The reality of scarce resources has made these ideals difficult to realize.

1.4.5 Policing in Botswana

The Tribal Police of Botswana was established to prevent crime (theft of cattle) by Kgosi (King) Khama II of Bangwato who ruled from 1832-1834 (Makgale 1997:02). This was the period of Difaqane wars when marauding and rampaging Ndebele and Kololo warriors were causing havoc among the Batswana communities by raiding and looting their cattle and other valuables, leaving huts and fields burning.
The creation of the tribal police was in addition to an already existing system of government which comprised of the chief and his senior executive officers (Makgale 1997:03). These senior executive officers were assisting the chief to receive land and adjudicate in land allocation and providing direction to the warriors in wartimes. A visit by a colonist named Patterson in July 1878 saw the police in Botswana starting to maintain order in town (Makgale 1997:04). During the pre-colonial days the tribal policemen were known as *maotlana* as they inflicted corporal punishment to persons convicted of wrong-doing and also enforced the chief’s order or judgements. Later, *maotlana* were referred to as *mapodisi* (the police). According to Makgale (1997:05), the police in Botswana evolved from the Tribal Police that had been established by pre-colonial chiefs in the 1830s for:

- Crime prevention;
- Crime detection;
- Apprehension of offenders;
- The safeguarding of life and property; and
- The maintenance of law and order.

In preventing the commission of offences, members of the Local Police Force carried out patrols within their areas of operation which included cattle posts and ploughing areas and educated the public on how to safeguard their properties as well as teaching young people the rule of law so as to divert them from criminal activities (Makgale 1997:...
The Local Police was transformed by the Local Police Act 13 of 1972, following the recommendations contained in the Pilane report of 1970. The purpose of enacting the Local Police Act 13 of 1972 was to arm the Local Police force with statutory powers of arrest. The Local Police Act 13 of 1972 makes provision for three major levels of authority, namely:

- His Excellency, the President as the appointing authority of the police.
- The Minister of Local Government as the officer in charge of the Local Police Force.
- The Chief or Sub-Chief for the general administration, of the Local Police Force subject to the general direction of the Minister of Local Government.

The police of Botswana is classified under discipline forces in terms of section 19(1)(b) of the Constitution of Botswana, Act 83 of 1966. The same Act provides that the command of the Botswana police is vested in the President and he/she holds the office of the commander in chief. The constitution does not spell out crime prevention as the core function of the Botswana police force. However, crime prevention is spelled out as the one of the functions of the Botswana police by the Local Police Act 13 of 1972.

1.4.6 Policing in Namibia

According to Rauch and Van Der Spuy (2006:96), in the pre-independence era the South African Police controlled the South-West African Police (SWAPOL) and shaped
their counter-insurgency operations. In 1980 the responsibility for the South African Police in Namibia was handed over to the Administrator General and the Council of Ministers. The only exception was the security branch and the national intelligence services, where the South African Police retained the responsibility. The SWAPOL was formally inaugurated in April 1981 and introduced new uniforms soon thereafter to distinguish the force from the former South African Police, but the close working relationship, cooperation, and support from South Africa continued. SWAPOL exhibited many features of a Bantustan-type police force created under the auspices of its colonial master.

The Police Act 7 of 1958 was the guiding piece of legislation for SWAPOL. The force was headed by a Commissioner who reported directly to Cabinet. The said police organisation was divided into four branches: security, administration, criminal investigation, and special operations (a task force and a guard unit). After 1989, democratic principles and operational practices were developed on how the Namibian Police (NAMPOL) was to be governed. The Namibian Constitution of 1998 changed SWAPOL to NAMPOL. Article 115 of the Namibian Constitution of 1998 and section 2(1) of the Namibian Police Act 19 of 1990, established the Namibian Police under the Ministry of Home Affairs. The Namibian Constitution does not spell out crime prevention as the core function of the police force, unlike the South African Constitution. The Namibian Constitution refers the duties of the police to the Namibian Police Act 19 of 1990, which state crime prevention as one of the functions of the police.
In terms of the Namibian Constitution, the Namibian Police is headed by an Inspector-General, who is appointed by the President and supported by two deputies under the Ministry of Safety and Security (prior to 21 March 2005 and subsequently under the Ministry of Home Affairs). The organisation consists of seven functional divisions headed by commissioners and regional police headquarters headed by deputy commissioners or chief inspectors. The policy framework of the Namibian Police states that it should engage in both proactive and reactive activities in fulfilling its policing mandate.

The increase in crime levels led to occasional interaction between the police and military (Rauch and Van Der Spuy 2006: 6). In terms of the provisions contained in the Defence Act of 2002, members of the National Defence Force can be deployed in support of various policing activities. Such provisions have given rise to debates about the desirability of joint police-military deployment. The Namibian Police is highly centralised and 50% of its personnel is assigned to paramilitary units responsible for:

- Guard duties;
- Manning checkpoints;
- Border guards; and
- The maintenance of public order.
1.4.7 Policing in Zambia

The Zambian Police was established in 1964, headed by the Inspector General of Police under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Home Affairs. The police have often been accused of the violation of individuals' rights, but the change from the Police Force to the Police Service in the 1900s influenced the operational method of the police to take human and individual rights into consideration (Anonymous (b) 2011).

The core functions of the Zambian Police Service are spelled out by Article 104 of the Constitution of Zambia, Act 18 of 1996 as to:

(a) protect life and property;

(b) preserve law and order;

(c) detect and prevent crime;

(d) co-operate with the civilian authority and other security organs established under this Constitution and with the population generally.

1.4.8 Policing in Malawi

McCracken (1986:127) states that the police in Malawi initially consisted of small groups of armed ex-soldiers who were totally untrained in conventional police duties. These ex-soldiers were employed by district officers for enforcing the payment of hut tax. In response to the threat that was posed by the emergence of labour migrants who were returning from the South in 1920, the authorities formed a trained and centralized police
force commanded by European police officers. Although this police force was very successful in protecting urban property in the reorganized districts of Malawi, its small size limited it in attempting to prevent and detect crime in the entire country.

The focus of the colonial government in Malawi was on raising educational standards and improving conditions of service for the Malawians. But after the riots of 1953, it focused more on increasing the number of police officials and giving the police more coercive powers. This process was accelerated in the aftermath of the 1959 state of emergency. Most police officers in Malawi spent their lives upholding colonial authority (McCracken 1986:128).

The Malawian national police force falls under the Ministry of Home Affairs and is headed by an Inspector General of the Police. Although police operations are hampered by a lack of resources and inadequate training, the government has been active in promoting the philosophy of community policing in an attempt to reform the then repressive police and make them more accountable to and trusted by the community (McCracken 1986:128).

Section 4 of the police Act Cap 13.01 gives the duties of the Malawi Police Service (MPS) as including that of crime prevention. It state that MPS shall be employed throughout Malawi for the prevention and detection of crime, the apprehension of offenders, the preservation of law and order, the protection of property and the due enforcement of all laws and regulations with which they are directly charged.
1.4.9 Policing in Scotland

After the Second World War, the police service in Scotland underwent a series of major changes. The Scottish Police College was established at Tulliallan Castle to provide residential training on a centralized basis and senior, junior, detective and traffic training are now provided on a single campus for all ranks up to Superintendent. In 1990, 96 courses were held involving 2,434 officers. Improved effectiveness and efficiency have been achieved through standardization of responsibilities in the higher police ranks, improvements in examination and recruitment methods, the introduction of new technology, and the reduction in the number of forces through a series of amalgamations, culminating in the creation of only eight forces covering the whole of Scotland at the time of local government reorganization in 1975 (Royal Commission report 1962).

The Scottish Crime Squad was established in 1969 to deal with crimes affecting more than one police area. To capacitate the Scottish Crime Squad, a dedicated drug wing was added to it in 1986 (Royal Commission report 1962). And to enhance its effectiveness and efficiency, a Technical Support Unit was set up in 1989. Police officials, like many police officers around the world, have considerable discretion because they do most of their work away from their seniors without much supervision (Royal Commission report 1962).
The functions of the Scotland Police are set out in the Chapter 77 of the Scotland Police Act of 1967 as follows:

(a) to guard and patrol;

(i) to prevent the commission of offences;

(ii) to preserve order;

(iii) to protect life and property;

(b) where an offence has been committed to take all such lawful measures, and make such reports to the appropriate prosecutor, as may be necessary for the purpose of bringing the offender with all due speed to justice;

(c) to serve and execute when required any warrant, citation or deliverance issued; and

(d) to attend any court of law for the purpose of giving evidence.

1.4.10 Policing in New Zealand

Chappell and Wilson (1969:17) state that prior to New Zealand becoming a British colony in 1840, soldiers were used exclusively to prevent crime. After 1840 civilian constables were appointed by magistrates to maintain law and order. These constables were inadequate for this task, and in 1846 an ordinance was passed for the establishment and maintenance of a new constabulary force. The New Zealand police force was to have a sufficient number of physically fit and able men who would serve as an armed force for crime prevention and apprehending offenders.
Chappell and Wilson (1969:17) further state that the work of the New Zealand police force was more difficult but less effective because violent crimes and theft cases were high. This led to the establishment of the first national police force in 1867 under the Armed Constabulary Ordinance. Due to the wars in Maori during this era, the national force was preoccupied in fighting the war rather than preventing crime and maintaining civil order. The provinces were abolished in 1877 and the provincial police forces were merged into the then two branches of the Armed Constabulary which was a field force and the police. The field force was dealing with the unrest among Maoris while the police were engaged in the normal policing duties, which included crime prevention.

According to Chappell and Wilson (1969:17), New Zealand's national police force was established by the New Zealand's Police Force Act of 1886. This police force was armed during emergencies and it maintained its link with the military by having the army officers in charge of the police until 1898, when the first civilian police commissioner was appointed.

According to section 9 of the New Zealand Policing Act 72 of 2008, some of the functions of the Zealand Police are:

- The keeping of peace;
- Maintenance of public safety;
- Law enforcement;
- Crime prevention; and
Community support and reassurance.

Section 10 of the above Act acknowledges the roles of other departments that are helping with crime prevention and emphasizes the necessity and appropriateness of the cooperation between the police and the public.

1.5 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Hernon & Metoyer-Duran (1993: 82) state that problem statement should have the following nine attributes:

1. clarity and precision;
2. identification of what would be studied;
3. identification of an overarching question and key factors or variables;
4. identification of key concepts and terms;
5. articulation of the study's boundaries or parameters;
6. some generalizability;
7. conveyance of the study's importance, benefits, and justification:
8. no use of unnecessary jargon; and
9. conveyance of more than the mere gathering of descriptive data providing a snapshot.

The above nine attributes provides the context for the research study and typically generates questions which the research hopes to answer. In this research the researcher found that too much research has been conducted in the domain of police and crime prevention in the world, including South Africa. Some of this research
questions whether crime prevention is the core function of the police as stated by Sir Robert Peel’s principles (Van Heerden 1992), or whether crime prevention is not the core function of the police as per the recent study of Dr Johan Burger (Burger 2007). The challenge with these assertions – crime prevention as the core function of the police or crime prevention as not the core function of the police – is that they affect the manner in which police performance is measured.

If crime prevention should be regarded as the core function of the police, then police’s performance can be measured in terms of their efficiency and effectiveness. Police efficiency is the ability of the police to prevent crime and police effectiveness is the ability of the police to arrest perpetrators after the commission of the crime. Should crime prevention not be regarded as the core function of the police, then police performance should be measured heavily by their ability to arrest perpetrators after the commission of crime. Should crime prevention be regarded as the core function of the police, then police performance should be measured heavily on their ability to prevent crime or in essence lower crime levels.

The implication of crime prevention as not the core function of the police is that the measurement of police performance will rely heavily on measuring their effectiveness. This could lead to a situation where police performance could be rated as good while crime levels and public fear of crime might be high. This might cause the measurement of police performance to be insignificant and irrelevant to most people who are experiencing high crime levels and criminality.
On the other hand, if crime prevention is the core function of the police, then police performance could be measured in terms of their efficiency and effectiveness. This could portray police performance in the context of crime levels and communities’ fear of crime. Although this provides a comprehensive measurement of police performance, it could place pressure on them to capacitate their social crime prevention units and activate the broader society in respect of awareness and prevention of crime.

Determining whether crime prevention is or is not the core function of the police is crucial in the light of the high levels of crime in South Africa. It will ultimately determine whether crime levels should be one of the variables that could be used to measure the performance of the police. If it could indeed be used, it will be important to determine to what extent it should be used or if not, obtain the reasons as to why it cannot be used as one of the variables in measuring police performance.

1.6 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The main objective of this study is to investigate whether crime prevention is or should be the core function of the police as it was initially asserted by Sir Robert Peel and stated by the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Van Heerden 1992; Act 108 of 1996). Or, whether crime prevention is and should not be the core function of the police as stated by Burger, which would require an amendment to the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Burger 2007). The following sub-objectives will be pursued
in an attempt to achieve the major objective of determining whether crime prevention is the core function of the police or not:

- Establishing the rationale of making crime prevention the core function of the police;
- Establishing the rationale of not making crime prevention the core function of the police;
- Determining the implication of crime prevention as the core function of the police;
  and
- Determining the implication of not making crime prevention the core function of the police.

1.7 THE RESEARCH QUESTION

According to Hofstee (2006:85), research questions should state as precisely as possible what the research will attempt to find. Based on this understanding and an attempt to focus this study and ensure that the research objective of the study is achieved, the following research question was used:

Is crime prevention the core function of the police?
1.8 VALUE OF THE RESEARCH

The emergence of an opposing view on whether crime prevention is the core function of the police or not raises questions on how police effectiveness and efficiency should be measured. Peel's principles of policing state that the test for police efficiency and effectiveness is the absence of crime and disorder (Germann, Frank & Gallati 1962:54). Establishing whether crime prevention is the core function of the police or not will determine whether the current method, which relies heavily on measuring police performance by crime levels, is a true indicator of police performance or not. Based on the above assertions (crime prevention as the core function of the police or crime prevention as not the core function of the police), the following benefits could emerge from this study:

- Crime analysts will know which variables to use when measuring police performance.
- The police themselves will understand whether they are measured realistically or not.
- Public expectation of the police could be aligned with what the police are expected to do and capable of doing.
1.9 RESEARCH DEMARCATION

According to Schwedt (1997:140), the site or place of a study is chosen on the basis of a combination of criteria including availability, accessibility and theoretical interest. The site or place that is chosen for the study is referred to as the research demarcation. The demarcation of the area of study is most important in order to ensure that the area of choice will provide a variety of information from which important general deductions can be made.

1.9.1 Geographical demarcation

Even though the study was conducted primarily in South Africa, comparative analyses were done with selected Southern African Development Community (SADC) countries, as well as two European countries, to explore the understanding that these countries have of crime prevention as the core function of the police. Understanding that sampling in qualitative research is designed to enhance the value of the information collected and not for statistical reasons like in quantitative studies (Auriacombe & Mouton 2007:488). Coupled with the accessibility and theoretical interest that the area of research should provide as stated by Schwedt (1997:140), the researcher conducted literature research to obtain policing information about the Southern African Development Community countries as well as two European countries.
Based on the above factors (availability, accessibility and theoretical interest), countries were selected based on accessibility, English-language, electronic-source material, as well as the working relationship of such country with the South African Police Service to ensure that it would be possible for the researcher to obtain all the information that is necessary for the research. These were critical factors for the success of this study, because it had to be a certainty that sufficient police literature could be obtained and the researcher would have access to corroborative evidence through interviews and questionnaires.

The analysis was done on all 15 Member States of the Southern African Development Community, namely: Angola, Botswana, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The Southern African Development Community countries which best met the above criteria and which were selected for the study were Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Malawi.

To get an international perspective on whether crime prevention is the core function of the police or not, an analysis was done of the countries with which the South African Police Service usually makes international comparisons, namely: Australia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom (England & Wales), the United Kingdom (London Metropolitan Police) and the United States of America. Because most of these countries meet the two criteria that were used to select the Southern African Development Community countries, New Zealand and Scotland
were randomly selected from the list of the countries that the South African Police Service makes comparison with. All the countries that were analysed have crime prevention as the function of the police either in their constitution or in their police act.

1.10 DEFINITION OF KEY THEORETICAL CONCEPTS

Theoretical definitions define the connation of concepts, while operational definitions provide the contextual definitions of the concepts (Mouton & Marais 1996:189). The theoretical definition is more abstract and the operational definition defines the concept in the context of what is being dealt with. Crime and crime prevention are the concepts that will be defined in this study because they are the central themes in this research.

1.10.1 Crime is one aspect that has received most attention in criminological literature. Literature also shows that the opinions of criminologists vary greatly regarding this concept, and how it should be defined.

Two broad approaches can be distinguished, namely the juridical approach and the criminological approach. The juridical approach defines crime as a violation of the law that warrants punishment by the state (Stevens & Cloete 1996:01). The criminological approach defines crime as all antisocial conduct that is in conflict with the law, or is injurious or detrimental to the sound normal life and the survival of an individual, his/her next of kin and the community (Van der Walt 1996:02). For the purpose of this study,
the focus will be on the juridical approach because it is more in line with the mandate of the police.

1.10.2 Burger (2007:12) defines crime prevention as any action designed to reduce either the actual level of crime or the perceived fear of crime. Peel, in Arrington (2006:33), defines it as actions that are designed to remove or reduce the anticipated or perceived crime risk. Van Heerden (1992:158) on the other hand states that crime prevention is mainly concerned with the proactive nature of policing and includes taking action before social order is violated.

For the purposes of this research, crime prevention will be defined as any action that is designed to prevent the occurrence of crime as this is a broad-based definition that neither advantages nor disadvantages the stated objective of this study.

1.11 ORGANISATION OF THE THESIS

The study is laid out as follows:

**Chapter 2 and 3: Literature review** – These two chapters deal with the literature review of the core function of the police. Chapter two deals with the school of thought that advocates for crime prevention as the core function of the police and chapter three deals with the school of thought that asserts that crime prevention is not the core function of the police.
Chapter 4: Research design and methodology – Discusses the research design, the research methods, the sampling, the population, the data collection methods, as well as the data analysis. It concludes by addressing the ethical considerations of the study, as well as validity and reliability.

Chapter 5: Research Findings - Interprets, analyses and discusses the empirical and literature findings of the study.

Chapter 6: Recommendations and Conclusion - Is the last chapter of the study. It makes the recommendations based on the findings of the study. Included in this chapter is the conclusion that gives the conclusive view of the entire study.

1.12 CONCLUSION

South Africa is a democratic country where the rule of law is supreme. The South African Constitution mandates the South African Police Service to perform various functions, which include crime prevention as the core function. High crime levels are held up by various political parties as alleged evidence of the failure of the policies of the ruling party. This enormous pressure from the public and politicians places huge stress on the police to bring crime levels down.

Although crime is a challenge for most countries all over the world, the violent nature of crime in South Africa is of the utmost concern. There is a need for the police and the
society in general to play a constructive role in the prevention of crime in general and the minimization of the violent nature of crime in particular. This could best be achieved if the roles and the responsibilities of both the police and the community in the fight against crime are clearly understood. The determination of these roles and responsibilities will indicate whether police performance is accurately measured and is in consonant with what the community expects from the police.
CHAPTER 2: CRIME PREVENTION AS THE CORE FUNCTION OF THE POLICE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter analyses the views and arguments of various authors, academics, and analysts who propagate that crime prevention is the fundamental function of the police. It investigates the rationale of making crime prevention the fundamental function of the police and the implication of this approach to modern policing.

The analysis is done in an attempt to establish factors that should influence police performance according to this school of thought. Understanding these factors is important as they will determine whether police performance is accurately measured and whether it truly reflects communities’ expectations of the police and what the police are capable of doing. These measures must not only reflect, but also help to shape, communities’ expectations of the police.

Preliminary investigation reveals that the current strategy of policing emphasizes on crime control through arrests. Arrests are produced by patrols, rapid response to calls for service, and crime investigation. Current police performance measures are linked directly to these tasks. The overall objective of the police has traditionally been perceived to be the prevention of crime through proactive policing or the deterrence value attached to reactive policing. This caused police performance to be measured by the number of reported crimes and the number of people arrested for these crimes.
2.2 POLICE AND CRIME PREVENTION

According to Miller (1977:30), Sir Robert Peel is credited with the formation of modern policing. He convinced the British Parliament of the need for organized policing and guided the early development of the police force in London. Through Peel and his two police commissioners - Charles Rowan and Richard Mayne - the role of the London Police Force was formulated and crime prevention was its primary function. Peel also stated that to enforce laws and exert authority, the police had to first gain legitimacy in the eyes of the public.

Peel and his associates carefully orchestrated the process of legitimizing the police because they recognized that in order to gain authority, police officers had to act in an impartial and orderly manner. They were cautious that failure to do so would cause the public to reject police officers. To achieve this end, Peel and his associates selected men who were even-tempered and reserved, a uniform that was unassuming, insisted that officers be restrained and polite, and did not allow officers to carry firearms. As a result, the legitimacy of the London Police Force was based on institutional authority that was grounded in the English Constitution and their behaviour was determined by the rule of law (Miller 1977:31).

Van Heerden (1982:79) regards Sir Robert Peel as the father of modern policing and the custodian of the concept “crime prevention” as the core function of any police
agency. Peel regarded police efficiency as the absence of crime and not the visible steps that are taken by the police to restore the violated order. Peel is supported by various authors, academics and analysts who are of the view that crime prevention is the fundamental objective of any police agency (Litwack 1961: No page number; Skogan 1976:279; Alpert & Dunham 1988:21; Kelling & Moore 1988:03; Van Heerden 1992:156; Hale 1994:34; Sherman 1998b:67; Uchida 2004: 03; Bruce & Neild 2005:12; Van Vuuren 2006:18; and Kennedy 2009:40).

The proponents of crime prevention as the core function of the police, state that the prevention of crime could be achieved by police’s ability to act proactively and intensify patrol operations. This is premised on the understanding that for crime to happen, both predisposing and precipitating factors should be present. Predisposing factors relate to the desire to commit crime, whilst precipitating factors relate to the opportunity for crime to be committed (Van Heerden 1982:153).

Although it is universally accepted that the police have little to do with the desire to commit crime, it is generally accepted that they have a great deal to do with reducing the opportunity for crime. This general acceptance is reaffirmed by Green (2000:309) who states that although some crimes may be difficult to prevent entirely, their recurrence can be significantly delayed or reduced by the police. Litwack (1961: No page number) states that a preventive police force acts as a deterrent to criminals and is in the best interest of society.
According to Litwack (1961: No page number), many citizens and politicians opposed the idea of a uniformed police officer in the early development of policing in England. They argued that an organized police force closely resembles a standing army, which could potentially give government despotic control over citizens. Ultimately, the argument for the organized police force prevailed, primarily due to the disorder and fear of crime experienced by London residents. The London Metropolitan Police Act that established a full-time uniformed police force with the primary purpose of patrolling and preventing crime in the city was finally approved in 1829.

2.2.1 Hypotheses on Crime Prevention

Sherman and Eck (2002:296) review the eight hypotheses on how the police can prevent crime. Their reviews also answer questions on what works, what does not work and what is promising. They outline the review and varieties of police crime prevention techniques as follows:

*Number of police officers:* According to Sherman and Eck (2002:296), the claim that hiring more police results in less crime is true. They state that this idea was developed not as a mathematical debate, but the doctrine was based on the apparent results of several demonstration projects with some empirical results. These included the court-supervised “Bow Street Runners.” The level of violence throughout the nineteenth
century declined while the number of police increased and many observers concluded that more police officers do reduce crime levels.

On the other hand, Evans and Owens (2007:182) state that various authors have examined the relationship between police force size and crime using cross-sectional data. Conclusions from these studies indicate that there is little evidence that a larger police force reduces crime. According to Evans and Owens (2007:182), some papers have recently used quasi-experimental variation to determine the impact of the size of the police force to crime levels, but there is still little evidence that more police reduce crime.

**Rapid response to emergency calls:** The quicker the police arrive at the scene of crime, the more likely it is that the police will arrest the offender or suspect before he or she flees. This leads to the conclusion that rapid response interrupts the successful commission of crime. Secondly, it serves as a deterrent to potential offenders that they will not be able to commit crime successfully. And lastly, it leads to the successful prosecution of offenders who are caught red-handed.

**Random patrols:** Increasing emphasis on rapid response to emergency calls in automobiles gradually put an end to directed patrols, allowing officers to patrol at random far beyond their assigned beats. This policy was justified by the theory that unpredictability in patrol patterns would create a perceived “omnipresence” of the police that deters crime in public places. Orlando Wilson – the former Chicago Police Chief
and the Dean of Criminology at Berkeley University – is a widely cited proponent of this view (Wilson 1963:232). Although the Chicago Police Chief favoured the use of police workload analysis to determine how many officers should be assigned to different beats and shifts, modern police practices show little variation in patrol presence according to time and place. Sherman and Eck (2002:297) reiterated that many police chiefs and mayors claim that hiring and recruiting more police officials to patrol, does reduce and prevent crime.

Directed patrols: Since the advent of computerized crime analysis, far greater precision has become possible in the identification of crime patterns. Police have used precision to focus patrol resources on times and places with the highest risks of serious crime. The hypothesis is that the more patrol presence is concentrated at the “hot spots” and “hot times” of criminals’ activity, the less crime there will be in those places and at those times.

Reactive arrests: Like police patrols, arrest practices can be either focused or unfocused on crime-risk factors. Reactive arrests (in response to specific citizen complaints) are like random patrols in that they cast a wide net, warning all citizens that they can be arrested for all law violations at all times. Observation of thousands of police encounters with suspect(s) show that police choose not to arrest suspects in the majority of cases in which there had been legal grounds to do so. The frequent decision not to arrest has been noticed by crime victims’ advocacy groups, who argue that more arrests will produce less crime. This hypothesis, like the general deterrence, is
expressed at two levels of analysis: the general or community-wide, and the specific or individual-level. The individual-level hypothesis has been questioned for decades by social scientists, and even some police officers who suggest that arrest, especially for minor offences (which are by far the most common), provoke a response from offenders making them more likely to commit future crime than if they had not been arrested. This argument lies at the heart of the ability of correctional facilities to rehabilitate offenders.

**Proactive arrests:** Like directed patrols, proactive arrests concentrate police on a narrow set of high-risk targets. The hypothesis is that a high certainty of arrest for a narrowly defined set of offenders will accomplish more than low arrest certainty for a broad range of targets. In recent years the theory has been tested with investigations of four primary high-risk targets, namely chronic serious offenders, potential robbery suspects, drug market places and areas, and high-risk places and times for drunk driving. The hypothesis about chronic serious offenders is tested by examining the rate at which such offenders are incapacitated from further offending by being arrested.

Another version of the proactive arrest hypothesis is called “zero tolerance” based on the “broken windows” theory (Wilson and Kelling 1982:06). According to the broken windows theory, areas appearing to be in disorder and out of control provide an attractive climate for crime just as a window with one broken pane attracts more stones than a completely unbroken window. The theory expounds the hypothesis that the more arrests the police make for less serious crimes, the fewer the chances for the more serious crimes.
Community and problem-oriented policing: Moore (1992:128) states that hypotheses about community and problem-oriented policing are less focused than other hypotheses to an extent that some observers have advised against trying to test them. They both involve far more variations and possible combinations of police activities than the narrow deterrence hypotheses. Crime problems vary so widely in nature that effective policing for prevention must vary accordingly, and arguably require many elements to succeed. While community and problem-oriented policing are often said to be overlapping strategies (Moore 1992:128), they actually have very different historical and theoretical roots. Community policing arises from the crisis of legitimacy after the urban race riots of the 1960s in the United States of America (Conklin 1971; President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice 1967; and National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders 1968).

Reports on these riots claimed that the police had lost contact with minority group residents, both by changing from foot patrols to radio cars and by taking a more legalistic approach to law enforcement. The police were then urged to increase their quantitative and qualitative contact with citizens in order to reduce crime (Moore 1992:128).

Community policing: The crime prevention effects of community policing are hypothesized to occur in four major ways, namely neighbourhood watch, public information about crime, community-based intelligence, and police legitimacy.
• The neighbourhood watch hypothesis justifies one of the most widespread community policing programmes called block watch. Block watch increases the surveillance of residential neighbourhoods by residents with the ultimate aim of preventing or deterring people from committing crime because the neighbourhood is being watched.

• Community-based intelligence increases the flow of intelligence to the police and enhances police effectiveness at crime prevention through problem solving strategies (Moore 1992:128).

• Public information about crime is where the police fax out warnings of criminal activity to a list of residential and business fax numbers that requested the service (Moore 1992:128).

• Recent theoretical and basic research work in procedural justice provides a more scientifically elaborate version of the police legitimacy hypothesis than its proponents in the 1960s intended (Moore 1992:129). The claim is not just that police must be viewed as legitimate in order to win public cooperation with law enforcement, but it is that a legitimate police institution fosters more widespread obedience of the law. Sherman (1974:64) attributes the low levels of violent crime in England to the law-abiding masculinity set by nineteenth century police, a role model that became incorporated into the English character. There is even evidence that the police themselves become less likely to obey the law when
they are disillusioned with its apparent lack of procedural justice (Sherman 1974:64).

2.3 CRIME PREVENTION

Skogan (2007:02) attributed a drastic decline in crime rates in Chicago between 1991 and 2005 to increased street patrols by the police. A drastic drop in crime due to many police street patrols is an indication that if police departments are visible in our streets, regardless of any means of crime prevention technique, crime goes down because police are performing their core function correctly.

While Brogden (1993:131) sees crime prevention as a process of catching criminals and taking them to court to answer for crime that they have committed, Hale (1996:03) emphasizes that in a non-emergency, policing proactivity is given a higher priority than reactivity. In this approach intelligence is used to target criminals and to inform crime prevention strategies. However, it is essential to retain the ability to revert to reactivity for the police to be able to deal with those incidents that can neither be prevented nor deterred by crime prevention measures.

Uchida (2004:03) states that crime prevention and the role of law enforcement were initially placed in the hands of every citizen in England. Each citizen was held responsible for aiding neighbours who were crime victims. Charles Reith – an English historian – refers to this model of law enforcement as "kin police" (Reith 1956:156). This
model is a purely crime prevention technique and is not different to what today’s police departments are doing in crime prevention.

Kelling et al (1988:01) state that for the past 30 years, the police had been responding to calls for service but now dozens of police departments are returning to foot patrol with the aim of preventing the call for service and the crime before it happens. Crime prevention through law enforcement is the fundamental purpose of the police throughout the world (Terry 1985:82). There is little doubt that patrols for the purposes of crime prevention is the most important function of the police (Alpert & Dunham 1988:21). This function has to be performed legally, respectfully and be assessed by the amount of harm prevented (Stone et al 1988:59).

The above assertions reaffirm Sir Robert Peel’s proposition that police efficiency should be measured by the absence of crime and not the visible steps that are taken by the police to restore the violated order. Furthermore, crime prevention can be effective if there is proper understanding of crime, the role-players in crime prevention and other factors contributing to crime. To prevent crime effectively, the police must be able to identify factors that may lead to crime, potential victims, and criminals.

2.4 POLICE PERFORMANCE

Performance cannot be accurately and reliably measured if there is no clearly stated duties that the police are expected to perform. As this chapter deals with crime
prevention as the core function of the police, the measurement of police performance will be investigated and analyzed in the context of crime prevention as one of the functions of police officers.

2.4.1 Measurement of Police Performance

Moore and Braga (2003:439) state that police performance measurement systems based on traditional indicators – such as arrest rates and response times – prevent police organizations from moving towards a strategy of crime prevention whereby police officers could be held accountable for preventing crime and addressing communities’ concerns. The absence of factors that measure the ability of the police to prevent crime will always propel them to gravitate toward and focus more on responding to the already committed crimes and effecting arrests because this indicates their effectiveness.

A number of police agencies have made considerable progress in developing performance measurement systems that address community concerns and drive police organizations toward a crime prevention strategy. The South African Police Service has a Performance Chart which measures the police performance. This Chart focuses more on reaction time, clearance rate and arrest. Maguire and Uchida (2000:495) state that police function stretched from forming partnerships with communities and rendering a loosely defined social function to crime combating and the arresting of the offenders.
These activities constitute the output of police organizations and most attempts to measure and explain this output have relied on arrest, clearance, and crime statistics. Arrest and clearance statistics, for instance, are frequently used as measures of a police organization’s productivity. The use of these kinds of performance indicators is beginning to fall out of fashion as police executives, scholars, and police scientists focus on alternative measures – for example, the concept of sector policing where the measurement is a crime free sector. Some agencies may emphasize aggressive law enforcement in order to achieve this while others may ignore minor offences. Although the concept of organizational style is intangible and difficult to measure, researchers have attempted to draw inferences about policing styles by examining arrest patterns for discretionary offences such as drunkenness or disorderly conduct. Although police organizations do many different things, the data is only systematically collected on very few of these activities. This limits the scope of measures that can be constructed from this data (Maguire & Uchida 2000:495).

Skogan (1976:278) states that there are two concepts that are used to measure the performance of private and public organizations (including the police), namely efficiency and effectiveness. Effectiveness means task performance, effective organizations are those which meet the challenges put to them, satisfy demands for service, or solve problems. In the context of policing, this will entail the ability of the police to prevent, combat and investigate crime successfully. Efficiency on the other hand, is defined in terms of processing costs.
Efficient agencies are those which convert inputs into outputs with less effort. This deals with the ability of the police to prevent, combat, and investigate crime successfully, using minimal resources. Although police organizations have much in common, they also show tremendous variations. Some patrol aggressively and arrest offenders for minor offences, others enforce the law with less vigour; some work closely with communities and spend time formulating customized solutions to local problems; others shun community involvement (Maguire & Uchida 2000:492).

For people to be safe and secure, police effectiveness and its measurements thereof should be able to relate to the expectation of the community on safety and security. According to Skogan (1993:159), community wants several things, but in the interests of brevity Skogan focuses on just one – namely the desire of people to live in safe and orderly neighbourhoods. Safe and orderly neighbourhoods include streets free of drug dealers, rowdy juveniles, threatening derelicts, soliciting prostitutes and predatory criminals; buildings without graffiti or other signs of decay; no drive-by shootings; and so forth. This will, to a large extent, indicate effectiveness of the police, if crime levels are high even if the police manage to arrest criminals, the community will not pride themselves in the effective and efficient police department because they will not have a sense of security. Skogan (1993:159) concludes by stating that the police ought to make the production of safer and more orderly neighbourhoods one of their goals. They ought to design ways of assessing the conditions of neighbourhoods before and after various police interventions. They ought to use that assessment to modify their deployments and tactics.
2.5 FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED WHEN MEASURING POLICE PERFORMANCE

Asserting that crime prevention is the function of the police implies that the measurement for police performance should rely heavily on their ability to prevent crime. This means that the absence of crime will take precedence over other factors such as crime combating and investigation. According to Alpert and Moore (1993:110), factors that should be considered when measuring police performance under this school of thought entails patrols, crime combating and crime investigation. The essence of these functions is understood as being to prevent and deter the commission of crime.

Alpert and Moore (1993:110) state that the public’s fear of crime is another factor that should be taken into consideration when measuring police performance. This is premised on the link between the public’s fear of crime, high crime levels and police’s ability to prevent crime. If factors such as the ability of the police to prevent crime are not taken into consideration, it is very possible that the police can be seen as performing well when they arrest people who committed crime but the fear of crime and victimization in the society will still be high.

According to Alpert and Moore (1993:111), measures of trust and confidence in the police should be taken into consideration when measuring police performance. If these measures are not taken into consideration, most people will not see the importance of measuring police performance because it will not be addressing their fear of crime and
victimization. Alpert and Moore are supported by Shane (2009:15) who states that the goal of measuring performance is to determine whether the intended outcome is indeed achieved. For example, to control the fear of crime, things such as crime and criminal victimization must be reduced; offenders must increasingly be held accountable; and feelings of personal safety must be enhanced. Police scientists indicate that when crime levels increase the community loses confidence in the ability of the police to protect them (Alpert & Moore 1993:110).

2.6 THE IMPLICATION OF CRIME PREVENTION AS THE CORE FUNCTION OF THE POLICE IN MODERN POLICING

Proponents of crime prevention as the core function of the police regard crime prevention as the process of educating people about the facts surrounding the likelihood of victimization on all types of crime that are reported and committed in their surroundings. According to Sherman (2002:166), numerous theories have been advanced over the years to explain crime prevention. The following four theories are Sherman’s focus for the implications of crime prevention in modern policing:

**Community disorganization theory**: According to Sherman (2002:166), community disorganization theory is developed out of research on the relationship between delinquency and urban areas in Chicago neighbourhoods from the 1900s to 1950s. According to this theory, offending is regarded as the disruption of community social order, which is maintained by social institutions such as the family, church, and school.
A deduction could be made that crime prevention measures such as the mobilisation of the community for crime prevention activities is based on this theory.

**Community disorder theory:** Community disorder theory has its roots in the “Broken Windows” hypothesis that postulates disorderly behaviour as the precursor to more serious street crime and decay (Sherman 2002:167). Kelling and Coles (1997:20) in a recent follow-up to the “Broken Windows” perspective state that disorderly, unregulated and unchecked places are a signal to the community that the area is unsafe. The community will respond by withdrawing from such areas and this will leave a vacuum that could be filled by criminals.

Kelling and Coles (1997:20) view community disorder as behaviour that disturbs life. Skogan (2007:01) makes it clear by distinguishing between social and physical disorder. Social disorder relates to behaviour such as public drinking, begging and loitering, while physical disorder involves visual signs of negligence and unchecked decay such as graffiti, abandoned buildings and vehicles. The scope of crime prevention, as guided by this theory, rests largely on efforts to tackle disorder at an early stage. Crime prevention in this regard is done largely through partnership policing.

**Community empowerment theory:** The theory of community empowerment deals with the sharing of the information that could make the neighbourhood vulnerable to crime. This encourages the community to take greater interest in and responsibility for their neighbourhoods (Bennett 1998:376). The police should play a bigger role in the
identification of factors that tempt people to commit crime such as boredom and dilapidated buildings.

**Community regeneration theory:** Corporate investment is an important protective factor against neighbourhood decline and crime. This is based on the understanding that it will not be possible to promote social cohesion in communities that are deprived of the basic necessities of life. According to Hope (1995:35), any efforts to develop community-based crime prevention schemes should first be concerned with the transfer of both economic and political resources to local institutions and residents. This transfer of resources will contribute to the empowerment of communities, help integrate marginalized youth into the wider community, and enable the community to tackle key community-level risk factors for delinquency.

Van Vuuren (2004) states that community policing as both the philosophy (a way of thinking) of the police and the organizational strategy (a way to carry out the philosophy) is designed to enhance partnership policing by bringing the police closer to the community. This rests in the belief that community challenges could best be addressed by the partnership between the police and the community, where the police as the active partner have the responsibility of activating the community, which is the passive partner. According to Van Vuuren (2004), community policing expands the mandate of the police because it broadens their role and adds a vital, proactive element to their traditional reactive role. Therefore community policing is about preventing crime and disorder and it arose from the realization that direct engagement between the police and
the community could go a long way toward reducing crime and the fear of crime in society.

According to the Department for Safety and Security (2000), in South Africa, the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS) provides a proactive framework for social crime prevention that seeks to promote the integrated crime prevention approach. This strategy provides for the involvement of governmental and non-governmental organizations in the prevention of crime. The emphasis of the NCPS is to utilise more resources for the prevention of crime rather than addressing the crime that has already been committed, with the ultimate aim of creating a safe South Africa. It acknowledges that the multi-causal factors of crime need a comprehensive approach to deal with it. This stresses the need for all role-players to be involved in identifying and addressing the root causes of crime.

2.7 POLICE STRATEGIES AND OPERATIONAL METHODS

Alpert and Moore (1993:112) state that many police executives are beginning to think about and experiment with a strategy of policing that differs from the professional model and emphasizes the development of a strong relationship with the community. The essence of this new paradigm is that police must engage in community-based processes related to the production and maintenance of local human and social capital. The means by which these lofty goals are to be achieved are the development of strong relationships with institutions and individuals in the community. While the specific
elements of this new strategy of policing have not been agreed upon or clearly
delineated, the broad characteristics are reasonably clear. The major theme of building
a strong relationship with the community has two justifications. Firstly, it is an important
way to make enforcement more effective and secondly, it is a way to prevent crime and
make the community co-producers of justice (Alpert & Moore 1993:112).

Alpert and Moore (1993:112) give one excellent example which comes from the Metro-
Dade Police Department (MDPD) in Miami:

“In June 1992 the staff of the North-side Station of the MDPD conducted a survey
of local residents to determine if any public personalities or activities could serve
as common ground between the police and young males (Metro-Dade Police
Department 1992). What emerged was that the young respondents identified
local rap radio disc jockeys and rap music as personalities and activities that
interested them. In March 1993 the police turned these empirical findings into
action. They created a series of concerts. Local disc jockeys were invited to hold
concerts in local parks sponsored by the police. While the youth enjoyed the
music and festivities, the police were there, talking with the youth and
encouraging them to talk and work with the police to understand each other and
help with the prevention of crime. Although more than 5 000 people attended the
first event, there were no negative incidents. The MDPD report states that while
the concert was originally intended to be a single step in a process to improve
police crime prevention initiatives, a step aimed particularly at young men, it
seems to have become part or all of the answer. It also became an educational experience for the community as they see police as agents of peace rather than enforcers of law. More importantly, it has demonstrated that the mere act of the police engaged in active listening has the effect of empowering them and perhaps alleviating some of their sense of alienation. In other words, this project provided an excellent vehicle for the police to create and maintain positive contacts with members of the community they serve and to be seen in a positive light. Further, by initiating and participating in activities the youths enjoyed, the police had an opportunity to see youth in a positive light (Alpert & Moore 1993: 112).”

2.8 CONCLUSION

To prevent crime effectively, it is important to have a mutual understanding of the true meaning of the concepts crime and crime prevention. From the analysis as well as the core function of policing, it is clear that there is a lack of mutual understanding about what is meant by the term crime prevention from a general policing point of view.

There is evidence which concur with scholars who are of the opinion that disorderly behaviour, as well as unregulated and unchecked places is a signal to citizens that the area is unsafe and crime is high. For one to understand what the main reason was for having policing in society with the ultimate end of determining whether crime prevention
should or should not be the core function of the police, it is important to understand the evolution of policing within the broader context of the spectrum of policing.

Throughout history, societies have established rules to govern the conduct of individuals, and have devised punishments for those who broke these rules. Since then, policing evolved slowly through the centuries to the stage at which we find it today. This emphasizes the need for crime prevention to be assessed and measured according to the amount of harm prevented by the police.
CHAPTER 3: CRIME PREVENTION NOT BEING THE CORE FUNCTION OF THE POLICE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the focus will be on the school of thought which asserts that crime prevention is not the core function of the police. This is based on the viewpoints of various criminologists, scientists and police practitioners who are of the opinion that the police should not be blamed for high levels of crime because most crime emanates from socioeconomic and other factors over which the police have no control. Some police practitioners challenge the doctrine developed by Sir Robert Peel in England almost two centuries ago, which states that the police must prevent crime, as an obsolete and impossible mandate to fulfil.

Grabosky (1988:02) states that productivity with regard to crime prevention refers to the output, or degree of effectiveness, obtained by the police agency in the concept of crime prevention. Unfortunately, productivity in policing is easier to conceptualize than to measure, for the ultimate ends of policing often resist quantification. An ideal measure of crime prevention productivity would entail the number of offences prevented by police activity divided by the cost of police crime prevention operations. Because events that have not occurred are exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to measure, hard indicators of police productivity, at least concerning crime prevention, remain elusive (Grabosky 1988:02).
Grabosky (1988:03) went on to state that crime result from a variety of factors, most of which are entirely beyond the ability of the police to control. Moreover, the processes by which police resources impinge upon the incidence of crime are often overlooked. It is not merely the availability of additional police resources, but how these resources are used, which determine the nature and extent of their impact on crime prevention. Overall strategies, management techniques, and resource allocation decisions may facilitate or inhibit the attainment of crime-related goals.

3.2 THE PURPOSE OF POLICING

According to Newburn (2005:142), most police officers who conduct patrol duties are not directly preventing crime, but they are restoring order and providing general assistance. He states the purpose of policing as being to stop something that is contrary to the law from happening. He is of the view that police on patrol interrupts and pacify situations of potential or ongoing conflict, such as young men who are drinking beer on a street corner and making rude remarks, a dog barking persistently late at night and irritating the neighbour, a truculent and inconsiderate neighbour obstructing a driveway with his car, etc.

Newburn (2005:143) states that when the police are called to actual or potential conflicts, they try to produce a truce by sorting out what has happened. Family disputes are the most common and the most difficult encounters that the police have to deal with.
daily. Sixty five percent of police officials in most police departments are assigned to patrol functions that could be regarded as boring because it involves restoring order as the main purpose of policing. This led to Newburn (2005:143) concluding that the main purpose of policing is the restoration of order and not the prevention of crime.

Burger (2007:140) on the other hand, states that the pronouncement of Sir Robert Peel in 1829 that the core function of the police is to prevent crime might have been understandable at that time, but currently it creates a number of dilemmas for the police. Notable in Burger’s work is the absence of what has changed in policing that made Sir Robert Peel’s assertion relevant at that time and irrelevant now. According to Burger (2007:140), the core function of the police is policing, which he describes as what they are realistically capable of doing, which entails law enforcement, crime investigation, visible policing and maintenance of order, but excludes crime prevention.

3.3 THE ABILITY OF THE POLICE TO PREVENT CRIME

Based on the fact that the police are least likely to succeed in preventing crime, Burger (2007:42) is of the view that crime prevention is and should not be the core function of the police. Burger’s assertion is shared by Professor David Bayley, an internationally renowned author and an expert on criminal justice systems. Bayley argues that the police do not and cannot prevent crime because 80% of all criminal incidents are rooted in socioeconomic factors over which the police have no control (Magnus 2003:07). Police inability to prevent crime is also asserted by Smith (2006:14) who is of the view
that the rapid growth of the private security industry in South Africa is a clear indication of the inability of the police to prevent crime.

Analyzing the role of the police in relation to serious crimes, Green (2000:310) states that the police have narrow law enforcement focus with regard to crime prevention. He asserts that the police’s focus is centred on serious crimes, as opposed to maintenance of community social order. Green (2000:310) further states that the police are not preventing crime, they are responding to the crime that was committed. Green’s analysis is based on what the police are doing and does not really deal with the question of what the police should be doing. It is of paramount importance to establish what the police were created for in order to determine what is it that they should do. According to Hale (1994:12), public perceptions on what the police should do create tensions when these expectations are not met. Burger (2007:01) called the police’s promise to reduce the incidence of crime a lie. Like Professor David Bayley, Burger argues that the police could not make such a promise because 80 percent of all crime has socioeconomic roots over which the police have no control.

Despite this, both the public and the police continue to focus on crime prevention as though it is the primary purpose of the police, and that the police are exclusively accountable for crime levels. Even worse, the method used most often to measure crime prevention performance by the number of crimes recorded by the police is not a very good indicator of the ability of the police to prevent crime (Legget 2003:03).

According to Burger (2007:06), the implementation of the National Crime Combating Strategy is impacted on negatively by the prevailing unfavourable socioeconomic conditions in the country. These socioeconomic conditions such as widespread poverty, lack of access to basic services, etc., contribute to the root causes of crime. Burger also questions the conceptual and terminological correctness of section 205(3) of the Constitution, which stipulates that crime prevention is one of the responsibilities of the South African Police Service.

3.3.1 Standard Model of Policing

Weisburd and Eck (2004:44) state that over the past years, scholars such as Bayley; Goldstein; Visher and Weisburd, have increasingly criticized what has come to be considered the standard model of police practices. They argue that this model relies generally on a “one-size-fits-all” application of reactive strategies to prevent crime and continues to be the dominant form of police practices in the world. The standard model is based on the assumption that generic strategies for crime reduction can be applied
throughout a jurisdiction regardless of the level of crime, the nature of crime, or other variations.

Such strategies as increasing the size of police agencies, random patrol across all parts of the community, rapid response to calls for service, generally applied follow-up investigations, and generally applied intensive enforcement and arrest policies are all examples of this standard model of policing. Weisburd and Eck (2004:44) further state that because the standard model seeks to provide a generalized level of police service, it has often been criticized as focused more on the means of policing or the resources that police bring to bear than on the effectiveness of policing in crime prevention, disorder or fear of crime. Accordingly, in the application of preventive patrol in a city, police agencies following the standard model will often measure success in terms of whether a certain number of patrol cars are on the street at certain times. In agencies that seek to reduce police response times to citizen calls for service, improvements in the average time of response often become a primary measure of police agencies' success. In this sense, using the standard model can lead police agencies to become more concerned with how police resources are allocated than whether they have an impact on public safety and crime prevention (Weisburd & Eck 2004:44).

This model has also been criticized because of its reliance on the traditional law enforcement powers of the police in preventing crime. Police agencies relying upon the standard model generally employ a limited range of approaches, overwhelmingly oriented toward enforcement, and make relatively little use of institutions outside of
policing (with the notable exception of other parts of the criminal justice system). Enforcing the law and not preventing crime is a central element of the standard model of policing, suggesting that the main tools available to the police or legitimate for their use are found in their law enforcement powers (Weisburd & Eck 2004:44).

3.4 INTELLIGENCE-LED POLICING

According to Tilley (2003:03) intelligence-led policing is a law enforcement strategy that seeks to reduce crime through the use of crime analysis and criminal intelligence to prevent and combat crime. It relies on the extensive clandestine collection and analysis of information from various sources. The analysis of this information enables the police to determine objective policing tactics in regard to enforcement targets, prevention activities and further intelligence gathering operations. Intelligence-led policing is evolving into a management philosophy that places greater emphasis on information-sharing and collaborative, strategic solutions to crime problems at the local and regional level.

3.5 APPROACHES IN POLICING

Weisburd and Eck (2004:51) reviewed the evidence on what works in policing using the criteria of police practices and divided discussion into four sections, representing four broad kinds of police approaches. They begin with a general proposition that summarizes what history says about police effectiveness in crime prevention, disorder, and fear of crime; followed by community policing; and concluding with targeted policing.
3.5.1 Proposition one: Effectiveness in crime prevention, crime disorder and the fear of crime

This proposition asserts the standard model of policing that relies on the uniform provision of police resources and the law enforcement powers of the police to prevent crime and disorder across a wide array of crimes and across all parts of the jurisdictions that police serve. Despite the continued reliance of many police agencies on these standard practices, little evidence exists that such approaches are effective in preventing crime and disorder or in reducing fear of crime. Weisburd and Eck (2004:51) identify the five broad strategies mentioned below that have been the focus of policing for crime prevention over the past three decades.

3.5.1.1 Increasing the size of the police and random patrols

Evidence from most case studies in which police have suddenly left their duties (e.g., police strikes) show that the absence of the police is likely to lead to an increase in crime (Weisburd & Eck 2004:51; Sherman & Eck 2002). While these studies are generally not very strong in their design, their conclusions are consistent. But the finding that removing all police will lead to more crime does not answer the primary question that most scholars and policy makers are concerned with, that is, whether marginal increases in the number of police officers will lead to crime prevention.
The evidence in this case is contradictory and the study designs generally cannot distinguish between the effects of police strength and the factors associated with the changes in tactics or organizational structures. Most studies have concluded that variations in police strength over time do not affect crime rates (Maguire & Uchida 2000). Therefore, if most concluded studies revealed that variations in police strength over time do not affect crime prevention, then there may be a need to review police performance by the extent of crime levels.

Weisburd and Eck (2004:51) state that random preventive patrols has continued to be one of the most enduring of standard police practices. Despite the continued use of random preventive patrolling by many police agencies, the evidence for crime prevention supporting this practice is very weak, and studies reviewed are more than a quarter century old.

A much larger scale and more persuasive evaluation of preventive patrol in Kansas City found that the standard practice of preventive patrol does not reduce crime, disorder, or fear of crime (Kelling et al. 1974). However, while this was a landmark study, the validity of its conclusions has also been criticized because of methodological flaws (Sherman & Weisburd 1995).
3.5.1.2 Rapid response to calls and generally applied follow-up investigations

According to Weisburd and Eck (2004:51), rapid response to calls for service, have also not been shown to reduce crime or even to lead to increased chances of arrest in most situations. The crime-reduction assumption behind rapid response is that if the police get to crime scenes rapidly, they will apprehend offenders, thus providing a general deterrent against crime. No studies have been done of the direct effects of this strategy on disorder or fear of crime.

The best evidence concerning the effectiveness of rapid response comes from two studies conducted in the late 1970s (Kelling et al 1974; Spelman & Brown 1981). Evidence from five cities examined in these studies consistently show that most crimes (about 75 percent at the time of the studies) were discovered some time after they had been committed. Accordingly, offenders in such cases have had plenty of time to escape. For the minority of crimes in which the offender and the victim have some type of contact, citizen delay in calling the police blunts whatever effect a marginal improvement in response time might provide. From these studies, deductions could be made that rapid response could enhance the chances of apprehending perpetrators. This deduction contradicts the aforementioned assertion of Weisburd and Eck that rapid response does not increase the chances of arresting perpetrators.

Weisburd and Eck (2004:51) state that there are no studies that examine the direct impact of generalized improvements in police investigation techniques on crime
prevention, disorder, or fear of crime. It has been assumed that an increase in the likelihood of crimes being solved through arrest would lead to a deterrence or incapacitation effect. The single most important factor leading to arrest is the presence of witnesses or physical evidence, factors which are not under the control of the police and are difficult to manipulate through improvements in investigative approaches (Weisburd & Eck 2004:51).

3.5.1.3 Generally applied intensive enforcement and arrests

Tough law enforcement has long been the technique used for police crime prevention strategies. This intensive law enforcement model applies broadly to incivilities and other types of disorder and has been described as “broken windows policing” (Kelling & Coles 1996; Kelling & Sousa 2001) or “zero tolerance policing” (Bowling 1999; Cordner 1998; Dennis & Mallon 1998; Manning 2001). While the common perception is that enforcement strategies (primarily arrest) applied broadly against offenders committing minor offences lead to reductions in serious crime, research did not provide strong support for this proposition. For example, studies in seven cities that were summarized by Skogan (1990 & 1992) found no evidence that intensive law enforcement reduce disorder – which went up on the special projects that were being evaluated. More recent claims of the effects of intensive law enforcement based on crime declines in New York City have also been strongly challenged because they are confounded with other organizational changes in New York. One correlation study by Kelling and Sousa (2001) found a direct link between misdemeanour arrests and more serious crime in New York,
although limitations in the data available raise questions about the validity of these conclusions.

3.5.2 Proposition Two: Community Policing

According to Weisburd and Eck (2004:57), there has been a major investment on the part of the police and the public in community policing over the past two decades. Because community policing involves so many different tactics, its effect as a general strategy cannot be evaluated. Overall, the evidence does not provide strong support for the proposition that community policing approaches impact strongly on crime or disorder. Stronger support is found for the ability of community policing tactics to reduce fear of crime, not to prevent it. Police practices associated with community policing have been particularly broad, and the strategies associated with community policing have sometimes changed over time. Foot patrol, for example, was considered an important element of community policing in the 1980s but has not been a core component of more recent community policing programmes.

Weisburd and Eck (2004:57) state that it is often difficult to determine whether researchers studying community policing in different agencies at different times are studying the same phenomena. One recent correlation study that attempts to assess the overall impact of investment for community policing found a positive crime control effect of “hiring and innovative grant programmes” where the community is involved in recruiting new police members (Zhao, Scheider & Thurman 2002). However, a recent
review of this work by some scholars has raised strong questions regarding the validity of the findings.

From the report of Weisburd and Eck (2004:57), door-to-door visits have been found to reduce both crime (Sherman 1997) and disorder (Skogan 1992). Simply providing information about crime to the public does not have crime prevention benefits (Sherman 1997). As noted above, foot patrol was an important component of early community policing efforts. An early uncontrolled evaluation of foot patrol concluded that foot patrol reduced reported crime (Trojanowicz 1988). However, Bowers and Hirsch (1987) found no discernable reduction in crime or disorder due to foot patrols in Boston. A more rigorous evaluation of foot patrol in Newark also found that it did not reduce criminal victimizations (Police Foundation 1981). Nonetheless, the same study found that foot patrol reduced residents’ fear of crime, not crime prevention.

According to Weisburd and Eck (2004:58), community policing lowers the community’s level of fear of crime when programmes are focused on increasing community-police interactions. A series of quasi-experimental studies demonstrates that policing strategies characterized by more direct involvement of police and citizens, have a negative effect on fear of crime among individuals and on individual level of concern about crime prevention in the neighbourhood.
3.5.3 Proposition Three: Targeted Policing

According to Weisburd and Eck (2004:58), there has been increasing interest over the past two decades in police practices that target very specific types of criminals and crime places. In particular, policing crime hot spots has become a common police strategy for addressing public safety problems by preventing crime. While only weak evidence suggests the effectiveness of targeting specific types of offenders, a strong body of evidence suggests that taking a focused geographic approach to crime problems can increase policing effectiveness in preventing crime and disorder. While the standard model of policing suggests that police activities should be spread in a highly uniform pattern across urban communities and applied uniformly across the individuals subject to police attention, a growing number of police practices focus on allocating police resources in a focused way. Weisburd and Eck (2004:58) reviewed research in police crackdowns and hot-spots policing.

3.5.3.1 Police crackdowns

There is a long history of police crackdowns that target particularly troublesome locations or problems. Such tactics can be distinguished from more recent hot-spots policing approaches in that they are temporary concentrations of police resources that are not widely applied.
Weisburd and Eck (2004:58), as well as Sherman (1990) reviewed eighteen case studies with regard to crackdowns. The result of the review revealed strong evidence that crackdowns produce a short-term solution on crime prevention. Weisburd and Eck (2004:58) state that Sherman (1990) also reported that crackdowns did not lead to spatial displacement of crime to nearby areas in the majority of studies he reviewed. The review revealed that crackdowns is a once off event crime prevention technique and crime take place after most crackdowns.

3.5.3.2 Hot-spots policing

Weisburd and Eck, (2004:58) state that although there is a long history of efforts to focus police patrols, the emergence of what is often termed hotspots policing is generally traced to theoretical, empirical, and technological innovations in the 1980s and 1990s. A series of randomized field trials shows that policing that is focused on hot spots can result in meaningful reductions in crime and disorder. The first of these, the Minneapolis Hot Spots Patrol Experiment (Sherman & Weisburd 1995), used computerized mapping of crime calls to identify 110 hot spots of roughly street-block length. Police patrol was doubled on average for the experimental sites over a ten-month period. The study found that the experimental, compared with the control hot spots, experienced statistically significant reductions in crime calls and observed disorder. In another randomized experiment, the Kansas City Crack House Raids Experiment (Sherman & Rogan 1995a), crackdowns on drug locations were also found to lead to significant relative improvements in the experimental sites, although the
effects (measured by citizen calls and offence reports) were modest and decayed in a short period.

Non-experimental studies provide similar findings (Hope 1994; Sherman & Rogan 1995b). The effectiveness of the hot-spots policing approach has strong empirical support. Such approaches would be much less useful if they simply displaced crime to other nearby places. While measurement of crime displacement is complex and a matter that need to be debated, a number of the studies reported above examined immediate geographic displacement of crime instate of total crime prevention.

3.6 MEASUREMENT OF POLICE PERFORMANCE

Grabosky (1988:02) state that crimes vary in terms of their vulnerability and accessibility to police operations. Most serious crime, including murder, robbery, and rape, are rarely if ever encountered by police on patrol. A great deal of crime occurs in private, beyond the preventive reach of any patrol activity. A significant proportion of sexual assault, for example, is committed in non-public settings by persons known to the victim. Although much police work is grounded in the assumption that the threat of detection and ultimate arrest will deter prospective wrongdoers, many criminals act on impulse, without attempting a rational calculation of the risk of apprehension and the value of ill-gotten gains.
Grabosky (1988:02) further states that measurement of police activity should be undertaken with great caution. Statistics are often imprecise and ambiguous. Analysts should be sensitive to what a particular measure is, and is not, revealing. One of the classic pitfalls of police performance analysis is the tendency to use crime statistics to measure effectiveness. It has become increasingly evident that crime statistics are a very imperfect reflection of the true rate of crime. Many factors intervene between the commission of a crime and its transformation into a crime statistic. Grabosky (1988:02) is of the opinion that not all crimes committed come to the attention of the police. Some, including the more skilfully executed frauds, are never detected.

Consensual transactions, involving illicit drugs, tend to come to light as the result of proactive policing. That is, the more police are assigned to a particular area, the more offences those police will detect. Statistics which purport to reflect these and other offences which lack aggrieved victims, tell police management more about police resource allocation than they do about the targeted criminal activity. Because of the ambiguities inherent in crime statistics, some commentators have called for their publication and interpretation by an independent bureau, not police management or the Department of Police.

Victims of more conventional forms of crime such as assault and theft may, for a number of reasons, be reluctant to report offences to the police. Such reasons may include the victim's perception that the matter was so trivial that the police could not or
would not be of much assistance, or that further pursuit of the matter would entail unnecessary stress and discomfort (Grabosky 1988:03).

3.7 FACTORS THAT ARE CONSIDERED WHEN MEASURING POLICE PERFORMANCE

Grabosky (1988:05) suggests that the more accessible the police, the greater the tendency of the community to report an offence. That is, more widespread telephone ownership and greater police manpower lessen the inconvenience of contacting the police and thereby facilitate the community’s reporting of crimes. Thus, ironically, an increase in the rate of reported crime may just as easily be interpreted as indicative of police effectiveness as it could be regarded as cause for alarm. Economists use the term ‘production function’ to describe the relationship of resources to objectives. Conventional wisdom assumes the relationship between police manpower and the crime rate to be negative. That is, an increase in police resources will produce a decrease in the incidence of crime, and a decrease in police manpower will result in an increasing crime rate.

Whether this proposition is true or not, it is accepted as an act of faith by members of the public and publicly embraced by the police themselves. Less thought has been given to the contours of this assumed production function. A perfectly linear relationship would mean that crime would decrease in direct proportion to the increase in police manpower; that is, a 25 percent increase in police manpower would produce a 25
percent decrease in crime. Alternatively, the relationship could reflect diminishing returns, where the impact of each additional police officer is less and less, or economies of scale, where the impact is greater and greater. The nature of this production function, indeed, whether it exists at all, has yet to be accorded systematic research in police departments (Grabosky 1988:05).

It is unreasonable, according to Alpert and Moore (1993:111), to expect the police to reduce crime all by themselves. Crime rates are affected by vast social, economic, and political forces. No matter how professional, police cannot solve the “root causes” of crime. They cannot be blamed for increasing unemployment, increasing inequality or eroding family structures. In addition, police are dependent on the rest of the criminal justice system to give significance to arrests. Limitations of the traditional policing strategy are also represented by the current performance measures. It is important that crime be measured in terms of reported crime, rather than through victimization surveys. Indeed, the police long resisted the development of criminal victimization surveys, concerned that they would reveal differential reporting and would be too subjective.

This emphasis on reported crime left invisible many crimes such as domestic violence, child abuse, extortion, drug crimes and other crimes in communities who did not trust or have confidence in the police. It is also important to note that measures that could have revealed the fairness of police measurement within which the authority of the police had been deployed received less attention than the question of police effectiveness. There
is no routine expectation that the police would publish data on patrol allocations, response times, or crime solution rates across neighbourhoods (Alpert and Moore 1993:111). Similarly, no serious efforts are made to develop statistical evidence on the incidence of brutality, excessive use of force, discourtesy, or corruption. In principle, one must collect information about these statistics by soliciting civilian complaints and taking them as indicators of problems, if not prohibitive of individual officer misconduct (Alpert and Moore 1993:111).

Legget (2003:04) questions what the police are doing as their core function. In answering this question, he states that apart from their support and management functions, police forces are traditionally divided into two core areas of operational activity, namely patrol (usually uniformed) and investigations. The functions of these two roles are so different that independent sets of indicators are required for each.

In addition to these operational functions, police members are managed by supervisors and supported by administrators and other specialists. In theory, these management and administrative workers exist to support the operational personnel, so while the former can be evaluated independently, their performance is ultimately reflected in the success of front-line staff. The patrol function is multifaceted. Street police officials are required to respond to calls for assistance, whether initiated from a central dispatch system or from direct public requests. These contacts often require a range of skills, and are more often resolved through mediation than through arrest. The uniformed member is required to determine whether a crime has occurred and whether an arrest is
possible and appropriate. They are responsible for generating accurate public records and may be called upon to testify in court (Legget 2003:04). The above are factors to be considered when measuring police performance.

3.8 THE IMPLICATION OF CRIME PREVENTION IN MODERN POLICING

Bayley (2006:02) mentioned the nine big reform ideas for crime prevention since 1967. According to Bayley, these are the ideas that have generated real changes in modern policing and police themselves consider them to be important, as well as controversial, from past practice to new crime prevention in modern policing. These ideas are:

- Community-oriented policing: This refers to the recognition that the police must encourage the public to share responsibility for public safety, specifically by consulting with them, adapting their operations to local conditions, mobilizing volunteer resources, and problem-solving.

- Problem-oriented policing: Involves developing police programmes that eliminate conditions that generate problems of insecurity and disorder that the police are repeatedly called upon to prevent.

- Signs-of-crime policing: Where police, drawing on the logic of "broken windows" (Wilson and Kelling 1982), prosecute minor offences that contribute to the creation of a milieu of incivility. This is sometimes mistakenly identified with "zero
tolerance policing," which Bayley (2006:02) does not consider a major strategic innovation. The idea of zero tolerance policing is based on ideas developed by two criminologists in the United States, James Wilson and George Kelling, who in 1982, published a seminal article entitled “Broken Windows” in the Atlantic Monthly magazine (Wilson and Kelling 1982). They argued that an ambience of unrestrained petty crime creates the impression that “no one is in control” and that more serious crime can be committed with impunity. In other words, unchecked disorder and incivility in a given locality send an implicit invitation to more predatory criminals. Zero tolerance policing is an option for fixing the broken window.

- Hot-spots policing: Meaning the short term or episodic concentration of police resources on areas or situations of repeated criminal activity.

- Policing of domestic affairs: Mandatory arrest for spouse assault in domestic violence cases changed the police’s traditional method of work where such cases used to be regarded as private matters that did not need or warrant police intervention.

- Enhancement of internal police discipline: Primarily through the explicit articulation of values, the development of policies for problematic situations, and the acceptance of effective internal investigation of complaints against the police.
• Police oversight: External oversight of the quality of police activity through civilian review, quasi-official independent supervision of management, and professionally driven accreditation by oversight of policing such as the Independent Complaints Directorate (ICD).

• Evidence-based policing: This means evaluating police activity by systematically collecting information about police operations and their effects.

• Inclusive policing: Enhancing diversity of personnel through creating mechanisms to ensure equal-opportunity hiring and promotion for women and minorities.

Bayley (2006:03) categorizes the first five bullets of the above big reforms as strategies, the next three bullets as relating to the standards, and the last bullet as dealing with the management.

3.8.1 Analysis of big reform ideas

The analysis of the above big reform ideas highlight the following four concerns. Firstly, although the big reforms mainly come from those people who played a big role in formulating and advancing police research, they emanate from people that are outside the police department such as Bayley himself. Secondly, Bayley chose 1967 as the start of big reforms, but neglected the reforms of what Moore and Kelling (1988) have referred to as the "professional era" in police crime prevention. According to Moore and
Kelling (1988), the professional era is a significant period of reforms in policing that occurred before the constitutional era of the 1960s-1980s and the community-policing era of the 1980s and afterwards.

Thirdly, Bayley (2006:03) focuses on the organizational changes in the police and ignores changes in technology and technique, for example, DNA analysis, crime-scene processing, computers and communications, and new technologies of crime prevention. And lastly, he ignores unplanned and often unrecognized changes that have nonetheless been very real. For example, collaboration with burgeoning private security, risk analysis and first-responding planning as part of counter-terrorism, and the hiring of specialists to investigate increasingly complicated commercial crimes, as well as crime both with and against computers. These changes represent important adaptations in policing, but do not rise to the level of what are considered reforms.

In other words, the sample that Bayley (2006:06) chose is biased in favour of innovations that were deliberately undertaken, that were recognized from the outset as constituting reform. These are necessarily top-down and more likely to be pushed by observers outside the police establishment. The sample undervalues changes in policing that loomed larger in the world of working cops than observing scholars. At the same time, it is an empirical question whether broadening the sample to compensate for the errors listed above would change conclusions about the process of innovation in policing, as well as crime prevention.
Bayley’s (2006:09) examination of the route from idea to change with respect to the nine big reforms listed is idiosyncratic. It is very likely that his own interests limited his understanding of the trajectories of all these reforms. So it should be understood that these are his opinions about provenance, based on his personal involvement and perspective. He further states that, if he had it wrong, people who are better informed must correct him.

3.9 POLICE STRATEGIES AND OPERATIONAL METHODS

According to Grabosky (1988:02), improvements in the efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity of policing do not occur spontaneously, but rather through systematic analysis and the application of modern management principles. These include strategic planning, the setting of priorities and systematic monitoring of operations. Grabosky (1988:05) states that police operations should be subjected to rigorous repeated evaluation in order to assess their efficiency and effectiveness. Police should conduct carefully controlled experiments in order to assess the relative efficiency and effectiveness of alternative deployment strategies. One type of research which might usefully inform resource allocation decisions is marginal utility analysis. This analysis enables executives to identify the effects of incremental changes to resource levels of existing units. According to Grabosky (1988:05), an extensive programme of marginal utility analysis would provide managers with a set of optimum allocation levels across an entire department. One of the more notable examples of this type of research was the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment (Kelling et al 1974).
This research involved the systematic analysis of fifteen patrol sectors (or ‘beats’) over the period of one year. Beats were randomly assigned to one of three categories. In five of the beats, the number of marked patrol cars was trebled. Preventive patrol was eliminated entirely, with police presence occurring only in response to calls for service. In the remaining five beats, normal patrol levels were maintained. The experimental treatments had no apparent effect on the incidence of crime (as measured by surveys as well as official crime reports) and there was also no significant differences in citizens' reported fear of crime or attitudes towards police. By contrast, a subsequent evaluation of foot patrols introduced in another jurisdiction revealed a reduction in citizens' fear of crime, but no apparent impact on the actual incidence of crime prevention (Grabosky 1988:05).

These led Bayley (2006:09) to conclude that the police posture of being able to control and prevent crime through their own efforts, even with higher levels of material support, were not possible. He states that to be truly effective, the police need a public that would notify them of crime, identify likely suspects, undertake self-protection, and mobilize people against potential law-breakers. According to Bayley (2006:10), the reformulation of basic police strategy arising out of the evaluations of standard operating procedures originated from Goldstein. Goldstein (1979) argued that police strategies are too generic and applied too broadly throughout jurisdictions. What was needed was the focusing of police resources on recurrent problems that accounted for a disproportionate amount of police attention. This required the police to analyze the
nature of their work, to isolate recurrent issues that might yield to a focused approach, to determine whether the conditions that generate these problems could be ameliorated through police activity, and, if so, to develop multifaceted strategies for doing so. This methodology became known as the SARA model (scanning, analysis, response, and assessment) and problem-solving became institutionalized through the activities of the Police Executive Research Forum (Bayley 2006:10).

Problem-oriented policing, like community-oriented policing, was clearly an outside-inside reform with substantial resistance from the rank-and-file of police members. According to Bayley (2006:10), almost thirty years after Goldstein’s introduction of problem-oriented policing, the methodology of problem-oriented policing is still difficult to implant, deflected by unquestioned faith among police in their standard-operating procedures, top-down management, unsupportive reward systems, and clumsy and imprecise measures of achievement. At the same time, it is important to note that Goldstein was a kind of insider, having worked as executive assistant to Superintendent O.W. Wilson in the Chicago Police Department from 1960 to 1964.

According to Bayley (2006:10), although many police deplored the decriminalization of public-order misdemeanours in the 1970s, largely because it deprived them of control over the unruly, it was two scholars (Wilson and Kelling) who developed the theory that serious crime was encouraged by allowing activities that created the impression in particular places that standards of civility were in abeyance and no one cares. The primary indicators of such don’t care attitudes were signs of physical deterioration and
disorderly behaviour. The interesting fact is that the broken windows policing has been revitalized with the recent development of reassurance policing.

3.10 CONCLUSION

Various methods and approaches that have been used in this study indicate differing opinions and findings on the ability of the police to prevent crime. The conclusions that are reached in the aforementioned studies and literature indicate that most of the proponents of the hypothesis that crime prevention is not the core function or the function of the police based their argument on the fact that the police cannot prevent crime. They further do not indicate what the core function of the police should be.

Many tactics that are applied broadly throughout the world have not been the subject of systematic police research, nor have they been examined in the context of research designs that allow practitioners or policy makers to draw very strong conclusions of whether crime prevention is the core function of the police or not. This is particularly troubling when considering the vast public expenditures on such strategies and the implications of their effectiveness for public safety. Police research must become more systematic and more experimental if it is to provide solid answers to important questions of practice and policy on crime prevention.
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

To obtain the required empirical evidence needed to either confirm or negate what has been discovered during extensive literature research on the subject, interviews and questionnaires were used. This chapter gives a detailed description and justification of the methodology, sampling and data collection techniques that were used. This information is provided to indicate the process that was followed by this study from the beginning to the end.

The chapter concludes by describing how the analysis of the collected information was done and provide detailed accounts of what was done to ensure the validity and reliability of the study. An account is also given of how ethical requirements in the research were taken into consideration.

4.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Silverman (2001:04) is of the opinion that research methodology refers to the approach that one adopts in gathering and analyzing data during research. This entails chronological and systematic steps that the researcher uses as a roadmap in unbundling the problem that is being studied. According to Rudestam and Newton (1992:60), the goal of research methodology is to provide a clear and complete description of specific steps to be followed in addressing the research problem. In other
words, the research methodology defines how one will go about studying a particular phenomenon. The phenomenon in this study is the determination of whether crime prevention is the core function of the police or not.

Qualitative and quantitative researches are the two main research approaches that are used in social sciences (Vermeulen 1998:10). In the study of cases and other sources of information, qualitative research uses little numerical or statistical data. Quantitative research, on the other hand, relies heavily on numerical or statistical data. De Vos (1998:15) describes the qualitative approach as primarily concerned with verbal data, in contrast with quantitative research, which is concerned with data that is essentially numerical. According to Miles and Huberman (1994:27), researchers who adopt the qualitative approach usually work with a small sample of people, while quantitative researchers work with larger samples of people that enable them to determine statistical significance. Leedy (1993:139) makes it clear that the nature of the data and the problem to be researched, will determine the methodology most appropriate for the research. Leedy (1993:144) refers to Stainback and Stainback in explaining that qualitative research is based on the belief that firsthand experience provides the most meaningful data. It was also for this reason that the methodology employed in this study was of a qualitative nature. The choice of this methodology was also justified by the research question that had to be answered and the stated objectives that this study intended to achieve. Qualitative analysis is defined by Babbie (2005:387) as a method for examining social research data without converting it to a numerical format. Babbie
further states that this approach pre-dates quantitative analysis and is even enjoying a resurgence of interest among social scientists.

Based on the need to corroborate, validate and explain the information that was gathered during this study, this study as mentioned previously used qualitative research. According to Miles and Huberman (1994:10), qualitative research is useful when one needs to supplement, validate, explain or interpret the collected information from the same setting. Miles and Huberman (1994:10) emphasise that qualitative data has the potential to determine whether predictions are supported or not.

4.2.1 Advantages and Disadvantages of Qualitative Research

The main advantage of qualitative research is the building of new theories as well as the exploration of new areas of research. According to De Vos (1998:240), qualitative research provides a researcher with a means of understanding a world that cannot be understood in terms of numbers and objectivity. It deals with complex questions that will be impossible to comprehend or answer using the quantitative method. A qualitative approach provides ways of transcribing and the discursive construction of everyday events and exploring the historical nature of life within a social group.

De Vos (1998:240) further states that in theory, qualitative research is the best route to take in every research study because it provides the researcher with an understanding
that takes into account the fact that people are individuals with different perspectives on the world.

Having stated some advantages of qualitative research, which as stated previously were some of the factors that led to the choice of this method in this study, it is important to highlight some of the identified disadvantages of this (qualitative) method, which are as follows:

- Subjectivity which leads to procedural problems
- Researcher’s bias
- Labour intensive and expensive.
- Not understood well by classical researchers

Because there is no research method that could be regarded as not having limitations and challenges, meticulous attention was used to minimize some of these challenges by standardizing questions and piloting them to test their comprehensibility beforehand. The pilot test was submitted to the management of the SAPS K9 Academy. The purpose of the pilot test was to ensure that:

- The questions did not have a double meaning;
- The vocabulary was understandable;
- Questions were not ambiguous;
- Phrasings of questions were not vague;
• The statements were applicable to the field of expertise; and
• There were no leading questions.

For future verification and validation, meticulous records were compiled on the activities of the pilot study. This is in line with Neumann’s (1997:362) assertion that taking notes on the following is essential in any qualitative research:

• Dates when access was gained to the field;
• Dates when the interviews were conducted;
• Track of the length of interviews;
• Registration of information on the interviewers;
• Record of all those who participated in the fieldwork;
• Track record of factors that influenced the fieldwork adversely; and
• Track record of refusal rates, response rates and reasons for refusals.

This was done to maximize the advantages of this method in this study and minimize some of its disadvantages that had been stated previously. The pilot study indicated that the questions asked were understandable and relevant to the study.

4.3 RESEARCH SAMPLE

Brynarrd and Hanekom (1997:43) state that a research sample is a portion of population selected for the purpose of a particular research project. The sample provides a means
for making inferences about the population using observations made on the sample. Purposive sampling was used to interview and mail questionnaires to senior managers of various police departments of the identified countries because these are people who are in positions to enhance proper understanding of the operational implications of including or excluding crime prevention as the core function of the police.

Purposive sampling is done when the researcher chooses only those respondents who have specific knowledge that best meets the purpose of the study (Bailey 1994:96). The senior managers of various police departments of the selected countries as mentioned below where sampled for this study because they were regarded as having the knowledge that could best fit the objectives of this study.

4.4 DATA COLLECTION

Data collection is the strategy of obtaining and analyzing information (Hagan 2006:110). In this study, interviews were used to collect the information. The purpose of data collection is to obtain information to keep on record, to make decisions about important issues, to pass information on to others. Primarily, data is collected to get firsthand information on the subject that is being studied, that is why it was important for this study to conduct empirical research on the identified police departments to get firsthand information on whether crime prevention is the core function of the police or not, as well as the probable implication of that. The following methods were used to collect data for this study:
Personal interview was conducted with Major General Sello Kwena on behalf of the South African Police Service. Telephone interview was conducted with Oscar Peter Embubulu on behalf of the Namibian Police. Questionnaires were mailed to Malawi; Botswana; Zambia; New Zealand and Scotland police departments. Responses were received from Dr. George Hendrian Kainja on behalf of the Malawi Police; Cynthia Setilo, on behalf of the Botswana Police; Auxensia Daka on behalf of the Zambia Police; Carey Griffiths on behalf of the New Zealand Police; and Berry Gregory on behalf of the Scotland Police. Extensive literature research was conducted on the subject. Appendix 1 to 7 contains the questions that were posed to the identified countries.

In all cases, the questionnaires were accompanied by a covering letter explaining the purpose of the research and the background of the research. It was also clearly stated that the University, as well as the South African Police Service, had granted the researcher permission to go ahead with studies. (Appendix 8 and 9 is attached for easy reference).

4.5 DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis involves the breaking up of data into manageable themes, patterns and trends in determining the relationship between variables and themes (Mouton 2001:108). The aim of analysis is to process the collected data into meaningful information that could be understandable. The researcher began a more detailed and fine-grained analysis of what the respondents stated. In this formal analysis, the
researcher unbundled the stated themes and concepts and built toward an overall explanation. According to Rubin and Rubin’s (in Mouton 2006:198), this approach enables the researcher to refocus on central themes of the study. In the final data analysis, common themes were grouped together; and themes and concepts were integrated into a theory that offered an accurate, detailed, and reliable interpretation of the collected data.

4.6 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

According to De Vos et al. (2002:166), validity relates to the ability of the instrument to measure what it is set out to measure and secondly, it relates to the accuracy of the measuring instrument. The extensive literature research on the policing of the selected countries ensured that the questions that had been posed to a specific police department were relevant and valid to their situation. This is reflected by the phrasing of the asked questions for specific countries as contained in appendixes 1 to 7 at the end of this study.

The pilot study revealed that the questions did ask what they had been designed to ask and did elicit the responses related to the themes of this study, indicating that if the same questions were to be asked to a similar type of respondent, it would elicit the same type of response. This type of consistent interpretation and comprehension of the asked questions was also detected when the actual study was conducted, thus asserting the validity and reliability of this study.
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4.7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical values are basic requirements for research (Vermeulen 1998:16). The South African Police Service’s policy on research and the University of South Africa’s research policy were taken into consideration during the research. This entailed requesting and obtaining permission to conduct the research in these police departments (appendixes 10 to 16 contain the endorsements of the permission granted).

According to Vermeulen (1998:17) participants in research projects have the right to remain anonymous, as well as the right to expect that their personal information will be treated confidentially. The interviewees were asked whether they would like their names to be linked to the provided information or not and nobody objected to having their names stated on the study, more so because they regarded the information that they were providing as already in the public domain in terms of their constitutions or police acts.
4.8 CONCLUSION

Based on the chosen research method, sampling and data collection techniques, the data that was received from the respondents were comprehensive enough to cover the research question and stated objectives of this study. All attempts were made to ensure that the study complies with the requirements of a scientific research study by ensuring that a sound process was followed from the beginning to the end and that the ethical standard was adhered to.
CHAPTER 5: RESEARCH FINDINGS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

To establish whether the initially asked research question is sufficiently answered and the stated research objectives are achieved, this chapter presents the empirical and the literature findings of the study. The presented findings from the countries that were selected for the study are also analysed in the context of this study to cover the broader themes that are raised by this study.

The presented findings are then analysed and the specific and general findings of the study are presented. Specific findings relate to the findings on the previously formulated research question and research objectives, while general findings relate to the general theme of the study.

5.2 PRESENTATION OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

The selected countries are of the view that the police are created to prevent crime so that individuals could be guaranteed of their safety and security needs. Reactive policing does not enhance individual safety and security because it mostly deals with people who have already been violated. They are also of the view that the police, unlike any other organization, are best placed to provide leadership to other organizations that are involved in the fight against crime. This sentiment backs the previously stated notion that the police are the active partners in crime prevention because they are paid to deal
with crime and it is their responsibility to activate the passive partner – which is civil society – in the fight against crime. Emphasizing crime prevention as the critical function of the police over reactive policing, New Zealand gave a health-related example by stating that “the emphasis should be on disease prevention, not surgical intervention and treatment, although this will always be necessary to some degree”.

Responding to what the implications are of making crime prevention the function of the police, respondents stated that most police resources should be used for the prevention of crime. This could be inferred from the high ratio of uniformed police officers compared to that of detectives in police agencies. They are also of the view that making crime prevention the function of the police will ensure that the police do not only rely on law enforcement, but that they adopt a broader approach to social issues that could precipitate crime and criminality.

The selected countries state that embodying crime prevention as the function of the police in the constitution or police act signifies the importance that these countries attach to individual safety. They are of the view that this embodiment is bound to trickle down and influence the broader crime prevention strategies and police operations.

The countries are of the view that it is realistic to expect the police to prevent crime because this expectation does not mean that the police should take the sole responsibility for crime prevention. What this means is that the police, in partnership with civil society, should lead the crime prevention agenda. Botswana went further by
asking “if we do not expect the police to prevent crime, who should be expected to do so?”

Explaining the measurement of police performance, Scotland states that in terms of the Scottish Policing Performance Framework, police performance is measured far more comprehensively than by crime only. The attached appendix 17 indicates the five broad areas, namely service response; public reassurance and community safety; criminal justice and tackling crime; sound governance and efficiency, and context measures – on which the Scottish Police are measured in terms of the Scottish Policing Performance Framework.

5.3 ANALYSIS OF EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

Respondents are aware that the police on their own will not be able to prevent crime, but that the inclusive approach where the police take a lead in activating other organizations and broader civil society in crime prevention or crime reduction is possible. They mentioned effective neighbourhood policing and partnership policing as some of the strategies that the police do initiate as crime prevention efforts to enhance individuals’ safety and security needs.

All the respondents have a fair understanding that crime prevention is not the function that the police could sufficiently fulfil on their own but in partnership with the civil society.
The countries regard crime prevention as the core function of the police and expect the police to be able to prevent crime.

From the analysis of these responses, it is clear that crime prevention is the core function of the police although police performance is currently not comprehensively measured because the measurement relies heavily on arrest statistics. As stated by Scotland, whose police performance is broadly measured in terms of the Scottish Policing Performance Framework, police performance should be broadly measured to include their ability to prevent crime as well. That is, it should be linked to proactive crime prevention and not the reactive approach alone.

5.4 SPECIFIC FINDINGS

To test whether the study has answered what it set out to answer and achieve what it intended to achieve, specific findings are presented to provide an answer on the research question and determination on whether the research objectives have been achieved.

5.4.1 Findings on the Research Question

In answering the question on whether crime prevention is the core function of the police, both the literature study and empirical findings reveal that the prevention of crime is the critical function of the police. It is a function that cannot be achieved by the police in
isolation, but by the police in conjunction with other organizations while the emphasis is still on the police playing a leading role by soliciting these other role-players to get actively involved in activities that are designed to prevent crime.

In South Africa, the National Crime Prevention Strategy (1996) is very clear on the need and importance of partnership policing in crime prevention, because this augment the knowledge, skills and resources that the police need for effective and efficient crime prevention measures. International literature reveals that this could only be achieved through solid partnerships between the police and civil society (Clegg, Hunt & Whetton 2000:3). This explains the increased use of volunteers such as police reservists and community patrollers for crime prevention by the South African Police Service.

The evolution of policing through various eras in paragraph 1.4 above shows that in spirit and principle the police have been created to protect people from crime. As asserted by Van Heerden (1986), and other proponents of crime prevention as the core function of the police, the police are the active partners who are responsible for activating the community who is the passive partner towards crime prevention.

The challenges that the police face in preventing crime and mobilising the community and civil society, does not warrant removing this responsibility from them. This is evident from the failure of the proponents of crime prevention as not the core function of the police to state who should be the main custodian of crime prevention in the country.
The study found that although it is universally accepted that the police have little to do with the desire to commit crime, it is generally accepted that they have a great deal to do toward reducing the opportunity for crime. This highlights that the police need to continuously research the effectiveness of their strategies and operations to be able to counteract the sophisticated methods of committing crime.

5.4.2 Findings on Research Objectives

The study found that crime prevention is and should still be the core function of the police. The proponents of crime prevention as not the core function of the police based their argument on the inability of the police to prevent crime, because crime emanates from many other factors that are beyond the police’s control. The challenge with this argument is that it asserts that if one does not have control over the root cause, then one should not be responsible for the prevention.

This argument does not take into consideration that police work largely deals with the symptoms rather than the root cause of the problems. For example, the police all over the world police demonstrations to prevent damage to property and loss of life should the demonstration get out of hand. They do not deal with the root cause of the demonstration that could be political or economic in nature. To mention but few, the police conduct surveillance and intelligence in order to prevent crime and also guard the essential installations in the country and act as bodyguards to government ministers to protect them from harm, irrespective of where the harm might come from. These are
just some of the crime prevention measures that the police perform to show that the root cause of policing is based on the prevention of crime.

The study found that the rationale of making crime prevention the core function of the police is based on the initial formation of policing. This trickles down from the fact that policing was initially formed to protect persons’ property against theft. As the commission of crime and criminality became more complex and sophisticated with the passage of time, policing also evolved to include some components such as crime detection, criminalistics and crime intelligence. All these were not developed to replace crime prevention but to enhance it.

The rationale of not making crime prevention the core function of the police is found to be non-existent because the mere fact that the police agencies are placed accordingly to provide leadership amongst other agencies involved in crime prevention becomes a rationale for making crime prevention the core function of the police. The fact that the police are charged with the maintenance of law and order in the country embodies the preventive aspect of policing as it encompasses both the preventive and reactive means of achieving this.

The study found that should crime prevention not be regarded as the core function of the police it could be possible that police performance could be rated as good despite the high crime levels and the public fear of crime. This could erode the sense of safety and security in the country and cause the assessment of police performance to be
immaterial to both the police and the public who might be experiencing high levels of crime and criminality.

5.5 GENERAL FINDINGS

This study has revealed that proactive crime prevention is an essential feature of any police agency. It could also be inferred from the study that effective policing consists of both the proactive and reactive components.

Where, due to the nature of crime, pro-activism appears to be less effective, re-activism in terms of effective investigation is equally important to enhance the detection and conviction rates that in the long run also serve as crime prevention through deterrence. This entails that any police agency is established to prevent crime either in the specific sense through proactive policing or in a general sense that includes prevention through deterrence.

Crime prevention in a broader sense of proactive and reactive policing reveals that the traditional measurement of police performance by factors such as arrest statistics and response rates will not give a true picture of the overall performance of the police. Taking into consideration that effective policing is composed of both the proactive and reactive activities, measurement of police performance should encompass both the proactive and reactive components.
5.6 CONCLUSION

The findings of this study reaffirm the pronouncement of Sir Robert Peel that the core function of the police is crime prevention and assert that this pronouncement is as valid today as it was during the establishment and the evolution of policing. The fact that this is a difficult mission that the police must accomplish was well understood even by the time when the modern policing was created, when Sir Robert Peel stated that when the police have failed in their basic duty and crime has now been committed, then the police should be able to restore the violated order by reactive policing – that is, investigating crime and arresting the perpetrators.

As revealed by the research, the police are expected to prevent crime and they embark on a number of activities to achieve this. The fact that this is a difficult task to accomplish does not mean that it is something that they should not do. Even the proponents of crime prevention as not the function of the police do not clearly state which organization should be charged with the prevention of crime in a country. The analysis of policing as a whole indicates that the police are designed for the ultimate prevention of crime, whether through proactive or reactive activities that ultimately leads to crime prevention through deterrence.
CHAPTER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Based on the findings of this study, this chapter makes recommendations, gives a comprehensive proposal on how crime prevention activities of the police can be measured and gives the conclusive view of the entire study. The recommendations are based on the understanding that crime prevention is the core function of the police and that it cannot be easily measured like the activities of reactive units. The difficulty of measuring crime prevention activities stems from the fact that crime prevention should precede the actual commission of crime, which as Mesko (2009:100) states, creates a paradox because if prevention succeeds the crime does not happen so in a sense it does not precede the commission of crime.

The need for comprehensive measures of police performance should be understood within this paradox and the fact that crime prevention includes broad and multifaceted phenomena which in some instances will happen and the police will not even be aware that, for example, their presence in a particular area at a specific time prevented a particular crime from happening. This complexity poses a challenge in developing a model of measuring police performance on crime prevention and is further compounded by the dynamic and complex nature of crime in various communities.
The proposed method of measuring police activities on crime prevention should be understood within these complexities and the fact that it has to be dynamic in order to be aligned to the continuously changing local circumstances.

6.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

There is a need to develop a comprehensive method of measuring the performance of the police to ensure that both the proactive and reactive activities are accurately measured. This could make the police to see the value of performing well in crime prevention activities and inculcate the holistic crime prevention culture that will ensure that there is a correlation between police effectiveness, efficiency, crime, and the public fear of crime. As has been indicated in this study, the current reliance on arrest statistics does not deal with preventive activities before the commission of crime and thus fall short of guaranteeing the safety and security of individuals.

In line with the method of measuring the crime prevention activities of the police mentioned below, there should be huge investment into crime prevention activities as these activities normally demand many resources. At the same time, there should be sufficient resources for reactive units or components to ensure that those who succeed in committing crime will be arrested and successfully prosecuted. This is equally important as it complements comprehensive crime prevention through deterrence. This will let potential criminals know that even if they do succeed in committing crime they still face the high risk of being arrested.
In addition to the well-established traditional method of measuring police performance by factors such as arrest statistics and response rate, which are important factors for crime prevention through general deterrence, as indicated previously. This study proposes the inclusion of actionable intelligence and community indicators to ensure the comprehensive measurement of both the proactive and reactive activities of the police.

6.2.1 Actionable Intelligence and Community Indicators

As stated by Skogan (1993:159) previously, community wants several things to live in safe and orderly neighbourhoods. Safe and orderly neighbourhoods include streets free of drug dealers, rowdy juveniles, threatening derelicts, soliciting prostitutes and predatory criminals; buildings without graffiti or other signs of decay; no drive-by shootings; and so forth. And asserted by Alpert and Moore (1993:111), supported by Shane (2009:15), as indicated previously, the goal of measuring performance is to determine whether the intended outcome is indeed achieved. The proposed measurement could concretise factors that have to be measured and expedite the achievement of the stated outcomes.
6.2.1.1 Actionable intelligence:

Crime analysts should brief the police on crime patterns on a daily or weekly basis so that the police can be assessed on their achievement on those given actionable indicators. This could enhance crime prevention and provide tangible factors of measuring police performance. This approach does not in any way suggest that police visibility and social interventions provided by the police is not important or does not add value to crime prevention. It has to be emphasized that police visibility and social interaction with the public is crucial and should be encouraged, but this measurement of actionable intelligence is trying to concretize what can be given to policing to do in terms of crime prevention and ensure that those facets that could be measured are indeed objectively measured. This could address the concern that has been raised by Maguire and Uchida (2000:495) that police organizations do many different things but the data is only systematically collected on very few of these activities and this limits the scope of measures that can be constructed from the collected data.

Added to the crucial random stop and search methods that the police embark on from time to time, the proposed measurement on actionable intelligence will assist in ensuring that police activities are focused towards stated and measurable outcomes. For example, if the crime analyst at the police station submitted 10 hints on the probable information on the planned commission of crime, the police station should be measured in terms of the hints given to determine whether the said crime has been committed, or whether it has been prevented by the police. This will be in line with performance of the
function legally, respectfully and assessed by the amount of harm prevented as stated by Stone et al (1988:59) previously.

The use of actionable intelligence to measure police performance on crime prevention could be beneficial to policing in the following ways:

- Crime analysts will know which variables should be used when measuring police performance.
- The police themselves will understand whether they are measured realistically or not.

6.2.1.2 Community indicators

Respective communities have different expectations from their local police officers, due to various social dynamics in the community. Through Community Policing Forums and Sectors, community expectations in terms of safety and security should be collected, analyzed, consolidated and integrated into the outputs that policing in that particular area will be measured against. Community expectation could entail what they think the police should do in dealing with symptoms of factors that the police have no control over, such as derelicts and rowdy juveniles, which pose threats to the safety and security of the community. A clear determination should be made on what the police can realistically do and the police and the community should agree on solid indicators that
the police crime prevention efforts will be measured on, such as regular patrols on the identified spots on the agreed times.

This will be taking into account public’s fear of crime as mentioned by Alpert and Moore (1993:110) who state that the public’s fear of crime is another factor that should be taken into consideration when measuring police performance. They further mention that factors such as trust and confidence in the police and the ability of the police to prevent crime should be taken into consideration because by considering these factors the police will be addressing the fear of crime and victimization by the public.

The use of community indicators to measure police performance on crime prevention could be beneficial to policing in the following ways:

- Crime analysts will know which variables should be used when measuring police performance.
- The police themselves will understand whether they are measured realistically or not.
- The public will know whether the police are doing what is expected from them or not.
6.3 CONCLUSION

The study gave a detailed analysis of the proponents and opponents of crime prevention as the core function of the police. This analysis has been provided in the context of the origin of policing through to the modern era in policing in an attempt to find out for which purpose the police had been established for. This was done in order to track down whether the initial purpose for which the police had been established for has changed in modern policing, with the ultimate aim of affirming or negating the proposition by some of the proponents of crime prevention as not the core function of the police, who are of the view that crime prevention should no longer be the core function of the police, as used to be the case.

The arguments and counter arguments on whether crime prevention is the core function of the police or not, as well as the response from the selected countries were analyzed. The golden thread that runs through the eras of policing is that crime prevention is and has always been the main function of the police. The relative ease of measuring police performance by reactive activities in comparison with proactive activities seems to indicate that the police might focus more working on these measurable activities as compared to crime prevention activities that could go unnoticed.

Based on the above assertion, the study concludes by proposing that the police’s activities should be measured comprehensively, because in terms of comprehensive
crime prevention, both the proactive and reactive activities of the police are important. The emphasis in terms of this study is on proactive activities because they guarantee the safety and security of the individual more than reactive activities, which only take place after the individual had often already been victimised.
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Appendix 1

QUESTIONNAIRE

(Botswana)

1. Why is crime prevention stated by the Botswana Local Police Act 13 of 1972 as one of the functions of the Botswana Police Service?
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3.2 Is the Botswana Police Service able to live up to this expectation?
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4. Is it realistic to expect the police to prevent crime?
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Appendix 2

QUESTIONNAIRE

(Malawi)

1. Why is crime prevention stated by Section 4 of the Police Act Cap 13.01 as one of the functions of the Malawi Police Service?
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2. What are the implications of stating crime prevention as one of the functions of the Malawi Police Service?
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3. Section 4 of the Police Act Cap 13.01 states crime prevention as one of the functions of the Malawi Police Service.

3.1 What informed this thinking?
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3.2 Is the Malawi Police Service able to live up to this expectation?
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4. Is it realistic to expect the police to prevent crime?
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INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
(Namibia)

1. Why is crime prevention stated by Section 13 of the Police Act 19 of 1990 as one of the functions of the Namibian Police Force?

2. What are the implications of stating crime prevention as one of the functions of the Namibian Police Force?

3. Section 13 of the Police Act 19 of 1990 states crime prevention as one of the functions of the Namibian Police Force.

3.1 What informed this thinking?
3.2 Is the Namibian Police Force able to live up to this expectation?
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4. Is it realistic to expect the police to prevent crime?
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Appendix 4

QUESTIONNAIRE

(New Zealand)

1. Why crime prevention is stated by section 9 of the New Zealand Policing Act 72 of 2008 as one of the functions of the New Zealand Police?
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2. What are the implications of stating crime prevention as one of the functions of the New Zealand Police?
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3. Section 9 of the New Zealand Policing Act 72 of 2008 states crime prevention as one of the functions of the New Zealand Police.

3.1 What informed this thinking?
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3.2 Is the New Zealand Police able to live up to this expectation?
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4. Is it realistic to expect the police to prevent crime?
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Appendix 5

QUESTIONNAIRE

(Scotland)

1. Why is crime prevention stated by Chapter 77 of Scotland Police Act of 1967 as one of the functions of the Scotland Police?
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2. What are the implications of stating crime prevention as one of the function of the Scotland Police?
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3. Chapter 77 of Scotland Police Act of 1967 state crime prevention as one of the functions of the Scotland Police.

3.1 What informed this thinking?
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3.2 Is the Scotland Police able to live up to this expectation?
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4. Is it realistic to expect the police to prevent crime?
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INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
(South Africa)

1. Why is crime prevention stated by section 205(3) of the South African constitution (Act 108 of 1996) as the core function of the South African Police Service?

2. What are the implications of stating crime prevention as the core function of the South African Police Service?

3. Section 205(3) of the South African constitution (Act 108 of 1996) states crime prevention as the core function of the police.

3.1 What informed this thinking?
3.2 Is the South African Police Service able to live up to this expectation?
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4. Is it realistic to expect the police to prevent crime?
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Appendix 7

QUESTIONNAIRE

(Zambia)

1. Why is crime prevention stated by section 104 of the Zambian Constitution of 1996 as one of the functions of the Zambian Police?
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2. What are the implications of stating crime prevention as one of the functions of the Zambian Police?
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3. Section 104 of the Zambian constitution 1996 state crime prevention as one of the functions of the Zambian Police.

3.1 What informed this thinking?
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3.2 Is the Zambian Police able to live up to this expectation?
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4. Is it realistic to expect the police to prevent crime?
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This report has been designed to be a more readable document and the volume of statistics featured has been reduced. To view the full statistics, log on to www.centralscotland.police.uk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints per 10k population</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total closed allegations</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of closed allegations where action has been taken</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of service closed allegations per 10k population</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service user satisfaction (initial contact)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service user satisfaction (police actions)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service user satisfaction (initiation of process)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with treatment by staff at initial contact</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service user satisfaction (overall contact)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency calls answered within 10 secs.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency incidents attended within target</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average actual response time (minutes)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-emergency calls answered within 40 secs.</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-emergency calls abandoned/lost</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Reassurance &amp; Community Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of recorded crimes &amp; offences (incl. detection rate)</td>
<td>See pages 4 &amp; 5 of report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially motivated and crimes and offences (incl. detection rate)</td>
<td>321 / 81%</td>
<td>343 / 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour community crimes and offences (inc. detection rate)</td>
<td>4,186 / 64%</td>
<td>10,435 / 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of detected youth crime</td>
<td>4,154</td>
<td>5,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth crime offenders</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>2,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People killed/seriously injured in road accidents</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children killed/seriously injured in road accidents</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury road collisions</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPPA offenders re-offending/rebreathing conditions</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice &amp; Tackling Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Special Constables</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Special Constables daily hours</td>
<td>12,253</td>
<td>18,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sound Governance &amp; Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of efficiency savings: - cashable (%)</td>
<td>£2,810</td>
<td>£2,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of working time lost to sickness absence (police officers)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of working time lost to sickness absence (police staff)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of police officers leaving the organisation</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of police staff leaving the organisation</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of salary costs accounted for by overtime (police officers)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of salary costs accounted for by overtime (police staff)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency calls per 10k population</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>1,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-emergency calls per 10k population</td>
<td>7,155</td>
<td>9,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents per 10k population</td>
<td>7,111</td>
<td>7,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of missing person incidents</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of registered sex offenders in community</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of domestic violence incidents per 10k population</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals taken into police custody</td>
<td>12,599</td>
<td>13,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Freedom of Information requests</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Freedom of Information questions</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>1,953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Reports submitted to the Procurator Fiscal within 20 days</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Reports submitted to SCRA within 14 days</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Reports marked &quot;no proceedings&quot;</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class A drug seizures (weight grams)</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class A drug seizures (unit)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class A drug seizures (total)</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded supply and possession with intent to supply offences</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Class A drug supply offences</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Green = improved/maintained performance or reduced service demand
- Red = reduced performance or increased service demand
- Amber = neutral
- = no data available at the time of publication
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