

# Chapter 22

## Cross–Cultural Collaboration for Community–Oriented Policing and Restorative Justice

**Anthony H. Normore**

*California State University – Dominguez Hills, USA*

**Brian Ellis**

*Sacramento Police Department, USA*

**Kerry Clamp**

*University of Western Sydney, Australia*

**Craig Paterson**

*Sheffield Hallam University, UK*

### **ABSTRACT**

*This chapter proposes ways to actively shape future cross-cultural police leadership and collaboration within and across police cultures. The ideas presented are intended to create dialogue across modern police organizations and those who lead them. All four authors are connected with police work either as police officers, police researchers, or criminology instructors. We highlight the impact of restorative justice in policing, community-oriented policing, and collaboration of the law enforcement community within US and UK. Examples of these efforts are embedded throughout the chapter to corroborate our argument for more collaboration within and across cultures if contemporary policing is to be successful. Future research directions are presented.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

The introduction of community-based policing and restorative policing during the 1980s and 1990s offered police officers in western societies additional discretion to develop flexible, long-term alternative responses to incident-focused, reactive “fire brigade” policing styles’ (Paterson & Clamp 2012, 195). Such initiatives acknowledge the central role of the community in identifying, reporting and respond-

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7672-3.ch022

ing to crime and are underpinned by a belief that the police are more likely to successfully tackle crime when policing strategies are based within and informed by community members themselves. However, two issues have arisen here. On the one hand, this ideological shift runs contrary to the historic policing mission where independent police professional knowledge directs local developments and it has thus generated a certain level of resistance by police officers (Bayley, 1994). On the other, a body of critical literature has developed that questions the extent to which this shift in power and responsibility has, or even can, take place (Bauman, 2001; Hobsbawn, 1995). This literature questions whether placing ‘the community’ at the centre of policing policy makes sense, especially during a historical period in which many communities (in their traditional sense) are understood to have disappeared (see Clamp & Paterson 2011). While we acknowledge this tension, we posit that not only is a cultural shift away from traditional approaches to policing our communities desirable, it is essential given the myriad of demands and values that co-exist in post-modern, multicultural societies (Clark 2005).

## **BACKGROUND: THE CHANGING CRIMINAL JUSTICE LANDSCAPE**

We begin by taking stock of the context in which the criminology is grounded. Until the early post WWII period, criminology had been dominated by a positivist approach which viewed the causes of crime as a consequence of one’s circumstances and neo-classicism which was based on the belief that swift and certain responses to crime would reduce the likelihood of repeat offending (Walsh & Ellis 2006). However, during the late 1960s and 1970s respectively, the discipline underwent two major crises (Young 1988). The first related to what Young (1988) referred to as an ‘aetiological crisis’. For the most part, positivism was based on the belief that as post-war social conditions improved crime would decrease. Instead, crime continued to rise. The second, a crisis of ‘penality’, followed the publication of a number of criminal justice studies in the United States which questioned both the effectiveness of the police and the reformatory potential of prisons in managing the problem of crime. These crises found expression in ‘nothing works’ pessimism and led to a ‘questioning of the state’s ability to control crime’ (Garland 2001, p. 62).

Advanced liberal democracies (e.g., UK, US, Canada, Australia) responded to this crisis by reforming criminal justice institutions and mobilizing non-state mechanisms in the ‘fight against crime’. From a criminological perspective advanced liberal democracies refer to political systems that group countries together. From the 1980s onwards criminal justice became characterized by an enhanced role for victims and communities in the administration of justice (rather than professionals alone) and the politicization of crime control. The rise of ‘populist punitiveness’ (Bottoms, 1995) involved politicians talking tough and introducing ever more stringent penal policies in order to secure public support (Young & Matthews 2003). This cultural and political shift resulted in increased resources for policing, prosecutions and prisons (McEvoy, 2007; Roach 2005) but also had the adverse effect of creating a perception of increased criminal incidents despite a relatively stable decline in crime rates from the mid-1990s (Young & Matthews, 2003).

Exclusive adherence to a punitive strategy did not produce the desired result in terms of ‘greater satisfaction with criminal justice or an increased sense of security’ (Roach, 2005). An increase in case-loads, an absence of faith in the ability of the criminal justice system to deal with crime effectively, and an increase in victim advocacy (Garland 2001; McEvoy 2007; Zehr, 2002) subsequently resulted in concerted efforts to find new and innovative ways of engaging with offenders, victims and communities.

17 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

[www.igi-global.com/chapter/cross-cultural-collaboration-for-community-oriented-policing-and-restorative-justice/219491](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/cross-cultural-collaboration-for-community-oriented-policing-and-restorative-justice/219491)

## Related Content

---

### Critical Incident Interventions: Crisis Response and Debriefing

Emily Brucia, Matthew J. Cordova and Josef I. Ruzek (2019). *Police Science: Breakthroughs in Research and Practice* (pp. 159-182).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/critical-incident-interventions/219472](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/critical-incident-interventions/219472)

### Foster Children and Deviance Risks After Emancipation

Gianna M. Strube (2021). *Global Perspectives on People, Process, and Practice in Criminal Justice* (pp. 214-225).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/foster-children-and-deviance-risks-after-emancipation/275074](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/foster-children-and-deviance-risks-after-emancipation/275074)

### Supporting the Community Reintegration of People Leaving Prison: Measuring Digital Skills as a Tool for Inclusion

Karlie E. Stonard, Laura Caulfield, Kyros Hadjisergis and Siobhan Sadlier (2026). *The Intersection of Technology and Criminal Justice* (pp. 381-404).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/supporting-the-community-reintegration-of-people-leaving-prison/411361](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/supporting-the-community-reintegration-of-people-leaving-prison/411361)

### How Might We Prevent Youth Crime?: Lessons From Research in Nigeria

Don John Omale (2026). *Juvenile Justice in African and Western Criminal Justice Systems* (pp. 81-96).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/how-might-we-prevent-youth-crime/397417](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/how-might-we-prevent-youth-crime/397417)

### Faculty Vulnerability: A Restorative Experiential Learning Activity for Academically-Disengaged College Students

Cicely Jenice Cottrell, Candice Rochelle Williams and Carley Michelle Shinault (2023). *Restorative Justice and Practices in the 21st Century* (pp. 76-103).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/faculty-vulnerability/322563](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/faculty-vulnerability/322563)