ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN POLICING AND CRIMINAL CONTEXTS

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH

Series Editor, Volumes 1–6: Gerard McElwee

Volume 7 onward: Paul Jones

Volume 1:	Innovating Women: Contributions to Technological advancement Edited by Pooran Wynarczyk and Susan Marlow
Volume 2:	Social and Sustainable Enterprise: Changing the Nature of Business Edited by Sarah underwood, Richard Blundel, Fergus Lyon and Anja Schaefer
Volume 3:	Enterprising Places: Leadership and Governance Edited by Lee Pugalis and Joyce Liddle
Volume 4:	Exploring Rural Enterprise: New Perspectives on Research, Policy and Practice Edited by Colette Henry and Gerard McElwee
Volume 5:	Exploring Criminal and Illegal Enterprise: New Perspectives on Research, Policy and Practice Edited by Gerard McElwee and Robert Smith
Volume 6:	New Perspectives on Research, Policy and Practice in Public Entrepreneurship Edited by Joyce Liddle
Volume 7:	New Perspectives on Entrepreneurship Education Edited by Paul Jones, Gideon Maas and Luke Pittaway
Volume 8:	Entrepreneurship and the Sustainable Development Goals Edited by Nikolaos Apostolpoulos, Haya Al-Dajani, Diane Holt, Paul Jones and Robert Newbery
Volume 9a:	Creating Entrepreneurial Space: Talking Through Multi-voices, Reflections on Emerging Debates Edited by David Higgins, Paul Jones and Pauric McGowan
Volume 9B:	Creating Entrepreneurial Space: Talking Through Multi-voices, Reflections on Emerging Debates Edited by David Higgins, Paul Jones and Pauric McGowan
Volume 10:	International Entrepreneurship in Emerging markets: Nature, Drivers, Barriers and Determinants Edited by Mohamed Yacine Haddoud, Paul Jones and Adah-Kole Emmanuel Onjewu
Volume 11:	Universities and Entrepreneurship: Meeting the Educational and Social Challenges Edited by Paul Jones, Nikolaos Apostolopoulos, Alexandros Kakouris, Christopher Moon, Vanessa Ratten and Andreas Walmsley

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP
RESEARCH VOLUME 12

ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN POLICING AND CRIMINAL CONTEXTS

AUTHORED BY

ROBERT SMITH
Independent Scholar, UK

United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2021

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-80071-057-3 (Print)
ISBN: 978-1-80071-056-6 (Online)
ISBN: 978-1-80071-058-0 (Epub)

ISSN: 2040-7246 (Series)

ISOQAR certified Management System, awarded to Emerald for adherence to Environmental standard ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF FIGURES

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF TABLES

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF CASE STUDIES

MICRO CASE STUDIES

MACRO CASE STUDIES

This page intentionally left blank

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr Robert Smith, or 'Rob' as he is known to academic colleagues, is an Independent Scholar operating from Aberdeen, UK. He was formerly a Professor of Enterprise and Innovation at the University of the West of Scotland and prior to that a Reader in Entrepreneurship at Robert Gordon University (RGU), Aberdeen. He studied for his MA (graduated 1997) at Aberdeen University and his PhD by research at RGU (graduated 2006) whilst working full-time as a police officer in Grampian Police. In 2008, he completed 25 years police service as a 'career constable' in Grampian Police. During his career, he served in a variety of roles including Response Offer, Community Police Officer, Rural Police Officer, Intelligence Officer, Crime Reduction Officer, and Criminal Investigation Officer. Between 2008 and 2012, he was the Scottish Institute for Policing research (SIPR) Lecturer in Management and Leadership. His research interests are eclectic, but his primary research focus is on study of entrepreneurship in different applications and settings including the socially constructed nature of entrepreneurship and thus entrepreneurial identity, semiotics, narrative, and storytelling in organisations including small and family business. Other areas of research interest include gender and entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial networks, small and family business, regional development and rural entrepreneurship. From a policing perspective, his interests include entrepreneurial-policing, criminal entrepreneurship, and entrepreneurial crime. He is a Prolific Scholar and has published over 180 journal articles and book chapters to date, many of which have policing themes. He is a Member of the Institute for Small Business and Entrepreneurship, The British Society of Criminology, and the Scottish Institute of Policing Research.

Dr Robert Smith, September 2020.

This page intentionally left blank

FOREWORD

This monograph is the result of many years of patient study inspired by the seminal study of Dick Hobbs into the entrepreneurial nature of Detectives in the East End of London (Hobbs, 1988). The book had a profound effect upon my professional thinking because it introduced me to and invoked my passion for entrepreneurship. As a result of reading the works of Hobbs and others I developed twin interests in 'Criminal–Entrepreneurship' and 'Entrepreneurial Policing'. This triggered an appreciation of the explanatory power of entrepreneurship theory to act as a change agent in contemporary policing. Over the years this appreciation matured as I reflected upon my experiences as a police officer and appreciated that as a 'thief-taker', a 'Collator', a 'Detective', and a 'Crime Reduction Officer', I had been acting in an 'intrapreneurial' manner and in some occasions in an entrepreneurial manner. The idea for this monograph was born out of this apercu. Its focus is on the emergence and evolution of the term into the lexicon of policing. In these continuing austere times, change is increasingly being thrust on the service with reform very much on the agenda. In 2008, Sir Ronnie Flanagan made a plea for Chief Constables to take an entrepreneurial approach to policing and identified 'Risk Aversion' culture as being a major obstacle in achieving such transformation. Flanagan called for a national debate on risk-aversion and culture change at a central government level. This has not materialised and the early promise of the topic has dissipated somewhat and although entrepreneurial policing has become an established area of academic study it has yet to make a significant impact on policing processes and practices. In 2009, I held a SIPR Seminar on the subject entitled *New Directions in Entrepreneurial Policing and Police Leadership* at Robert Gordon University. I continued to research and publish on the topic. In the interim period, a stream of publications has emerged which mention the term entrepreneurial policing. At present, the term is still used 'loosely' by a group of enlightened Chief Officers, Politicians and Policing Scholars for whom it means different things. Putting aside the theoretical and the conceptual underpinnings of the construct, there are many questions still to be answered. Will it engender practical outcomes? Should we develop and adopt new systems of entrepreneurial policing? What would these look like? This exploratory monograph addresses some of these questions. Its aim is to encourage others involved in policing scholarship and practice to consider the influence of entrepreneurship on Policing and the Criminal Justice system. It is hoped that this monograph will begin a debate between policing practitioners and scholars and business school and entrepreneurship scholars to find new ways of policing,

new forms and structures and new business models which will improve the way we police organised crime and other pressing societal issues. It is a debate which is long overdue and to which I look forward to contributing too.

Dr Robert Smith.
Aberdeen October, 2020.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my wife Valery whom patiently typed several sections of this manuscript and also Dr Rodger Patrick and Chief Inspector Martin Gallagher for their constructive feedback on drafts of the monograph. I would also like to acknowledge the staff at Emerald Publishing for their patience and expert guidance in writing this text.

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

ABSTRACT

This volume of the Contemporary Issues in Entrepreneurship Research series is an invited expert contribution and is designed around a theme of growing importance in the entrepreneurship community namely that of entrepreneurship in policing and criminal contexts. The author was formerly a 'Career Constable' and also later a 'Professor of Entrepreneurship & Innovation' which makes him an acknowledged expert in both fields. This monograph explores and develops theory and practice in an area which has not received a lot of academic scrutiny. It will be useful to scholars of entrepreneurship who have limited knowledge of how entrepreneurship manifests itself in policing and criminal justice contexts; and to policing scholars and practitioners who have a limited knowledge of the power of entrepreneurship to revolutionise policing in the twenty-first century. It is specifically written with both audiences in mind and the need to be theoretical and robust. It is also timely given the changes brought about by an era of austerity followed by the Covid-19 pandemic and social upheavals which have challenged and changed the way we police an ever-changing society.

This introduction is presented in three parts. The first sets the scene and provides an autoethnographic account of how this study came into being and the seminal academic studies that inspired it. This is important because the authors appreciation of how entrepreneurship as a philosophy pervades policing and criminal contexts evolved slowly over a number of years in the 1990s when he served as a police officer as a result of a combination of his policing experiences and personal study. The second section articulates the breadth and scope of the study. The third section provides an overview of the chapters which follow to guide readers expectations.

1. AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC ACCOUNT OF THE GENESIS OF THIS STUDY

This monograph is the result of many years of patient study into the topics of entrepreneurship in policing and criminal contexts which has been the subject of passionate interest to this author for over two decades now and has shaped his world view of policing. This author joined Grampian Police as a Constable in 1983 and being of an academic disposition, developed a passion for reading

criminology textbooks and true crime books. The author became a proficient 'thief-taker' and studied every book he could source on criminal investigation and catching criminals. Between 1993 and 1997, he studied part time for an MA degree at Aberdeen University whilst still working full time in the police. In 1996, this author enrolled on an entrepreneurship module being taught by Dr Alistair R Anderson his future friend and mentor. The genesis of this study began in earnest that year, when this author was studying in the library at Aberdeen University gathering material for an essay on criminal entrepreneurship and by chance encountered the seminal studies of Dick Hobbs into the entrepreneurial nature of Detectives in the East End of London (Hobbs, 1988); and Levi (1985) on phantom Capitalists. The books had a profound effect upon his professional thinking because it introduced him to and invoked his continuing interest in entrepreneurship. As a result of reading the works of Hobbs and others, this author developed an abiding interest in the twin sub-topics of 'Criminal-Entrepreneurship' and 'Entrepreneurial Policing'. Another seminal study which influenced the growing obsession was the book 'Criminal Shadows' by the psychologist and criminal profiler Professor David Canter (Canter, 1994). The interest was also stimulated by a comment by Alistair R Anderson that the author was academically bright and should consider conducting a PhD. These influences triggered an appreciation of the explanatory power of entrepreneurship theory to act as a change agent in contemporary policing and a continuing interest in entrepreneurial policing.

Over the next few years, this appreciation matured as this author reflected upon his experiences as a police officer and appreciated that he had been acting in an intrapreneurial and entrepreneurial manner. He also appreciated that many of the criminals he dealt with on a daily basis were also entrepreneurial by nature. It also stimulated the author to conduct further personal studies which resulted in an unpublished monograph on the entrepreneurial modus operandi of disorganised criminals (Smith, 1999); and another unpublished study into the links between entrepreneurship and criminality (Smith, 2000) which formed the basis of an application for a doctoral candidacy at Aberdeen University. The said proposal was accepted, but the title and scope of the doctoral study later evolved into a study about the socially constructed nature of entrepreneurship (see Smith, 2006). The author transferred his PhD studies to the Robert Gordon University in 2001 when his supervisor Alistair R Anderson transferred there on securing a Professorship. During his doctoral studies, this author began his academic career and secured a part time position as a Research Fellow. The idea for this monograph was born out of this apercu and these influences and the focus of this monograph was initially on the emergence and evolution of the term 'entrepreneurial policing' into the lexicon of policing but gradually evolved to include material on entrepreneurship in a wider policing and criminal context. In the ensuing years, the author continued to collect references and material on 'criminal entrepreneurship' and 'entrepreneurial policing'.

In 2008, Sir Ronnie Flanagan made a plea for Chief Constables to take an entrepreneurial approach to policing and identified 'Risk Aversion' culture as being a major obstacle in achieving such transformation. Flanagan called for

a national debate on risk aversion and culture change at a central government level. This has not materialised and as a result the early promise of the topic dissipated and although entrepreneurial policing has become an established area of academic study it has yet to make a significant impact on policing processes and practices. In 2008, the author also retired from the police after 25 years as a 'career constable' and took up a position as SIPR Lecturer in leadership and management at Aberdeen Business School, Robert Gordon University.

In 2009, this author held a SIPR Seminar on the subject entitled *New Directions in Entrepreneurial Policing and Police Leadership* at Robert Gordon University which resulted in articles in the Police Professional and Police Review Journals (see Smith, 2009b, 2009c) highlighting the importance of this paradigm. This author continued to research and publish on the topic and in the interim period, a stream of publications has emerged which mention the term 'entrepreneurial policing'. At present, the term is still used 'loosely' by a group of enlightened Chief Officers, Politicians, and Policing Scholars for whom it means different things. Setting aside the theoretical and the conceptual underpinnings of the construct, there are many questions still to be answered. Will it engender practical outcomes? Should we develop and adopt new systems of entrepreneurial policing? What would these look like? This monograph addresses some of these questions. Its aim is to encourage others involved in policing scholarship and practice to consider the influence of entrepreneurship on policing and the criminal Justice system.

2. ARTICULATING THE SCOPE OF THIS MONOGRAPH

This monograph explores the specific contemporary and under researched themes of 'entrepreneurial policing' and 'criminal entrepreneurship' and is concerned with specific applications, contexts and settings of entrepreneurship in criminal justice settings. Entrepreneurship pervades and influences what the police do, how they do it in the context of ever-changing external environments and accordingly this monograph critically opens up a new area of policing research, innovatively using theories of entrepreneurship, management, and leadership, to illustrate different perspectives on policing in which entrepreneurialism is present. It presents a scholarly discussion about concepts and theories underpinning the topic. This monograph and its contents are timely given the growing pressures upon policing in the twenty-first century including the growing appreciation of the entrepreneurial nature of criminality; the increasing criticism of the police and their methods in light of the death of George Floyd and the 'Black Lives Matters' movement which gained momentum as a result calls for new methods and philosophies of policing and new ways of doing things including calls for dismantling problematic policing departments and agencies and for 'defunding the police'. Such radical change can only be implemented if better methods and models of policing are available and if new means of funding such changes are put in place. It is evident from several years of patient research into aspects of entrepreneurialism in policing and the wider field of criminal justice that there are

numerous crossovers in the literatures of entrepreneurship, policing and criminality because innovation, transformation, and change are integral facets of all of these phenomena.

Despite acknowledging the existence of this overlap between entrepreneurialism and policing, there are various cultural and organisational factors which make the implementation of entrepreneurialism in policing and criminal justice contexts problematic. The chapters in this monograph collectively explore and develop entrepreneurial theory and practice and the focus is upon the evolution of the literature and on barriers to its effective implementation. This monograph offers a critical perspective on a key contemporary challenge in policing by articulating the concept, tracing it history, and providing a critical analytic commentary on why it has yet to make an impact on policing praxis. This critique traces its evolution in the academic literature from a critical conceptual and theoretical perspective supported by evidence-based micro-case studies. The chapters address fundamental challenging questions impacting future directions in policing and as a consequence, the focus is very much on the practical – what it is, why it is important to policing, and what measures have to be put in place to realise its true potential.

The concept of 'entrepreneurial policing' became in vogue as a transformatory ideology and discourse in academic policing circles during the 1990s. Yet despite initially making a tentative impact, it has not fulfilled its potential promise. It showed great promise but met with considerable resistance primarily because of austerity measures. Being a concept, it is developmental, and is, therefore, less concrete than a universal theory. Concepts develop over time and have ontological ramifications as they develop and come 'into being'. This is an important distinction because entrepreneurial policing is the still an evolutionary notion which requires critical evaluation. Theories provide sound explanatory frameworks based on observations. At present, there is no unifying theory of entrepreneurial policing, despite the theoretical underpinnings discussed here. Entrepreneurial policing is best explained as a social concept, or an intellectual label trapped in academia where it exists as a muted, niche conversation.

Moreover, entrepreneurial policing is opaque and undefined and indeed, the concept is not mentioned by Newburn and Neyroud (2008) in their acclaimed *Dictionary of Policing*. At present, it is used 'loosely' by enlightened chief officers, politicians and policing scholars as a 'catch-all' to encompass innovative forms of policing. This positions it as an externally applied concept rather than an internally validated policing philosophy. Conceptually and theoretically, we have moved beyond this point because the term is in usage and it is up to readers to individually validate the concept as capable of implementation in a practical, everyday policing context. Therefore, each scholar must define and articulate what they mean by it. Nevertheless, it has theoretical and practical implications for contemporary and future policing practice and policy.

The purpose of this monograph is to provide an explanation of the term and to articulate why an understanding of entrepreneurship is vital in encouraging necessary change as for example in relation to the implementation of transformational leadership in the police service (Ritchie, 2010). Thus, although the terminology is currently in vogue, it is little more than rhetoric because traditionally,

the term 'entrepreneur' itself lies out with the pragmatic lexicon of policing. Consequentially, the power of entrepreneurship to act as an organisational change agent remains untapped. This monograph presents some fascinating and novel 'ideas' which should be of interest to police officers, and academics, as they struggle to initiate change albeit the ideas have yet to be unleashed on the service. These conceptual and theoretical ideas are presented in conjunction with practical examples to assist the reader understand the idea and scope of entrepreneurialism in policing contexts (Harvey, 1989). An overarching aim of this work is to critically synthesise material and arguments normally separated within disparate literatures. The text will be useful to policing scholars whom it is hoped will encourage a critical dissemination of the ideas expressed herein. It should be of interest to scholars of entrepreneurship because it is an interesting and unusual application and/or setting of enterprise. It will interest practitioners within the wider field of criminal justice because the ideas are not restricted to the police, but to the Prison and Probation Services too because both are presently undergoing major structural changes which involve private enterprise. Undergraduate scholars in business, criminology and policing topics, may find this monograph useful in recognising and exploring the scope of entrepreneurialism and its potential impact on the criminal justice system. It will be of interest to Business School students and staff because entrepreneurship as manifested in policing and criminal contexts behaves differently from entrepreneurship in a free market context. Although the contents and examples in this monograph are primarily UK and US based, entrepreneurship in policing and criminal contexts also has an international reach and audience.

To understand any phenomenon, one must understand the nuances of its theories, themes and stories. Accordingly, throughout this monograph, we discuss how aspects of entrepreneurship theory such as intrapreneurship, corporate, and team entrepreneurship can be applied in a practical context to policing as transformational practices, illustrating how such theories and practices can be used in a practical context to benefit the service. For example, entrepreneurship theory applied to policing can help combat crime or it can be used in a contemporary policing environment, albeit it has to be legitimised on the mental map (Gould & White, 1972) of most officers. Existing theories of crime and entrepreneurship overlap at many points with those of policing, making it helpful to understand some of the internal and external drivers and influences involved in its ontological development. In terms of legitimacy, the importance of entrepreneurial policing received a boost when Sir Ronnie Flanagan (2008) made a call for a more entrepreneurial form of policing; and for an end to the culture of risk aversion. Indeed, Flanagan advocated a more entrepreneurial approach, arguing that within policing organisations risk aversion drives so much bureaucracy (Flanagan, 2008, p. 1). He called for more 'dynamic and flexible policing' and for 'entrepreneurial and innovative solutions from the leaders of the police service as all levels' (Flanagan, 2008, p. 1). Flanagan (2008, p. 36) singled out two individual British Police Forces as epitomising this new spirit of entrepreneurialism. These were North Wales and Kent. The former developed an innovative funding formula by selling police expertise to other forces and agencies; whilst the latter sold driving courses and

were innovative in relation to organisational aspects of service delivery. A major flaw of the Flanagan report is that it did not clearly define entrepreneurial policing! Readers were left to work it out for themselves. Despite this plea, the British Police remain the most resistant of the public services in failing to embrace the ethos of entrepreneurialism.

For the purpose of this monograph, entrepreneurial policing is defined as

> The implementation of new innovative ways of thinking and entrepreneurial processes and practices in policing contexts.

This definition is useful to theorists and practitioners alike, but a more nuanced and all-encompassing definition must be the focus of future research.

3. AN OVERVIEW OF THE MONOGRAPH

This section provides an overview of the monograph and sets out what readers can expect to encounter and sets out what sub-topics are discussed. Chapter 1 is set out as follows. In Section 1.1, the concept of entrepreneurial policing, introduced above, will be expanded upon, and described in more detail. A brief discussion of what entrepreneurship is and is not, will be conducted to begin to illustrate the scope and power of entrepreneurship to revolutionise policing in the twenty-first century. Thereafter, several applications and settings of entrepreneurship, including corporate and team entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, and social entrepreneurship are discussed and their relevance to policing highlighted. This is followed by a discussion of why entrepreneurship is of critical importance to the police service. Thereafter, a discussion is initiated in relation to what entrepreneurial policing means. In Section 1.2, the foundations of entrepreneurial policing are critically examined to illustrate that it is an evolutionary process and that it is derived from developments in new public management and new entrepreneurialism in the public services. The evolution of entrepreneurial policing has also been influenced by simultaneous developments in the literatures of criminal entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial leadership. In Section 1.3, the strands discussed above are drawn together to develop a greater understanding of the 'entrepreneurship–policing nexus'. This is followed in Section 1.4 with a brief discussion in identifying the stakeholders in the entrepreneurial process. The chapter concludes with takeaway points.

Chapter 2 develops an understanding of policing culture and its anti-entrepreneurial nature. This is necessary to better understand organisational and cultural elements of policing that inhibit the development of a more entrepreneurial culture and outlook in the police and wider criminal justice settings. Thus, Section 2.1 provides a discussion of socio-culture and organisational barriers to entrepreneurial policing which require to be understood and overcome to implement an entrepreneurial policing culture. These include the antithical nature of the police rank structure in relation to the enactment of entrepreneurial practices; other organisational factors and barriers which inhibit its practice; and in particular, the need to challenge the existing military model of policing, which is at present, a

dominant paradigm which stifles entrepreneurial behaviour. In Section 2.2, issues relating to police organisation in British and American policing organisations which hamper the implementation of entrepreneurial policing, are discussed. These relate to police culture, bureaucracy, and the risk averse nature of contemporary policing philosophies. The issue of police culture in relation to change is expanded upon and examples provided. A discussion of negative organisational traits associated with policing such as anti-entrepreneurialism and anti-intellectualism is conducted. In Section 2.3, other positive forms and structures of entrepreneurship of interest to policing, are introduced and discussed. These include cultivating a more entrepreneurial organisation; encouraging the stereotype of the 'maverick' officer; the privatisation of policing; and the commercialisation of policing services. These topics are of vital importance in implementing a more positive entrepreneurial culture to policing. In Section 1.4, an appreciation of the links between entrepreneurship and innovation in policing are developed. The main point is the need for the police to adopt a more innovative approach to its structures, operating practices and outlook to innovation. The chapter concludes with takeaway points.

Chapter 3 expands upon the points raised in Chapters 1 and 2 and continues with an exploration of the 'Entrepreneurship–Leadership nexus'. This is an important chapter because it introduces and discusses the important element of leadership in initiating entrepreneurial cultures and organisational change. Section 3.1 introduces the topic by providing a broad brushstroke discussion of where the elements of policing, entrepreneurship and leadership sit in relation to one another. In Section 3.2, these themes are developed further by the introduction of a discussion on the development of the art of entrepreneurial management. This is followed in Section 3.3 by a wider discussion of the need to understand police leadership styles and the influence these have on entrepreneurial policing practices. In Section 3.4, a change of direction is taken to consider the changing semiotics of policing and how this understanding can be used to help facilitate a more entrepreneurial culture in policing. Section 3.5 continues the themes raised in Section 3.4 and provides two comparative models of police leadership which influence the semiotics of policing. These are the 'commander versus executive' model. In Section 3.6, the discussion returns to consideration of adopting leadership styles appropriate for changing times, including humble leadership and the implementation of agile leadership and agile teams. The chapter concludes with takeaway points.

Chapter 4 is devoted to developing a better understanding of the expanding paradigm of criminal entrepreneurship and how this understanding can be used by the police to help interdict crime and criminality, but in particular, serious and organised criminals. Section 4.1 provides a description of the existing criminoentrepreneurial ecosystem to situate both policing and criminality in context with entrepreneurship theory. Section 4.2 expands upon this nuanced understanding and develops an enterprise-based model of criminal entrepreneurship. The chapter concludes with a summary of the main takeaway points.

Chapter 5 concentrates on academic tools and techniques which can be used to implement entrepreneurial policing into everyday practices. Section 5.1

discusses problems associated with implementing entrepreneurial policing and considers how best to overcome them. Section 5.2 discusses the topic of assessing personal and entrepreneurial self-efficacy in organisations and provides some examples such us The General Enterprising Tendency Test; Creativity Tests; and The Business Model You framework. Section 5.3 introduces academic methods of implementing new policing practices including SWOT Analysis, PESTEL Analysis, Process Mapping, Risk Management, the Business Model Canvas, Red Teaming, Agile Teams, and Appreciative Inquiry. The chapter concludes with takeaway points.

Chapter 6 relates to implementing entrepreneurial policing practices in complex scenarios. Section 6.1 narrates the case story of Albanian Organised Crime in the UK; and Section 6.2. narrates the contentious case story of American Police Gangs. Section 6.3 narrates the twin case stories of the implementation of intrapreneurial policing practices in the form of the Grampian Police Village Constable Scheme and of using innovative methods to reduce shoplifting amongst chaotic offenders. Section 6.4 presents the takeaway points of the chapter.

Chapter 7 seeks to consolidate and unify the main takeaway points discussed in the preceding chapters to develop a momentum in relation to entrepreneurial policing. Section 7.1, therefore, discusses the critical need to change police culture and introduce a more entrepreneurial modus operandi. In Section 7.2, the discussion is developed in relation to how the police can learn to lead more entrepreneurially. Section 7.3 continues the discussion of how to overcome obstacles and difficulties facing the police service in implementing entrepreneurial policing. Section 7.4 discusses the influence of politics and Covid-19 on policing practice in the UK. Section 7.5 looks at reversing the culture of risk aversion and ant-entrepreneurialism. Section 7.6 looks at reversing the police culture of anti-intellectualism. Finally, Section 7.7 looks to the future and the need to develop a more entrepreneurial edge to policing.

CHAPTER 1

ENTREPRENEURIALISM IN POLICING AND CRIMINAL CONTEXTS

ABSTRACT

This chapter introduces the two main topics of 'entrepreneurial policing' and 'criminal entrepreneurship' and begins in Section 1.1 by considering the concept and scope of entrepreneurial policing around which this monograph is organised. Its definition and ontological development are considered. Thereafter, the author briefly discuss what entrepreneurship is (and is not) and set out examples of entrepreneurship of interest to policing, including – 'Corporate' and 'Team' Entrepreneurship, 'Intrapreneurship', 'Social Entrepreneurship and Animateurship', 'Civic Entrepreneurship', and 'Public Service Entrepreneurship'. The author then discusses why entrepreneurship is of critical importance to the police service and discuss worked examples. Having developed a basic understanding of the power and utility of entrepreneurship, then in more detail what the term entrepreneurial policing means and how it evolved in practice and in the academic literature are considered. In Section 1.2, the foundations of entrepreneurial policing considering its ontological and epistemological development from 'New Public Management' to 'New Entrepreneurialism' and also the influence of the merging literatures of 'Criminal Entrepreneurship' and 'Entrepreneurial Leadership' are critically examined. In Section 1.3, our consideration to include a more nuanced understanding of the what is referred to as the 'Entrepreneurship–Policing Nexus' including consideration of the influence of dyslexia on policing and crime and the power of the 'Entrepreneurial' and 'Gangster' dreams on entrepreneurial motivation and propensity are expanded. In Section 1.4, an attempt is made to identify who the stakeholders of this new policing philosophy are? Finally, in

Entrepreneurship in Policing and Criminal Contexts
Contemporary Issues in Entrepreneurship Research, Volume 12, 1–32

ISSN: 2040-7246/doi:10.1108/S2040-724620210000012002

Section 1.5, the chapter takeaway points which both articulates and confirms the inherent importance of entrepreneurship in policing and criminal contexts are discussed and detailed.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship; entrepreneurial policing; intrapreneurship; new public management; new entrepreneurialism; criminal entrepreneurship

1.1. INTRODUCING THE CONCEPT AND SCOPE OF ENTREPRENEURIAL POLICING

The concept of entrepreneurial policing is in some policing circles a contested concept, but this does not undermine its potential future utility, albeit not everyone will accept its validity. In the introduction, we posited a working definition of the term as – *The implementation of new innovative ways of thinking and entrepreneurial processes and practices in policing contexts,* however, it has far wider connotations than this as will be discussed in this monograph. Indeed, context is extremely important in understanding the nuances of entrepreneurship and economic behaviour because it can be better understood within its historical, temporal, institutional, spatial, and social contexts which provide individuals with opportunities and set boundaries for their actions (Welter, 2011). It is helpful to consider the definition and etymology of the term entrepreneurial policing itself. To date, there are no all-encompassing concrete definitions of the very term – entrepreneurial policing and because it is a collocation of the words 'entrepreneurial' and 'policing' it comes pre-loaded with the ideological and philosophical baggage of both concepts. From an ontological perspective, one of the earliest practical and non-academic examples of its usage in popular culture was expressed by American journalist Kay Bohner (1996) who illustrated its practice. See Micro Case Study 1.

Micro Case Study 1 – First Reference to Entrepreneurial Policing

Bohner (1996) described the activities of a particular Sheriff 'Mel', who worked with the Sheriff's Department at St Clair County, Illinois. Mel was desperately short of money to pay for new reflective stripes on his police cars and in an entrepreneurial spirit, raised the cash by selling advertising space above the wheel wells of their cruisers. This is a classic example of the spirit of commercialisation.

This is a rather narrow definition, but channels of commercialisation are nevertheless an important and practical facet of the phenomenon. Indeed, it is a common misconception that it refers to the implementation of business practices to models of policing because it covers a wider gamut of activity than that. Yet, it is more than the 'Businessifaction' or 'McDonaldization of Policing' (see Heslop,

2011a, 2011b; Ritzer, 2004). Nevertheless, to succinctly define what it is (or is not) remains problematic. Yet, Mitchell (2003, p. 151) makes reference to a police service osmotically impregnated with social market orthodoxies and business practices. Moreover, examples of entrepreneurial policing and entrepreneurialism in policing contexts pre-date its appearance in the lexicon of policing. It is helpful to consider what entrepreneurship is or is not.

1.1.1. What is Entrepreneurship?

Most readers will have a basic personalised, understanding of what entrepreneurship is but it is helpful to briefly introduce and explain entrepreneurship theory as it applies to the police service (the service) before we can begin to consider interrogating the conceptual and theoretical implications of entrepreneurial policing per se. As a protean concept, it is not in the lexicon, nor in the vocabularies of many officers, making it necessary to explain what it is, and why it is important to policing. It is not the purpose of this text to delve too deeply into the nuances of entrepreneurship theory because that would produce a very different and more theoretical text. Readers interested in finding out more should consult entrepreneurship textbooks such as those by Kirby (2003), Burns (2007, 2013), and Nielsen, Klyver, Evald, and Bager (2012) which provide a wider theoretical underpinning. Instead, we seek to understand and explain it in simple terms because entrepreneurship is a cognitive human activity that one can engage with and enact without recourse to theoretical knowledge or underpinnings. Indeed, entrepreneurship is a life theme in everyday life (Bolton & Thompson, 2000). Its basic definition translated from French is 'one who acts between' or 'one who undertakes'. It operates at various levels. Entrepreneurship is the overarching term used to describe it as a subject and as a practice. However, as a practice, it can be described as 'Entrepreneurialism' and 'Entrepreneuring'. At another level, one can refer to it as a practice by using the cognate term 'Enterprise' as in criminal enterprise or nefarious enterprise as in a specific 'Enterprise Culture' or 'Enterprise Ethic'. It can be utilised at a 'Theoretical', 'Practical', or 'Conceptual' level and as an 'Ideology' and 'Philosophy' (Smith, 2006).

Moreover, entrepreneurship is a complex socio-economic jigsaw and as a result the very term 'Entrepreneur' has become conflated with business *per se* and in particular with successful businessmen such as Sir Richard Branson and Sir Alan Sugar, but it is now widely accepted that it can occur in any sphere of life (Bolton & Thompson, 2000). Moreover, entrepreneurship is associated with organisational and social change, turbulence, and often chaos. Thus, it has negative connotations which make it a difficult management strategy to implement. It generally entails transformation from on state to another, involving innovation or adaptation of existing practices. Frustratingly, entrepreneurship is difficult to explain, and even entrepreneurship scholars cannot agree on a universal definition (Gartner, 1988). Nevertheless, this complexity and lack of definition need not be a problem to practical, pragmatic people like police officers. Although most of what we have come to associate with the practice of entrepreneurship does relate to its practice in a business environment – entrepreneurship theory can be applied

to all facets of life making it possible to talk about 'entrepreneurial criminals' and 'entrepreneurial police officers'. Indeed, entrepreneurship is an attitude of mind, a personal and collective philosophy of practice. It is also a quality of a behaviour, or action, which must be 'read out of' or 'into' the occurrence in which it is situated. Thus, entrepreneurship at a basic level is about putting new ideas into practice and doing things differently.

Moreover, one can practice entrepreneurship without having knowledge of its theories but if one wants to understand how a practice works it is necessary to engage in theorising. As a process, entrepreneurship is best understood as 'The creation and extraction of value from an environment' (Anderson, 1995). This definition takes its practice out of the domain of business. In this context, it is about scanning one's environment and by dint of self-efficacy and persistence creating new value. It is also the 'creation of new organisations along with the renewal of existing organisations' (Nielsen et al., 2012). It influences our everyday thoughts and actions irrespective of circumstances. Yet, the common misconception that it relates solely to business activities persists albeit entrepreneurship transcends business, making it a socially nuanced activity. This idea is critical to understanding and unleashing the power of entrepreneurship in a policing context. The under-utilisation of entrepreneurship in policing contexts is compounded because it is an area of research in which few police scholars, or practitioners, have the requisite knowledge and expertise to tap into its potential. As a result, this 'Policing–Entrepreneurship Nexus' is under-developed and seldom converge, which is surprising given the fluid nature of policing and the pragmatism of police (Smith, 2008a, 2008b, 2008c, 2008d). Thus, it is helpful to develop a working understanding of entrepreneurship theory before applying it is a policing environment.

It is, therefore, essential to understand that entrepreneurship itself is a practice-based activity which is resistant to theorising (Nielsen et al., 2012). As stated, there is no one universal theory of entrepreneurship and no all-encompassing definition. Thus, unlike management models, one cannot simply follow a step-by-step process and achieve universal results.[1] Instead, one must understand the nuances and contexts of the particular social setting, or processes, one is seeking to change and then apply new thinking, processes, practices, or modes of operation to achieve the desired result. Nevertheless, entrepreneurship should be of critical interest to policing scholars and practitioners alike.

1.1.2. Why is Entrepreneurship of Critical Interest to Policing?

To understand this, it is first necessary to investigate the embeddedness of entrepreneurship within policing culture *per se*. For Alderson (1979, 2003) in a bourgeoisie democracy, one of the main policing functions is to protect private property whilst dispensing justice and fairness. This links the police inexorably to capitalism, the entrepreneurial elite, and establishments. Indeed, Panzarella (2003, p. 128) suggests that police officers can be divided into 'Doers and Overseers'. At a basic level, policing entrepreneurs thrive in the streets and in high-profile special operations where they see police work as a chance to do things as an

individual, or small team player. Panzerella suggests that traditionally police work is structured to be entrepreneurial and to illustrate this he likens police entrepreneurs (patrol cops) to being salesmen with the autonomy to operate unsupervised. Such officers are schooled to make decisions on the street as individuals and to initiate immediate action providing them the mandate to be entrepreneurial. Panzarella (2003, p. 128) argues that street level cops take control by force thereby displaying peer (informal) leadership. There is a link between informal leadership and non-conformism. Similarly, Nuldén (2003) argues that in police culture and practice, patrol orientated police officers often see themselves as 'crime-fighting' entrepreneurs. Likewise, Muir (1977) assigned the police to the role of street corner politician. Ruess-Ianni (1983) divides officers into two basic typologies – street cops and management cops, suggesting the former are more entrepreneurial than the latter; whilst Reiner (1991) constructed a typology of Chief Constables including 'action orientated' (and, thus, entrepreneurial) and 'politicians'. Entrepreneurship and policing are both action orientated activities.

It is also evident that entrepreneurship in a policing context is essentially about being innovative, being creative, doing things differently, being non-conformist, rebellious, and sometimes about 'rule-breaking'. Ironically, Buckingham and Coffman (2001) advise us that leaders often have to break the rules to make a system work. Thus, despite the hierarchical, militarised nature of policing (as discussed in Chapter 2) the reality may differ from the tidy organisational organigram. Fleming and Grabosky (2009) talk of the role of entrepreneurial politicians and astute police union activists in reform. This is important because the philosophy of entrepreneurial policing requires funding, which is within the remit of the politician (Shearing, 2007).

There are a variety of different applications, contexts, and settings of entrepreneurship which are of interest to policing contexts including corporate and team entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, and social entrepreneurship.

1.1.3. Initiating 'Corporate and Team Entrepreneurship'

Although entrepreneurship is usually articulated as a heroic activity carried out by the 'lone wolf' figure, it is more effective when perpetuated by teams (Smith, 2006). Individual police forces are basically corporate entities, therefore, a knowledge of 'Corporate-Entrepreneurship' (Burns, 2013) is essential in understanding how entrepreneurship is practiced in the service. Corporate entrepreneurship is the practice of entrepreneurship within and between companies, corporations, organisations, and institutions at a higher and different level and different (mature) dynamic (Burns, 2013). Yet, corporations are viewed as the antithesis of all things entrepreneurial. Although police are comfortable with the corporate ethos, unlike true corporations are not free to 'hire and fire' entrepreneurial talent in senior management positions. O'Dowd (1988) stresses the importance of instilling a sense of corporate purpose to promote an entrepreneurial spirit. However, Hisrich and Peters (1992, p. 534) sum up the guiding principle of corporate culture as 'follow instructions given, do not make any mistakes, do not fail, do not take the initiative, but wait for instructions, stay within your turf,

and protect your backside'. This restrictiveness is not conducive to creativity, flexibility, independence, and risk-taking – the jargon of intrapreneurs. Likewise, Kirby (2003, p. 302) argues 'large organizations often see enterprising individuals as loners (not team players), eccentrics, interested in pet projects, cynics, rebels, free spirits, responsible for sloppy work'. In other words, the very traits of entrepreneurial people.

Donald and Goldsby (2004) stress that viewing corporate entrepreneurs as visionaries who do not follow the status quo can be misleading because corporate entrepreneurs are often forced to 'walk a fine line' between clever resourcefulness and rule breaking in the pursuit of entrepreneurial activity. However, entrepreneurialism need not handicap progression because a degree of entrepreneurial flair and innovativeness is helpful, providing one is not viewed as 'too different'.

Entrepreneurial teams can be very effective by creating small autonomous groups. Bennis (1966) referred to these as adhocracies. By using the entrepreneurial spirit latent in staff members, bureaucracies' benefit. Stephenson (1995) researched the formation of 'Virtual Entrepreneurial Groups', which harness the synergy between entrepreneurial collective action and bureaucracy and concluded these groups work because they push against accepted practices and struggle for legitimacy. However, when legitimised organisationally they lose entrepreneurial drive. The police are adept at team working. Indeed, Elliot (2003, pp. 197/199) highlights the role of leaders to inspire, motivate, and direct operations and talks of brigading units and of partnership working.

This is an area where the police could exploit by arranging for selected senior officers and civilian managers to have a six-month secondment to approved corporations to 'shadow' a counterpart and learn how successful entrepreneurial companies operate. A two-way mentorial secondment process would also be beneficial to the police because corporate entrepreneurs could quickly critique how the police operate and make suggestions for change and point out areas of existing good practice that could be enhanced. Models of corporate and team entrepreneurship also operate alongside models of intrapreneurship making them compatible strategies to pursue.

1.1.4. Unleashing Intrapreneurship in Organisations

The concept of 'Intrapreneurship' is perhaps one of the most promising and useful variants of entrepreneurship in a policing context because it can genuinely be practiced by police of all ranks and by civilian employees too. An intrapreneur is an enterprising person, working in a company, public body, or organisation utilising entrepreneurial practices or management techniques to succeed. Intrapreneurship is the practice of entrepreneurship within organisations (Pinochet, 1985). Being an intrapreneur involves doing things differently and making incremental differences in everyday working practices. It entails operating with a positive frame of mind. The power and utility of intrapreneurship is that it can be initiated easily, without a budget or intensive resourcing, and often without seeking permission. Its practice can be difficult in corporations whose structures stifle and prevent innovation and change but it has considerable relevance

to contemporary policing practices because enterprising officers of all ranks can practice it in their everyday roles and duties.

Barham (2006) conducted a study of intrapreneurship in North Wales Police in which he identified the overwhelming need for entrepreneurial activity working within the quasi-markets of the modern public sector. He identified the trend for public sector organisations such as the police to punish failure and not reward entrepreneurial activity enough for such 'intrapreneurship' to thrive and describes the police as being especially inhospitable to entrepreneurial activity because of an intransigent command and control culture and highly regulated environment. He argues that there is a growing evidence base that, despite this toxic environment, cultures are changing, and frontline, middle and senior manager officers and staff are developing intrapreneurial activities. His case study considers whether senior managers create an intrapreneurial culture, or whether it is a misperception. See Burns (2013) for a fuller discussion of how intrapreneurship can be unleashed in organisational settings.

This particular element of entrepreneurial policing should be one of the easiest for the service to implement because it involves a small incremental change to existing police cultures and mindsets. This could be done by small training sessions and briefing notes. It will entail listening to officers of all ranks and encouraging officers to demonstrate that their new ways of thinking and doing things actually work and improve existing everyday practices and procedures. Creating a register of examples and authoring teaching case studies and practice notes would help promulgate best practice across the service. Another application of entrepreneurship of interest to policing is that of social entrepreneurship and social animateurship.

1.1.5. Fostering 'Social Entrepreneurship' and 'Animateurship'

Also, of interest, in policing terms, is the growing sub-discipline of 'Social-Entrepreneurship' which impinges upon the multiagency work being carried out by the police in the 'Third-Sector' where not-for-profit organisations are encouraged to be more entrepreneurial (Thompson, 2002). Social entrepreneurship (Dees, 1998) is the process of pursuing innovative solutions to social problems. Dees saw a role for social entrepreneurship in reducing crime and its social effects and in developing new policing techniques. An understanding of social entrepreneurship and its language is critical in contemporary policing because if potential and existing partners are 'buying into' the ideology and philosophical underpinnings of entrepreneurship, and enterprise culture, then it is incumbent upon them to do so to communicate effectively with partners.

The police have always been adept at working with NGOs, charities, and Third-Sector organisations on individual issues, initiatives, and projects they have supported such projects and programmes with indirect funding such as time and resources in lieu of fiscal payment (see K'nife & Haughton, 2013). This practice could be accelerated and accentuated holistically across the sector to improve outreach. The benefit of working with such organisations is that they have the ability to draw down on various funds to initiate dual agency community projects. The service

should look at developing a localised multiagency and NGO strategic approach to take a 'joined up' approach to resolving community problems; and by introducing liaison officers to assist with grant applications. As above, creating a register of examples and authoring teaching case studies and practice notes would help promulgate best practice in relation to social entrepreneurship across the service.

Another, relevant issue relating to social entrepreneurship is for the service to encourage the emerging notion of 'community animateurship' to become embedded in community policing initiatives. Community-based entrepreneurship and animateurship initiatives are becoming increasingly more common. In the entrepreneurship literature, the topic of animateurship is becoming increasingly more of interest because it relates to an alternative form of community-based entrepreneurship whereby, particular members of the community engage in enterprise and community development activities that are of benefit to the community and which result in community regeneration and, in some case, employment creation. See the studies of Smith (2013) and McElwee, Smith, and Somerville (2017). The study of Smith (2013) illustrated how a local community group, animated others to initiate community projects and enterprises which led to the setting up of several social and community enterprises. The same animateurs also helped initiate community projects by providing advice and helping with funding applications. The main point to be taken away from this is that a similar application of animateurship, in relation to community policing and community building capacity, would be of use in resolving criminogenic community issues. The study of McElwee et al. (2017) provides further illustrations of how community animateurship can be used in policing contexts. A similar study by Jack, Frondigoun, and Smith (2020) described how a police initiated, community project in Central Scotland used asset-based methodologies and animateurship to build community capacity and initiate projects of benefit to the local community which helped reduce crime in the area. The power of animateurship lies in the individual and community ownership of initiatives and projects in a given community and it works because the animateurs and residents all buy in to the project goals and work towards their implementation. Unlike top-down initiatives initiated by local councils, there is seldom any fall out in the form of vandalism or interference. Animateurship is a useful tool in the community policing toolbox, as is engaging with Civic Entrepreneurship.

1.1.6. Engaging with Civic Entrepreneurship

The concept of 'Civic Entrepreneurship' (Leadbetter & Goss, 1998) is of vital importance to policing and the concept of entrepreneurial policing per se because it relates to the interface between community and local politics. Police forces are part of the civic-political architecture and receive assistance from academic-entrepreneurs and consultants. This is important because entrepreneurship as a practice is associated with individuality and the 'cult of the individual' (Burns, 2013). It is practiced by people and requires the application of 'Agency' and one must have the power and authority to act entrepreneurially. Civic entrepreneurship is of interest to policing because it provides a channel for initiating community policing and crime prevention schemes in local communities in conjunction with