

Deakin Research Online

This is the published version:

Bartkowiak-Théron, Isabelle and Asquith, Nicole L. 2012, The extraordinary intricacies of policing vulnerability, *Australasian policing : a journal of professional practice and research*, vol. 4, no. 2, Summer, pp. 43-49.

Available from Deakin Research Online:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30049039>

Every reasonable effort has been made to ensure that permission has been obtained for items included in Deakin Research Online. If you believe that your rights have been infringed by this repository, please contact drosupport@deakin.edu.au

Copyright : 2012, Australasian Institute of Policing

The Extraordinary Intricacies of Policing Vulnerability

Isabelle Bartkowiak-Théron¹ & Nicole L. Asquith²

Abstract

Vulnerable people have become a key focus of policy over the past few decades. As a result, police organisations have had to adapt to ongoing requests for specialised attention and protocol development to mediate the interactions between frontline officers and members of a variety of vulnerable groups. This article examines the various socio-political developments that have led to contemporary policing practices in relation to vulnerable people, and untangles a series of problems in our current approach to vulnerability. Additionally, we propose an alternative operationalisation of vulnerability, which shifts the focus from siloed cultural competency to integrated critical diversity, and in doing so, attempts to relieve some of the institutional, political and operational pressure faced by policing services.

The past sixty years have been marked by significant social progress, which has led to the explicit acknowledgment of society and communities as multifaceted entities (Brogden & Nijhar, 2005). In Australia, multiculturalism has flourished—in spite of its challenges (Joppke, 2004; Levy, 2000)—and there is a growing recognition of diversity as a source of wealth. The shift to a multicultural mainstream, where over a quarter of Australians were born overseas, and 53% have one grandparent born outside of this country (ABS, 2012b), has not been smooth. The political action of various social and cultural movements in the 1960s and 1970s has fundamentally altered what it means to be Australian in the twenty-first century. This social change however is not unique to Australia; though, it presents some unique challenges in this country – challenges generated out of colonialism, geography, and, more recently, globalisation.

Importantly, in the last twenty years, what started as a narrowly defined notion of diversity—as ethnicity or race—has been expanded to account for a variety of individual, social and institutional experiences (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1994). New definitions of diversity now encompass a range of permanent or transient narratives such as age, health, wealth, abilities, language, education, sexual and gender identity, housing, etc (Herring and Henderson, 2011; Asquith & Bartkowiak-Théron, 2012). With this expanded meaning has also come the acknowledgement that more than one narrative can apply to an individual, and that these can change over a lifetime. However, these labels are not always positive and often exist as a way to point out socio-political inequalities and sometimes ingrained and persistent disadvantage. Ignoring this legacy of disadvantage whilst uncritically promoting the benefits of diversity is bound to create unrealistic expectations and stall the progress made to date (Herring & Henderson, 2011).³ The normative fragmentation of society represents, on the one hand, rather formidable progress in relation to how we ‘picture’ society as a multiple and dynamic entity (May, 1987). On the other hand, however, this new definition of social diversity has presented multiple challenges for government and non-government institutions alike.

There are good indications that as far as the criminal justice system, and policing in particular, is concerned, policy makers and practitioners have been aware of these challenges, and have attempted, with more or less success, to positively adapt to this newly defined form of diversity;⁴ however, obstacles remain to be confronted. This article

explores the complex considerations at stake when police interact with disadvantaged members of society, now often referred to as ‘vulnerable people’. In line with policy developments in the area of policing diversity, we present a model for understanding how police interact with vulnerable people, and set out a number of problems identified in the literature as well as in practice. We also consider how policy might be a compounding factor in the complexity of police working with vulnerable people. Our argument is that ‘productive diversity’ (Cope and Kalantzis, 1997) based on a ‘critical diversity’ approach (Herring and Henderson, 2011) represents a significant springboard for positive social and political change at the frontline and institutional levels of policing.

Social and Productive Diversity: Implications for the Criminal Justice System

For the criminal justice system, the acknowledgement of social diversity has brought about an urgent requirement to adapt and cater for the needs of the ‘previously’ disadvantaged (Brown, 2011). In response to the claims of some influential lobby groups (such as the African-American support groups in the United States, indigenous advocacy groups across the commonwealth, and victim support associations across the world), the justice system in the western world was obliged to revisit what was seen as a ‘rigid, white, European-based’ system that did not cater for the needs of underprivileged groups (Bartkowiak & Jaccoud, 2008).

On the grounds of fairness, equity and rule of law, the past few decades have seen the creation of new regulatory mechanisms intended to establish a ‘level playing field’ for disadvantaged individuals facing the criminal justice system. One of the major reforms of the system was a clear delineation of who these new mechanisms were aimed to serve, which has resulted in the creation of various lists of ‘who qualifies’ for special care, attention and protection (Brown, 2011). In recent years, a wide range of terminology has permeated legislation and policy; focusing the attention of frontline justice practitioners and police officers on addressing the needs of specific members of the population. The expressions ‘at risk’, ‘at risk children’, ‘disadvantaged’, ‘problem-people’, etc (Asquith & Bartkowiak-Théron, 2012) are now familiar to anyone who has perused health, judicial, critical, ethics and criminological literature. We address this point later. More specifically though, the ‘vulnerability’ terminology has been more prominent in recent years, and legislation and organisational guidelines now regularly make reference to ‘vulnerable people’, in general, as key foci of policy.

Problem 1: The Definition and Fragmentation of Vulnerability

The most prominent problem that arises in the analysis of the emergence of vulnerable people as a key focus of policy and operational procedure is a lack of definition and a subsequent lack of uniform terminology across policies and jurisdictions. Whilst multidisciplinary literature has proliferated on the topic, one still has to find an explicit definition of what *vulnerable* means according to law and exactly what the concept of vulnerability encompasses as policy or practice within the criminal justice system.

In the absence of an actual definition, a number of institutional strategies have been developed to fence-in the categories of people who can potentially be vulnerable in the criminal justice system. One of these strategies has been the creation of normative lists of 'vulnerable' groups. This classification of the vulnerable has given direction to policing practices, and acted as a checklist for standard operating procedures. It allows practitioners (the police essentially, as the gatekeepers of the criminal justice system), to consider those who require:

1. additional support and/or referral to partnering agencies due to their particular circumstances (for example, victims of crime),
2. additional attention and care due to their historically tense relationship with police (for example, ethnic groups),
3. attention due to their potential as a "procedural risk" for police (for example, people with co-morbidity issues such as drug and alcohol addiction and mental illness),
4. care because they are at risk of being treated unfairly by/in the system (for example, Indigenous Australians), and
5. due to their reduced accountability or culpability, and who *must* be treated differently (for example, children) (Bartkowiak-Théron & Corbo Crehan, 2012; Cunneen & White, 2011).

In Australia, vulnerable people are therefore generally understood to include: young people, the elderly, people with a culturally and linguistically diverse background, the mentally ill, the disabled, victims of crime, Indigenous Australians, people with addictive behaviours, and sexual and gender diverse communities (see Bartkowiak-Théron & Corbo Crehan, 2010; Henning, 2011). In some jurisdictions, the homeless are also recognised as a vulnerable population.

At this juncture of our argument, though, it has to be said that policy classifications of vulnerability sometimes vary considerably in form and content across Australian states and territories. While it can be argued that the acknowledgment of all forms of disadvantage, in any form is a good thing, it is also a considerable problem in relation to how it translates into practice. From the point of view of policy, the erratic development of 'vulnerability-based vernacular' and the multiplication of legal terminology tend to cloud the issues and dramatise the layers of vulnerability that may be found within individuals. This stems from a methodological hesitation as to how to approach the very topic of disadvantage, and a lack of homogeneity in relation to research, analysis and policy development. Elsewhere, we indicate that

the language of policing vulnerabilities is not universal, with some countries using other vernacular to describe the same individuals. An extensive review of literature over the past 10 years relating to the topic of vulnerable people in policing unveils such terms and expressions as: at risk, disadvantaged, risky, problem-people, vulnerable populations, vulnerable adults, vulnerable witnesses, vulnerable children, at risk children, to name but a few (Asquith & Bartkowiak-Théron, 2012, 5).

Legislation however, tends to be prescriptive. In New South Wales, for example, vulnerable persons are identified in section 24 of the *Law Enforcement (Powers and Responsibilities) Regulation 2005 (LEPRR)* as:

- ...a person who falls within one or more of the following categories:
- a children,
 - b persons who have impaired intellectual functioning,
 - c persons who have impaired physical functioning,
 - d persons who are Aboriginal persons or Torres Strait Islanders,
 - e persons who are of non-English speaking background,

but does not include a person whom the custody manager reasonably believes is not a person falling within any of those categories.

In Tasmania, vulnerable people are identified in piecemeal legislation and policy, and definitions are scattered throughout various texts, to the extent that the Tasmania Law Reform Institute recommends, in resonance with New South Wales regulation, that a new "proposed *Arrest Act...* include protective provisions for vulnerable persons" such as:

- Young persons;
- Persons who have impaired intellectual functioning;
- Persons who have impaired physical functioning;
- Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders;
- Persons who are of non-English speaking background (Henning, 2011, p. vi).

The limitations of these lists are obvious and fail to acknowledge the range of vulnerabilities otherwise recognised by whole of government principles. However, there is slow but notable progress in how some police organisations have attempted to remedy those gaps by bringing new perspectives on how vulnerability should be approached by frontline police officers. In that regard, the Queensland Police Service provides one of the most comprehensive documents on vulnerability to date, operationalised for the purpose of assessment by police (*Queensland Police Service Vulnerable Persons Policy 2012*). The Service offers, as a public document, a 14 item list of which people count as vulnerable. The list does not consist of an exhaustive catalogue of categories of people who 'simply qualify' as vulnerable. Rather, it presents in the form of a non-exhaustive inventory of generic or specific attributes that may guide a police officer's assessment of a person's potential to be harmed or to not fully comprehend the policing process or justice system. Due note should be paid to the breadth of characteristics, unavailable elsewhere. The *Queensland Police Service Vulnerable Persons Policy 2012* reads as follows:

Identifying a Vulnerable Person

While it is not possible to supply an exhaustive list of persons who may be vulnerable in the criminal justice system, the following could be considered a guide:

1. immaturity, either in terms of age or development;
2. any infirmity, including early dementia or disease;
3. mental illness;
4. intellectual disability;
5. illiteracy or limited education which may impair a person's capacity to understand police questions;
6. inability or limited ability to speak or understand the English language;
7. chronic alcoholism;
8. physical disabilities including deafness or loss of sight;
9. drug dependence;
10. cultural, ethnic or religious factors including those relating to gender attitudes;
11. intoxication, if at the time of contact with police the person is under the influence of alcohol or a drug to such an extent as to make them unable to look after or manage their own needs;
12. Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders;
13. children; and
14. persons with impaired capacity.

Problem 2: Ethical Ramifications

While the above classifications indicate the range of people who can be, should be, and are, classified as vulnerable from a legal or policy point of view, they outline a major flaw in how institutions have approached vulnerability as a whole. The aforementioned lists are an indication of the generality with which vulnerability is assessed and normatively allocated to groups and individuals (Bartkowiak-Théron & Lee, 2006; see also Brown, 2011). Those lists provide a blanket determination of disadvantage, lack specificity and exclude many of those characteristics of vulnerability identified in the research, and discussed above. As Bartkowiak-Théron & Corbo Crehan (2012, 36) indicate:

Not all mental illnesses, for instance, are such as to make a person vulnerable in their dealings with police (for example, mild depression), nor are all Indigenous Australians going to be vulnerable in their dealings with police (for example, a case where an Indigenous lawyer is arrested).

These categories therefore come with serious limitations as to how they should be approached and operationalised in the field. Careful consideration and due criticism need to be paid to the process of categorisation, as some 'deserving' of support may actually not need as much support as prescribed on paper (for example, a non-English speaking background person whose English is excellent). Practice protocols based on prescribed categories also cannot account for individuals who are eligible for the label of 'vulnerable', but may actually refuse this label (Annaromao, 1996). This approach also fails to account for individuals who may fall into a number of these categories at the time of engagement with police, or over their lifetime.

Indeed, vulnerability-specific policy and legislation are based on a discourse of deficiency and need, which is faulty on two, if not more, levels. In the first instance, it does not acknowledge that some individuals who are labelled vulnerable may have developed or acquired protective mechanisms or skills to address, if not overcome, their disadvantage (for example, tertiary education, legal skills, etc). Second, a discourse of 'complex needs' (Baldry, 2010) may send a wrong message to institutions, practitioners and society about the social costs of diversity, where individuals are represented as a burden on government services (Richardson, 2008; Guidry-Grimes & Victor, 2011; Bartkowiak-Théron & Fleming, 2012). This is something that should be avoided, as it is likely to rebuke those who face such complexity and, in turn, exacerbate their vulnerability.

In its current state, legislation and policy that address vulnerability have failed to encompass the complexity of a phenomenon such as cross-sectional vulnerability. While studies on co-morbidity are now common place and are finding their way into policy, the presence of tri-morbidity (or even more complex circumstances) is rarely considered in policy (see NSWLR, 2012, for their exceptional, albeit limited discussion of young homeless Indigenous Australians), and more often a topic of canteen culture than evidence-led practice. The rarity of these cases has meant that they have been ignored by research until very recently, and that there are no specific guidelines to address the most complicated of these cases. Yet they exist and have a potential for being operationally complex for police under current siloed provisions for vulnerability.

Problem 3: Operational Ramifications

This siloed fragmentation of vulnerabilities has already had a significant impact on police operational procedures and protocols. As the gatekeepers of the criminal justice system, frontline police have had to follow the trend of various precautionary mechanisms that were set in place for those labelled 'disadvantaged' by the system at a particular time. As par for the course, special protocols were instigated, and always, they were accompanied by unavoidable, acutely specialised, training at recruit and senior levels. For example, curricula on mental illness and its impact on anti-social behaviour constitute a large

part of police training in most jurisdictions. Significant portions of this curriculum consist, at recruit level, of awareness raising about mental health and focus on the various signs to look out for when a person is in crisis. For the most specialised and senior officers (for example, Crisis Intervention Teams in the United States or Mental Health Intervention Teams in NSW), resource-intensive training in de-escalation techniques, types of illnesses and medication for example (Herrington et al, 2009) is delivered across as many as 40 hours of professional development sessions. This level of training is warranted given the significant operational issues that need to be addressed for this specific group of clients. However, it only responds to one of the many concerns raised by vulnerability in frontline policing, and is siloed knowledge that is rarely transferred—or, in fact, transferable—to other incidents involving other vulnerable victims or offenders.

Operational procedures have not been the only part of policing affected by the emergence of vulnerable populations as a key policy focus. Special recruitment programs have been instigated to ensure that police organisations are more representative of the communities they serve. Police recruitment now therefore caters (however successfully) for more members of social, cultural and ethnic minorities. Such 'community immersion' also goes as far as providing cheap housing in vulnerable, at risk and risky neighbourhoods, in order to enhance community ties, and improve two-way communications between communities and local neighbourhoods (see, for example, the 'Officer Next Door' program discussed by Winter & Asquith, 2012). The pluralisation of policing, the creation of specialised portfolios (liaison officers and specialised spokespersons) and the emergence of what is now known as the 'extension of the police family' are also partly the consequence of this concern for further police-community representativity (Johnson, 2005, 2006).

Community policing initiatives have also had to bear the weight of ongoing demands for better representation of communities in policing initiatives. Consultative mechanisms have therefore been created so that representatives of neighbourhoods or special interest/advocacy groups participate in police training (design and/or delivery), become part of the design and implementation of a policing initiative (see, for example, the Race Hate Crime Scrutiny Panels and Sexuality Hate Crime Scrutiny Panels in the UK; Asquith, 2012), or are reported to regularly, usually monthly, on the progress of operations in local areas (see, for example, the reporting mechanisms associated to Local Safety Committees in Victoria).

Problem 4: Compound Responses to Vulnerability

The multiplication of vulnerability categories has had, to date, significant and worrying implications for police. From each vulnerability category, a series of operational steps unfolds. For example, hypothetically – when police interact with a child at risk they need to take the child to a place of safety, contact parents and/or guardians, start investigating the scene whilst at the same time, in some cases, contact specialised child protection officers. Concurrently, the police must also reassure the child, and protect his or her health and wellbeing.

Alternatively, when police deal with a person living with a mental illness, one officer acts as the contact point with the consumer⁵, whilst another monitors the scene and assesses the risks. If neither have received specialised training and it is a crisis situation, the officers would need to contact specialised mental health officers or workers (depending on the model used to deal with persons in crisis), acquire information from significant others such as family members, guardians, friends or neighbours. According to various institutional and organisational agreements, the officers would also need to contact the consumer's health practitioner or mental health crisis team (see, for example, the various memoranda of understanding between health departments and police services across Australia).

When police interact with an Indigenous, CALD or LGBTIQ person, policy recommends that the officers reach out to specialised officers (within or outside the police force, including for example, ACLOs, ELOs, MCLOs, GLLOS, LGBTIQ⁶ officers) and/or interpreters to facilitate a two-way communication between the police and the individual (see Cherney and Chui, 2010 for a study of police liaison officers).

When the three cases are combined, at least on paper, all these protocols need to be combined and all need to unfold simultaneously. These protocols, from a human rights perspective, are of paramount importance. International conventions and treaties, and the universal principle of the rule of law dictate that all precautionary measures are in place to ensure that everyone (including the most vulnerable members of society) is treated equally within the criminal justice system. In our aforementioned hypothetical case of tri-morbidity, the *Principles for the Protection of Persons with Mental Illness and the Improvement of Mental Health Care* (United Nations, 1991) would apply, in combination with Article 40 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, which dictates that children's encounters with law enforcement officials be mediated by parents or legal guardians and by laws and procedures specifically applicable to them.⁷

Of course, in this three-fold case of vulnerability, anti-discrimination legislation would also apply. While most Australian national and state legislation have integrated these international benchmarks of fair and equal treatment, there continues to be a lack of clarity about the way these mission statements are converted to policy, which, in turn are converted to practice documents. This is especially problematic for frontline officers who must negotiate a policy minefield in order to assess the operational sequencing of each vulnerability protocol.

A major issue is that current training does not easily cater for the co-existence of various forms of vulnerability. The experience of many practitioners involved in recruit training (including many of the contributors to Bartkowiak-Théron and Asquith, 2012b) is that it often focuses on legislative requirements and the acquisition of basic cultural competency, with intersecting vulnerabilities often left aside, or mentioned in passing without discussion of operational practice (Bartkowiak-Théron & Layton, 2012). All training that follows probation (with the exception of custody officer training), becomes more and more specialised and siloed, with a single vulnerability as a focus. Ironically, those officers who are most likely to encounter multiple, intersecting vulnerabilities are those trained as a liaison or specialised officer for one of the recognised vulnerable groups. Once in a specialised role, they are often required to handle the most complex cases, and in a policy and practice vacuum are forced into creating ad hoc, sometimes, individualised policy responses.

Unravelling the web of operational protocols is therefore a significant issue for police, but also a significant issue for criminal justice. In dealing with vulnerability at the frontline of policing, any wrong decision about the order and significance of each protocol can have devastating results on the outcomes of police investigations and defence prosecutions.⁸ Unrecognised or mis-recognised vulnerability could also be a matter of life and death (for example, in a case of undetected acquired brain injury, or of a mental illness *due to* an acquired brain injury). It could be argued that depending on circumstances, some protocols would need to take precedence over others (for example, calling health practitioners before the guardians, or vice versa), but without clear policies or practices, officers are left to judge the importance themselves, which could be the cause of grounds for protracted public accusations and legal argumentation, necessitating the use of justice, police and support resources.

Moving Forward

From an analytical point of view, the multiplication of legal categories of vulnerability has had dramatic consequences for police. Police organisations are under close and constant scrutiny by the public, the media and the political sphere. Vulnerability adds a new dimension to these public expectations and new, potential obstacles to satisfaction with the police, especially when police engage with vulnerable members of society. As we have shown above, the *operationalisation* of vulnerability has created a labyrinth of standard operational procedures. We argue, however, that there is nothing 'standard' about these protocols, memoranda, practice documents and legislation; they are often hard to follow and reconcile, let alone operationalise concurrently.

In critically analysing policing practices in light of a critical diversity approach, we have shed light on the well-intentioned, but 'mismatched' initiatives that have come about as a result of protocol quick fixes to cater for gaps and 'organisation pathologies' (Sheptycki, 2004). While the concept of vulnerability has been a tremendous step forward for social equity, its operationalisation has resulted in a misshaped patchwork of protocols, which make the work of police complicated. Police have done, to date, an exceptional job at catching up with ongoing demands for doing more with less, with constant political and public pressure to perform better for a range of diverse communities, and at the same time, adapt quickly to the vocal and *growing* demands of a number of smaller vulnerable communities.

The paramount problem is the siloed approach to vulnerability as (non-) defined in legislation and policy, and the siloed lists of operational protocols attached to this approach. The ongoing multiplication of these categories and protocols has created an organisational maze (complete with obligatory paperwork or data entry), which requires a radical re-think in order to translate diversity deficits into assets. There are several reasons to consider a new approach. First of all, it is clearly unfair to require police (arguably, the only service available 24/7) to know everything about everything. Specialised cognate agencies require many years of specialised training from their employees (social work, nursing for example); the type of training that cannot be achieved in siloed training workshops. As such, there needs to be some flexibility. Social and political expectations need to be re-aligned to the realities of frontline policing; and, equally, expectations need to be reconsidered in light of what police *should* only be required to do in the absence of specialised knowledge and skills. Furthermore, some of the vulnerabilities cited above, when separate from the circumstances of public safety, are clearly outside the scope of the policing core business. The pressure on police, alone, to deal with the vulnerable denies the logical co-ownership of such 'wicked' issues⁹ by a number of partnering agencies (health, education, licensing, housing, for example). However, it is recognised that in many cases, the police or the courts often act as 'brokers' of services, with their initial contact with vulnerable individuals acting as the trigger for service delivery by specialist agencies.

While progress in public administration and organisational partnerships in relation to 'wicked problem-solving' has been made (Fleming, 2008), the problem of vulnerability still remains to be approached with a broader lens than has been used to date. An essential step in operationalising this wider view of vulnerability, we argue, could be the principle of universal precaution. This approach—adopted in other areas such as health, bio-ethics and legal philosophy (see, for example, Ruof, 2004; Bartkowiak-Théron & Asquith, 2012b)—begins with the acknowledgement that best practice emerges from the assumption that all individuals are potentially vulnerable, until proven otherwise. Vulnerability is ubiquitous in the criminal justice system, and this is patently clear to those who work on the frontline of policing.

Whether victim, offender, informant or witness, the criminalisation and victimisation processes are most likely to be marked by vulnerability. Elsewhere, we argue:

it is rather unlikely that a person will come in contact with the police... without having been under duress in the lead-up to contact with the police. They could have been under the influence of drugs or alcohol, suffering a mental health breakdown, or have been the focus of an attack of any form, or in shock of having observed an accident or a crime (the list is long here). Assuming vulnerability should therefore be the norm rather than the exception (Bartkowiak-Théron & Asquith, 2012a, 282).

This new model discards the current 'blanket presentation' of vulnerability, embedded in a discourse of deficiency (Annaromao, 1996; Brown, 2011), which does not acknowledge individuals' resilience (Bartkowiak-Théron & Asquith, 2012a). It offers a new level-playing field, which encourages strength-based approaches to responding to offending and anti-social behaviour. It also avoids confronting police with what can present as a protocol labyrinth (guided by risk-averse institutional behaviours) in favour of an exercise in problem-solving, where police become solution finders and brokers of government/support services. What we suggest is a new policing model based on a much deeper cultural competency. Free of political and lobby game-play, it actually considers the fragility of all, acknowledges the strengths of many, and is deeply embedded in practice rather than principles alone. We call it vulnerable people policing.

References

ACT Human Rights Act 200

New South Wales Law Enforcement (Powers and Responsibilities) regulation 2005

Queensland Police Service Vulnerable Persons Policy 2012

United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities 2006

United Nations Principles for the Protection of Persons with Mental Illness and the Improvement of Mental Health Care 1991

Victoria Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities 2006

Annaromao, N.J. (1996) 'A Feminist Interpretation of Vulnerability', *Philosophy in the Contemporary World*, 3(1), 1-7.

Asquith, N.L. (2012) 'Vulnerability and the Art of Complaint Making', in I. Bartkowiak-Théron & N.L. Asquith (eds), *Policing Vulnerability*. Annandale: Federation Press, 147-62.

Asquith, N.L. & Bartkowiak-Théron, I. (2012) 'Vulnerability and Diversity in Policing', in I. Bartkowiak-Théron & N.L. Asquith (eds), *Policing Vulnerability*. Annandale: Federation Press, 3-19.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2012) *Reflecting a Nation: Stories from the 2011 Census, 2012-2013* (No. 2017.0). Canberra: ABS.

Baldry, E. (2010) Women with complex needs including problematic alcohol use in the criminal justice system in NSW Oral Evidence to the Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry into Drugs and Crime, 2 August, 2010.

Bartkowiak-Théron, I. & Asquith, N.L. (2012a) 'Vulnerable People Policing: A Preparatory Framework for Operationalising Vulnerability', in I. Bartkowiak-Théron & N.L. Asquith (eds), *Policing Vulnerability*. Annandale: Federation Press, 278-293.

Bartkowiak-Théron, I. & Asquith, N.L. (eds) (2012b) *Policing Vulnerability*. Annandale: Federation Press.

Bartkowiak-Théron, I. & Corbo Crehan, A. (2012) "'For when equality is given to unequals, the result is inequality': The Socio-legal Ethics of Vulnerable People", in I. Bartkowiak-Théron & N.L. Asquith (eds), *Policing Vulnerability*. Annandale: Federation Press, 33-46.

Bartkowiak-Théron, I. & Corbo Crehan, A. (2010) 'A new movement in community policing? From community policing to vulnerable people policing', in J. Putt (ed) *Community Policing: Current and Future Directions for Australia – Research and Public Policy*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.

Bartkowiak, I. & Jaccoud, M. (2008) 'New Directions in Justice in Canada: From Top-down to Community "Representatives"', in J. Shapland (ed) *Justice and Community and Civil Society: A Contested Terrain*. Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing.

Bartkowiak-Théron, I. & Fleming, J. (2012) 'La catégorisation politico-sociale de la population australienne : l'exemple des politiques sanitaires et pénales', *Informations Sociales*, n°171, 80-89.

Bartkowiak-Théron, I. & Layton, C. (2012) 'Educating for Vulnerability', in I. Bartkowiak-Théron & N.L. Asquith (eds), *Policing Vulnerability*. Annandale: Federation Press, 47-64.

Bartkowiak-Théron, I. & Lee, M. (2006) 'Modelling Risks and Vulnerabilities: Legal Implications and Protection of the Law', Paper presented at the 23rd *Australasian Law and Society Conference*, University of Wollongong, 13-15 December 2006.

Brogden, M. & Nijhar, P. (2005) *Community Policing: National and International Models and Approaches*. Portland: Willan Publishing.

Brown, K. (2011) "'Vulnerability': Handle with Care", *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 5(3), 313-321

Cherney, A. & Chui, W.H. (2010) 'Police Auxiliaries in Australia: Police Liaison Officers and the Dilemmas of Being Part of the Extended Family', *Policing and Society*, 3(20), 380-297.

Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (1997) *Productive Diversity - A New, Australian Approach to Work and Management*. Sydney: Pluto Press.

Cunneen, C. & White, R. (2011) *Juvenile Justice: Youth and Crime in Australia*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Fleming, J. & Wood, J. (eds) (2006) *Fighting Crime Together: The Challenges of Policing and Security Networks*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Fleming, J. (2008) *Rules of Engagement: Policing Anti-social behaviour and alcohol-related violence in and around licensed premises*. Sydney: New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, [http://www.bocsar.nsw.gov.au/lawlink/bocsar/ll_bocsar.nsf/vwFiles/r59.pdf/\\$file/r59.pdf](http://www.bocsar.nsw.gov.au/lawlink/bocsar/ll_bocsar.nsf/vwFiles/r59.pdf/$file/r59.pdf) Accessed 14 October 2012

Gardenswartz, L., & Rowe, A. (1994) *Diverse Teams at Work*. Chicago: Irwin Professional Publications.

Gudjonsson, G.H., Hayes, G.D., & Rowlands, P. (2000) "Fitness to be Interviewed and Psychological Vulnerability: the views of Doctors, Lawyers and Police Officers", *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 11(1), 74-92 .

Guidry-Grimes, L. & Victor, E. (forthcoming) Vulnerabilities Compounded by Social Institutions' *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics*, 5(2).

Henning, T. (2011) *Consolidation of Arrest Laws in Tasmania*. Hobart: Tasmania Law Reform Institute.

Herring, C. & Henderson, I. (2011) 'From Affirmative Action to Diversity: Toward a Critical Diversity Perspective', *Critical Sociology*, 38(5), 629-43.

Herrington, V., Clifford, K., Lawrence, P.F., Ryle, S. & Pope, R. (2009) *The Impact of the NSW Police Force Mental Health Intervention Team: Final Evaluation Report*, Charles Sturt University Centre for Inland Health and Australian Graduate School of Policing, Sydney, www.police.nsw.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0006/174246/MHIT_Evaluation_Final_Report_241209.pdf Accessed 27 May 2010,

Johnston, L. (2005) 'From "Community" to "Neighbourhood" Policing: Police Community Support Officers and the "Police Extended Family" in London', *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 241-254.

Johnston, L. (2006) 'Diversifying Police Recruitment? The Deployment of Police Community Support Officers in London', *The Howard Journal*, 45, 388-402.

Joppke C. (2004) 'The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: theory and policy', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 55(2), 237-257.

Levy J. (2000) *The Multiculturalism of Fear*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

May, L. (1987) *The Morality of Groups*, Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame.

New South Wales Law Reform Commission (2012). *Bail*, No. 133. Sydney, NSWLRC.

Richardson E. (2008) 'Mental Health Courts and Diversion Programs for Mentally Ill Offenders: The Australian context', 8th Annual International Association of Forensic Mental Health Services Conference, Melbourne, Monash University, 14-16 July 2008.

Ruof, M.C. (2004) 'Vulnerability, Vulnerable Populations, and Policy', *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, 14(4), 411-425.

Sheptycki, J. (2004) 'Organizational Pathologies in Police Intelligence Systems: Some Contributions to the Lexicon of Intelligence-Led Policing', *European Journal of Criminology*, 1(3), 307-32.

Winter, R. & Asquith, N.L. (2012) 'Quality of Life Policing in Broadacre Housing Estates', in I. Bartkowiak-Théron & N.L. Asquith (eds), *Policing Vulnerability*. Annandale: Federation Press.

Endnotes

1. Tasmanian Institute of Law Enforcement Studies, University of Tasmania, Hobart
2. School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Deakin University, Victoria
3. Further, Herring and Henderson (2011) suggest that in order to make the most of diversity, we need to be cognisant of both the legacy of disadvantage and its inter-generational transmission.
4. This includes the early research, training and practice development completed by Chitrita Mukerjee (NSW Police), Maria Dimopoulos (Myria D Consultants) and the Australasian Police Multicultural Advisory Panel in the early 1990s.
5. This is a term often used in literature and policy about people living with a mental illness, which comes from the expression, 'consumer of mental health services'.
6. These acronyms respectively stand for: Culturally and Linguistically Diverse; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex and Queer; Aboriginal Community Liaison Officers; Ethnic Liaison Officers; Multi-Cultural Liaison officers; Gay and Lesbian Liaison Officers.
7. For example, special procedures for children are mandated by the *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities 2006* (Vic), ss 23 & 25(3) and the *Human Rights Act 2004* (ACT), ss 20 & 22(3).
8. As stated in Bartkowiak-Théron & Corbo Crehan (2012, 38):
The compulsory nature of these provisions means that, amongst other things, evidence obtained in situations where vulnerable people are not offered the relevant protections and services may be ruled inadmissible at court (Gudjonsson, Hayes and Rowlands, 2000; Bartkowiak-Théron and Lee, 2006).
9. Where 'the problems and/or the solutions are either hard to define and/or not available or sub-optimal and often carry consequences that might lead to further problems. A wicked issue crosses international and national boundaries and involves multiple agencies and sectors at all levels of government' (Fleming & Wood, 2008: 2).