Innovative police responses to drug problems: Exploring a third-party policing partnership between police and community pharmacy

Julianne Louise Webster
MA, BA

Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance
Arts, Education and Law
Griffith University

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

March 2012
Candidate’s Statement of Originality

The work presented in the dissertation is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, original and my own work, except as acknowledged in the text, and the material has not been submitted, either in whole or in part, for a degree at this or any other university.

Julianne Louise Webster

Professor Paul Mazerolle
Principal Academic Advisor
Acknowledgements

Many thanks must be given to the community pharmacists who gave their time to participate in this research and who shared their experiences and insights. Additionally the research would not have been possible without the cooperation and support of the Queensland and Victorian Police services, the Pharmacy Guild of Australia and the Pseudoephedrine enforcement taskforce and the contributions of the respective officers of those organisations.

Describing a Doctorate as a journey to someone starting out seems like such a cliché, however I have learnt that this is the best word to describe the last four years of my life. There have been the highest of highs and lowest of lows and the constant distraction of real life to contend with. My supervisors Professor Paul Mazerolle and Associate Professor Janet Ransley have been very supportive of me during this period. From the outset they believed in my ability, my ideas and what I was trying to achieve. Additionally they gave me space when I desired it and always enthusiastically guided me throughout my research – for this I am indebted. Thank-you to my academic colleagues for being there for me throughout this journey, in particular, Professor Lorraine Mazerolle, Ms Ingrid Sykes, Ms Nada Ibrahim and Ms Li Eriksson.

This dissertation would not have been possible without the patience and support of my family, my husband Jim and my two beautiful children. Thank-you to my parents-in-law for helping with childcare; and to my mother, siblings and friends for their encouragement and support. This dissertation is dedicated to my father who was a talented engineer who could ‘make’ or ‘fix’ anything and who went about his work and interests without a fuss. During the first year of my dissertation, he was diagnosed with terminal cancer and endured eighteen months of experimental treatments. His great strength, courage and determination during this difficult time inspired me in this dissertation, to finish what I had started; to write with all my heart; and to never give up.
Publications relating to the research topic

Journal Articles
Webster, J. L. (R&R). *Effective Policing Partnerships or missed opportunities?* Policing and Society.

Encyclopaedia entry

Reports
List of Tables

TABLE 1: PHARMACISTS SURVEY DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ................................................................. 85
TABLE 2: OBSERVED AND PERCEIVED IMPACT OF PSEUDOEPHEDRINE RESCHEDULING ....................... 181
TABLE 3: CUSTOMER REACTIONS FOLLOWING SALE REFUSAL ........................................................... 183
TABLE 4: MEASURES TAKEN TO REDUCE VISIBILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY OF PSEUDOEPHEDRINE PRODUCTS .......... 184
TABLE 5: PHARMACIST RESPONSE TO SUSPECTED SUSPICIOUS AND CONFIRMED SUSPICIOUS PSEUDOEPHEDRINE REQUEST BY STATE .............................................................................................. 186
TABLE 6: RECORDING AND REPORTING PSEUDOEPHEDRINE SALES .................................................... 187
TABLE 7: SUPPORT FOR PROJECT STOP ................................................................................................ 189
TABLE 8: REASONS FOR NOT USING PROJECT STOP ............................................................................. 190
TABLE 9: REASONS FOR USING PROJECT STOP .................................................................................. 191
TABLE 10: UNDERSTANDING AND SUPPORT IN OPERATING IN THE PARTNERSHIP .................................. 192
TABLE 11: PERCEPTION OF RELATIONSHIP WITH POLICE ................................................................... 192
TABLE 12: ESTIMATED PROPORTION OF PSEUDOEPHEDRINE DIVERTED PRE AND POST INTERVENTION ........... 193
TABLE 13: PSEUDOEPHEDRINE RUNNERS’ BEHAVIOUR ........................................................................ 194
TABLE 14: WILLINGNESS TO CONTINUE USING PROJECT STOP .................................................................. 195
TABLE 15: UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF THE PARTNERSHIP ......................................................... 195
TABLE 16: FINANCIAL IMPACT FROM REDUCED PSEUDOEPHEDRINE SALES ........................................... 196
TABLE 17: PSEUDOEPHEDRINE SALES IMPACT ..................................................................................... 198
TABLE 18: PERCEIVED DECREASES OF LEGITIMATE AND NON-LEGITIMATE PSEUDOEPHEDRINE SALES .......... 198
TABLE 19: IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE REGULATIONS AND PROJECT STOP ......................... 199
TABLE 20: STRENGTHENING THE PARTNERSHIP .................................................................................. 200
TABLE 21: DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDING ACROSS LAW-ENFORCEMENT, TREATMENT AND EDUCATION (PER CENT) ACTIVITIES.201
TABLE 22: INDIVIDUAL, ORGANISATIONAL, PROFESSIONAL AND PERCEPTION-BASED VARIABLES ...................... 206
TABLE 23: (MODEL ONE) LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THIRD-PARTY REGULATORY ENGAGEMENT THROUGH HANDLING ALL PSEUDOEPHEDRINE SALES .......................................................... 210
TABLE 24: (MODEL TWO) PARSIMONIOUS LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THIRD-PARTY REGULATORY ENGAGEMENT THROUGH PHARMACISTS’ HANDLING ALL PSEUDOEPHEDRINE SALES ........................................ 211
TABLE 25: (MODEL THREE) LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THIRD-PARTY REGULATORY ENGAGEMENT THROUGH STORING PSEUDOEPHEDRINE PRODUCTS BEHIND THE COUNTER ..................................................... 215
TABLE 26: (MODEL FOUR) PARSIMONIOUS LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THIRD-PARTY REGULATORY ENGAGEMENT THROUGH STORING PSEUDOEPHEDRINE BEHIND THE COUNTER ..................................................... 216
TABLE 27: (MODEL FIVE) LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THIRD-PARTY USE OF PROJECT STOP ............... 222
TABLE 28: (MODEL SIX) PARSIMONIOUS LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THIRD-PARTY USE OF PROJECT STOP .......................................................... 224
TABLE 29: (MODEL SEVEN) LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THIRD-PARTY REPORTING OF PSEUDOEPHEDRINE SALES TO POLICE THROUGH PROJECT STOP ......................................................................................... 227
TABLE 30: (MODEL EIGHT) LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THIRD-PARTY REPORTING PSEUDOEPHEDRINE SALES TO POLICE THROUGH PROJECT STOP ......................................................................................... 229
TABLE 31: (MODEL NINE) LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THIRD-PARTY PERCEPTION OF THE DETERRENCE OF DRUG RUNNERS ......................................................................................... 233
TABLE 32: (MODEL TEN) LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THIRD-PARTY PERCEPTION OF THE DETERRENCE OF DRUG RUNNERS ......................................................................................... 235
TABLE 33: (MODEL ELEVEN) LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THIRD-PARTY PERCEPTION OF OVERALL REDUCTION PSEUDOEPHEDRINE DIVERSION ............................................................................... 237
TABLE 34: VARIABLE CODE TABLE ........................................................................................................ 288
List of Figures

FIGURE 1: PARTNERSHIPS TYPOLOGY ................................................................................................................... 12
FIGURE 2: PROJECT STOP PARTNERSHIP .............................................................................................................. 60
FIGURE 3: REGULATIONS EFFECTIVE BY STATE ..................................................................................................... 180
FIGURE 4: CUSTOMER REACTION TO PSEUODOEPHEDRINE SALE REFUSAL ..................................................... 182
FIGURE 5: PHARMACIST REACTION TO SUSPECTED SUSPICIOUS PSEUODOEPHEDRINE REQUEST BY STATE .......... 185
FIGURE 6: PHARMACIST RESPONSE TO CONFIRMED SUSPICIOUS PSEUODOEPHEDRINE REQUEST BY STATE ........ 185
FIGURE 7: SUPPORT FOR PROJECT STOP ........................................................................................................... 188
FIGURE 8: REASONS FOR NOT USING PROJECT STOP ............................................................................................ 190
FIGURE 9: REASONS FOR USING PROJECT STOP .................................................................................................... 191
FIGURE 10: PHARMACY CRIME 2006, 2007 AND 2008 ....................................................................................... 197
FIGURE 11: SUMMARY OF PREDICTOR VARIABLES ACROSS SIX MODELS MEASURING THIRD-PARTY REGULATORY ENGAGEMENT (A), PARTNERSHIP PARTICIPATION (B) AND PERCEPTIONS OF INTERVENTION EFFECTIVENESS (C). .......................... 241
## List of acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Australian Crime Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APG</td>
<td>Australian Pharmacy Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATS</td>
<td>Amphetamine-type-substances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Community-oriented policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMA</td>
<td>Drug Use Monitoring Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDPSC</td>
<td>National Drugs and Poisons Scheduling Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET</td>
<td>Pseudoephedrine Enforcement Taskforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>Problem-oriented policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Pseudoephedrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Queensland Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QP</td>
<td>Queensland Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guild</td>
<td>Australian Pharmacy Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPDTP</td>
<td>Third-Party Driven Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPP</td>
<td>Third-party policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office of Drug Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Victorian Police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract

Third-party policing partnerships are a policing innovation increasingly discussed in the crime prevention literature, but what we actually know about third-party policing partnerships is extremely limited. In the main, studies examine voluntary community-oriented partnerships, ‘hot-spots’ approaches and strategies utilising legal-levers to mobilise third-parties to perform a crime prevention or crime control response. Typically, the results of such studies are observed through changes to crime and disorder concerning the particular intervention at the designated place. However rarely do studies seek to understand the processes underpinning the development and implementation of third-party policing partnerships which are mandated by regulation; the role of third-parties; the role of regulation in the mobilisation of the partnership; the impact of the intervention for the third-party; or the effectiveness of the strategy from the perspective of the regulated third-parties.

This dissertation seeks to further understand how such third-party policing partnerships are developed; how they are implemented; the nature of their impact; and how they perform against their crime control objectives. This study of third-party policing partnerships draws upon a case study of a policing partnership implemented to control access to pseudoephedrine products from community pharmacies. Products containing pseudoephedrine are utilised as a key precursor chemical in the domestic manufacture of illicit synthetic drugs such as methyamphetamine in clandestine laboratories. Hence the diversion of these products for non-therapeutic purposes represents a serious crime problem.

The dissertation addresses three key objectives. Firstly it thoroughly documents the development and operation of the case study partnership because currently we do not know if partnerships that are constructed for operational efficacy through technology actually produce partnership structures that connect the partners, provide frameworks which support partner legitimacy and whether these models can provide outputs that are valued by the police. Secondly few drug law-enforcement studies examine the translation of partnership policy to partnership practice and this knowledge gap
impacts upon our understanding about optimal partnership structures that best facilitate congruence between policy and practice in partnership models. In addition the literature gives little attention to examining and evaluating the consistency with which drug crime control interventions are applied within communities and also how these strategies diffuse across multiple crime sites. Thirdly the current evidence pays little attention to the role of regulation in mobilising crime control responses. As such we don’t know if partnerships of this nature are better managed by police or third-parties and or if they operate more effectively when managed at the local-level. Importantly we don’t know how regulation impacts on the third-parties engagement in the intervention and/or their perceptions of intervention effectiveness. Moreover we do not know the most crucial factors that influence third-party engagement in these regulated and voluntary partnership intervention frameworks. The dissertation examines these three key knowledge gaps, specifically: to determine the optimal partnership framework able to support a non-public third-party partnership intervention; to determine the most crucial factors which influence third-party engagement in these types of interventions; and to determine the most crucial factors associated with third-party perceptions of the effectiveness of the partnership intervention.

Unlike other studies concerning the use of partnership responses which have tended to focus on police perceptions of partnerships, the central focus of this study is the examination of the experiences and perceptions of the non-public third-parties co-opted into performing a crime control role in the regulated policing partnership model. Specifically this role relates to preventing non-legitimate access to pseudoephedrine products sold by community pharmacies. Notwithstanding this primary research focus, the study also incorporates police and other stakeholder perspectives. These additional perspectives provide important contextual balance and support to the key findings concerning partnership structures, third-party engagement and perceptions of effectiveness. In framing the key research findings the dissertation maps the crime problem of pseudoephedrine diversion from community pharmacies in the Australian context; it describes domestic and other drug policy frameworks and outlines a number of policing approaches utilised to respond to problems of illicit drug
production and supply in domestic and international contexts. It then discusses the emergence of third-party policing as an innovative crime control response to illicit drug problems and correspondingly its application to the crime problem of precursor diversion from pharmaceuticals in the Australian context.

The cross-jurisdictional comparative methods employed by this research focus on examining the experiences of third-parties and police in two Australian States with further examination of local-level experiences in two case study sites. The development and operation of the third-party policing partnership is examined through an exploratory mixed-methods approach, which adopts both an individual and place-based unit of analysis. Firstly a large survey of third-parties is used to examine the experiences and perceptions of third-parties performing the partnership intervention in two Australian State jurisdictions. Secondly interviews with police as well as a number of other stakeholders – such as the Australian Pharmacy Guild (APG) and the Pseudoephedrine Enforcement Taskforce (PET) – are utilised to examine partner and stakeholder contributions, experiences and perceptions of the partnership intervention. The selection of two partnership implementation States provides the opportunity to examine how different regulatory frameworks impact on the experiences of the partners and the perceived outcomes of the partnership intervention. The selection of two case study sites allows for an in-depth exploration of policing partnership implementation issues.

The research findings presented in this dissertation extend our knowledge concerning third-party policing partnerships and drug policy. In particular the optimal partnership structures in which to enhance third-party engagement and effectiveness of the partnership intervention are described. The findings of this dissertation highlight the operational complexities and also the potential benefits associated with implementing a regulated partnership intervention by using non-public entities as third-party crime controllers. Additionally the research findings highlight the challenges of reconciling the objectives of macro-driven partnerships with performance and engagement of the partners at the local-level. Furthermore, the findings highlight the importance of partnership model translation within and across jurisdictions and of consistent partner
engagement. The results from this dissertation advance understanding about optimal partnership models, the factors that are important for promoting third-party engagement with the intervention and the partnership features that facilitate partnership efficacy and longevity.
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