

#19 (LORRAINE MAZEROLLE)

This transcription was provided by a transcription service that claims a high degree of accuracy combining artificial intelligence and human checking. While their advertising claims accuracy for clear audio transcriptions, Reducing Crime LLC and Jerry Ratcliffe have not checked the transcription and make no warranties or representations of any sort, implied or expressed about the reliability, availability or accuracy of services, products, information or transcriptions contained on our website or in this document for any purpose. We make no claim that this transcription is verbatim. Any reliance that you place on the information contained within this document is strictly at your own risk.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Jerry Ratcliffe again, with Reducing crime, a podcast featuring influential thinkers in the police service and leading crime and policing researchers. Lorraine Mazerolle is professor of criminology in the school of social science at Australia's University of Queensland and one of the world's leading experimental criminologists. We discuss her career in criminology and police and crime prevention partnerships. Find out more in this episode at reducingcrime.com and on Twitter at [_reducingcrime](https://twitter.com/_reducingcrime).

Hi, two quick things before we start, first, the American Society of Evidence Based Policing is having their annual conference in Washington DC on June 1st and 2nd, it's a great meeting and I highly recommend it. Second, this episode was recorded before the true extent of the Australian bush fire season was known. I lived in Australia for four very happy years and have subsequently visited many times and my thoughts are with all of my friends there and everyone affected by the current devastation.

Lorraine Mazerolle's an experimental criminologist, and a professor of criminology in the school of social sciences at Australia's University of Queensland. She's been an Australian research council Laureate fellow, a chief investigator with the ARC Center of Excellence for Children and Families over the life course, editor in chief for the journal of experimental criminology and a past chair of the American Society of Criminology's division of experimental criminology. Among her many prestigious accomplishments is being an elected fellow of the American Society of Criminology and the recipient of numerous awards, including the 2016 ASC division of policing distinguished scholar award, the Joan McCord award in 2013 and the ASC division of international criminology Freda Adler distinguished scholar award. And that's a mouthful that took me three takes to get.

Her grants and scholarship have covered a wealth of policy relevant topics, such as third party policing, police engagement with high risk people in disadvantaged communities, community regulation, problem oriented policing, police technology, civil remedies, street level drug enforcement and policing public housing sites. We chatted at the American Society of Criminology meeting in San Francisco, covering how she got into criminology, how police can manage and keep partnerships with outside agencies fresh by writing in a sunset clause and the surprising situation where police in Australia are helping school teachers understand procedural justice. I learned that dyad partnerships aren't Welsh thing and sneak in a quick joke about drop bears. If you're ever a tourist in Australia, watch out for the drop bears.

Need to be copied in. I was having coffee, come on, cut me a break. I was getting coffee. I think at ASC, there should be a rule that you're allowed to be late. And your excuse for being late is, I was getting coffee because the lines in these places, unbelievable.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

REDUCING CRIME PODCAST TRANSCRIPT

Well I had a lovely cup of coffee with Betsy and her friend that she went to graduate school with, Leslie Stanko. You know Betsy don't you?

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Yeah. She used to be with the Met police.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

We're talking about her being here at ASC in the mid 70s where there was 400 members.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Wow. Changed now.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

5,000 members.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

I could imagine what it was like back then.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

400 members.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

I mean, that feels tiny.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

And 12 women.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

No, seriously?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah. So she started the division of women in criminology. Yeah.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

It's changed a lot, now. It seems to be, feels like it's almost, certainly the younger crowd seems to be majority women now.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Well that's because all the women want to go into solving the world's problems, Jerry. Solving the world's problems.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

REDUCING CRIME PODCAST TRANSCRIPT

So what are all the men going to do?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

I don't know.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Create them?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Create the problems and the women solve the problems. Is that right?

Jerry Ratcliffe:

That's about right, isn't it?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

All right, shoot.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Well, where do you want to start? How did you end up being a criminologist and one of the leading criminologists in the world?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

I wanted to be a police officer. You know this story, don't you Jerry?

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Yes, but that's why we're recording a podcast because other people don't know this story. This is how it works.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Right. Okay. All right. Okay. Off we go. So when I was 14, I was fascinated with reading about murders and all sorts of stuff in the newspapers and our school counselor-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

That wasn't dark and scary.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

That wasn't dark and scary. And then a school counselor who was probably the PE teacher, and who knew nothing about careers guidance, they threw us all books when we were in about grade 10 or 11 and said, "Pick your career. Pick your career." So we're in the library and I got to A, accounting. I went, "Oh, I can't be an accountant." Flipped over a few pages, get to B's, banker. "Oh, I don't think I could be a banker." And got to C, and there's criminologist. So I thought, "That's what I'll do."

REDUCING CRIME PODCAST TRANSCRIPT

Jerry Ratcliffe:

I thought you were about to say copper.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Copper, no, criminologist. So I went to this counselor who really wasn't a counselor, he was the PE teacher. And he says to me, "Oh, the only way for you to be a criminologist is to join the police." So in those days, you joined the place after your 17th birthday. So the day after my 17th birthday, I grabbed my girlfriend said, "Come on, we're going to join the police together because we're fit and we're going to do the obstacle courses and we're going to be marching and doing all this fantastic fitness stuff." That was really what I thought it was all about.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Amazing how many times in my policing career, I had to climb a rope. Useful skill.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Very, very useful skill, Jerry, in fact, I'm so keen to do the obstacle course, that our embedded police fellow has organized for me to do a special edition of the obstacle course.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Lorraine Mazerolle obstacle course.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

We never got to do it. So what ended up happening was that my girlfriend got put in one room, I got put in the other, they asked me a couple of questions about my politics, which was a little bit left of center in those days. So they put me under the height restriction, I was five foot three and three quarters and they threw me out. So I didn't even get to the first step, so washed up at 17.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Bloody hell. Your girlfriend went on to become the commissioner.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

She went on to become a police officer and still is a police officer with the South Australian police these days. So then I went to do an economics degree, so accounting, banking, criminology.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

You just went back to the beginning of the book, didn't you?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Exactly. And then, so I did an economics degree and then discovered sociology of deviance. So then I did that subject and ended up working for the office crime statistics and that's where it started. But there was another part to the story as to how I actually came to the States. David Bailey and Ron Clark came over as visiting scholars to the old national police research unit in Australia. And both of them invited me to come over and do my PhD in the US.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Did you have to pay your passage to America on a tramp steamer or something like that?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

No, nothing like that. But the only reason why I came to Rutgers was that Ron Clark promised me that he'd give me an office where I would be able to see the statue of Liberty. He said, "If you come to Rutgers, you're right near New York and you're right near the statue of Liberty." And so I was sold. And so my 13th floor office in the center for crime prevention studies, at four o'clock in the morning when you're running all that data and everything, and you can see the very, very top of the flame of the statue of Liberty, that was my office for three years. Technically could see a little bit of the statue of Liberty.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

And that was the thing that brought you-

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Brought me to Rutgers.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

And did it make it worth it?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Oh, it was an interesting journey. Well, my first job was with David Weisberg.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

I've heard of him.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

You've heard of David? Have you podcast with David Weisberg?

Jerry Ratcliffe:

No, not yet, but I'll get around to catching David at some point. He's everywhere, we get to hear from David a lot. But it's not so often we get you to this side of the planet, so it was great to have a chance to talk to you.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Thanks for inviting me.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

I didn't invite you all the way here to America, I just grabbed the fact that you're at the conference. Come on, don't give me that much credit. So you worked with David.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yes. David called me up.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

David opens every door possible.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yes, that's right. So David called me up, I think it was about, it could have even been the 1st of April on April fool's day.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

There's something in that, right?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

There's something in that.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

There was a message.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

There was a message, I should have realized that. And he says to me, "You can be my project manager if you're arrive in two weeks, or if you arrive in three months." Which was when I was due to arrive, "You can just work as an assistant, which one do you want?" And so I said, "Well, I'll come and manage the project." And he said, "Well, you have to be here in two weeks." Of course, I didn't have a visa, I didn't have any arrangements in place to get over there. But for David that's just not really a matter, you just get there, right? I think I was flying out on the Monday morning and my visa arrived at-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

You didn't have to swim the Rio Grande, or anything?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

No, no, nothing like that. Just catch about 10 million planes and spend 50 hours in the air or something. So my visa arrived on the Friday afternoon at four o'clock in the afternoon and my flight was leaving at six o'clock or something the next morning.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Blimey. There you go.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Landed in Newark New Jersey, right at the height of the crack cocaine epidemic.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

It's an discovered paradise.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Undiscovered paradise. Oh, well, in those days it was really a very, very dangerous city, with drug markets on every other corner and really good place to-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

You have to get through your PhD somehow, right?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Well I didn't do my PhD on the Jersey City project. So that was another story. So Dennis Rosenbaum actually had been working with the Oakland police and he got this grant to look at their beat health program and then he actually unfortunately had a heart attack and asked David to do this grant for him. And David was off busy doing other stuff, we were running the drug markets-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

David stuff.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

David stuff. And I was running the drug markets project in Jersey City for David. And this was an opportunity to do something completely separate from David, so I did my PhD on the Oakland beat health program. A good decision and for any graduate students listening, to run your own project and not be part of a senior scholars project for your PhD.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

I always think it's nice to have a couple of different things running at the same time. I can't sit down and work on one project the whole day, my brain turns to jelly mid afternoon. So it's nice to transition to something else, like a separate side project that you're interested in, that you can just work on.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

I think also, there's lots of synergies and if you're working on different projects, you see things from different perspectives.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

It broadens that experience.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

I'm a big fan of crime in place and I've done a lot of research on understanding the dynamics of crime in place. But the thing that really always bothered me about that, is people are in places and so you've still got these dynamics of why people are in these places and what you can do in terms of working with the people and not just focusing on the place dynamic.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Is that to some degree how you started getting into things like third party policing?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah, it was because what bothered me and what I saw about the police working on places, the problem solving that was very place centric that could really change some of the longterm dynamics there, but hotspots policing and those sorts of things, they'd come in and do a crack down, or they do very shallow problem solving. And within a couple of months, the problems were back the same way.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Or even less time than that sometimes.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Sometimes much quicker, what is it, 15 days or what have you and the problems back and sometimes they're back even stronger. And we actually had a captain of the Jersey City police, Frank [Deduceski 00:11:59] make the analogy to grapevines, that you might cut off the grapes, but the vines still strong.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

That's a good one.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah, and in Australia actually, we have native trees that if you trim them and you trim them a lot, they actually grow much stronger and much more bushy-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

They're much better able to support drop bears then.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah, there you go. So I always felt that that high pressure on the places was always a tactic that actually strengthened the markets. And a lot of the research that looks at networks, networks in organized crime, networks in drug dealing and those sorts of things, it's really interesting that if you actually take out the central character in a network, it actually strengthens the network because a decentralized network is actually less susceptible to disruption. So it got me very interested in how do you sustain long term gains and I really think that the police can't sustain longterm crime control in places or with people, without the partnerships and partnerships in policing is really what creates the capacity for police to sustain those gains over time.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

So tell me about third party policing and then how that transitions into your work on partnerships.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

So in Oakland, at the time, police captain Bob Crawford, he was working with a range of different city inspectors, the rodent control, health and safety, varied city inspectors. And he started working with them as a team and so they came together as a specialized multi agency response team. And it wasn't really about having health inspectors coming into the crack houses or looking at the fire codes and was the place up to code or what have you. It was really a way for the police to be able to get some control over the place, through working with the other agencies.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

When I worked in Philadelphia, Chuck Ramsey, when he was police commissioner, he used to say, he loved it when he could get other branches of government to spend their money to solve his problem.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

That's exactly the principle. And the trick there was to, it wasn't really a trick, but it was really to have their goals be consistent with the police goals.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Right. Because so often in these things, I've seen them break down because it just collapses into tribalism or feudalism. Each agency is looking to protect their turf and not really wanting to put themselves out to help another agency of government.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

That's right. But unless it's genuinely focused on mutual goals, it's going to fail. So they might do it as a favor to the police for a short period of time. They might build the partnership and see it as something that is worthwhile doing for a short period of time, but if the goals don't become mutually beneficial, the partnership will collapse.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

So your man in Oakland, Bob Crawford, was he successful?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

He was incredibly successful.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

So did it rely on him? That's the tricky part with this, I mean, how did he manage to get traction where other people have tried that stuff and it's just dissolved into a massive individual agency fighting, as much as anything.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah. So first of all, he was very charismatic. He was charismatic, he was dynamic, he was convincing, he was persuasive and he was able to convince the other agencies that it was a mutually beneficial goal that they were working towards. So over time, as with a lot of these partnerships, the routinization of the intervention was really eroding for the partnership because it became too structured and too routinized. So the multi agency response teams, if you had to get four or five different inspectors and the police, all going to do an inspection at the same time, the coordination of that became very difficult. Unless you're able to create a momentum that sits in behind it, that's not dependent just on one individual, you have a-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Champion is bought in, it's their idea, but then they get promoted because they've done something, well, I mean, I would like to say they get promoted, but promotion systems in policing tend not to be that meritorious.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah, that's right. And I don't actually even know that he was ever promoted beyond a sergeant. But I do think that the alternative, the top down impose partnerships are equally fraught because they're better in terms of the negotiations at the inter agency level and then they don't become ad hoc, they don't become Bob Crawford calling up his mate that's in fire and saying, "Hey, we've got this inspection. Can you come along?" And so it's very much a transaction around personalities.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Okay. So you've got a bottom up approach, which is personality driven. It's a sergeant calling up his mate in licensing inspection, it's a sergeant calling up his mate at a relatively low level in the fire department, to all get together and hit a house that's been causing problems for the police department. But that's reliant on informal networks and personalities.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Correct.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Or you've got the top down approach, which is formalized and it's memorandums of understanding and agreements of strategic plans and all that good stuff. Which is better?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Both have a limited life.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

It's interesting you say that they both have a limited life because I'm sure some people would argue that if you formalize these things, bring in structures and business processes and strategic plans, that's much more able to be sustainable because it becomes part of the organizational mantra, than the informal approach that relies on character and individual personalities. But you're still saying the top down approach has a limited lifespan.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah. I think it has a limited lifespan. I think that the way that those partnerships evolve over time become far too routinized. They lack insight, they lack innovation, there's a lot of turnover, there's a lack of institutional memory, problems move on and that partnership has run its course. And if they can get refreshed and they can change in shape, that's where you can get some sustainability. I think that they need a sunset clause.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

I was going to say, do we need to build in a time when this dies?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Absolutely, I think so. And I think that if you've built it in so that you can say it might run for a year or two years, that seems to be the extent of the partnership. And then I think it's important to really stop it and to think about is this meeting both of our agency demands, you might have a change of leadership, the change of leadership has some

different priorities. If it doesn't meet those new priorities or the form of the crimes changing, the drug markets are changing, it just needs to change. And I think that some partnerships just aren't meant for longevity and some are.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Welcome to my personal life.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

There you go. I just think that to have successful partnerships, I think you do need the charisma meeting the top down.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Are we still talking crime? Are we now into marriage guidance counseling, relationship counseling?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

You certainly don't want more partnerships than one at a time, Jerry. You can edit that out.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

You play by your rules and I'll play by mine.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah, that's right. So there's a couple of other dimensions, I think. One of the other components of third party policing, is having some legislation that sits in behind the partner. And what that legislation is, is quite different and variable. If it's health and safety legislation, if it's-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Is it existing legislation or is it legislation that's created to support the partnership? Because that's a big lift.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah, no, it's definitely not new legislation, it's existing legislation. And one of the big projects that we've been working on for the last seven or eight years, is around the truancy legislation. So in Australia, there's legislation through the Department of Education that requires a school aged child to attend school and the parent is actually held responsible and they can be prosecuted if their child doesn't attend school. As with a lot of these ordinances, regulations, administrative laws, they get applied in a very ad hoc fashion. So partnerships that have a partner with some legislative requirements, seem to be more successful than those partnerships where the entity doesn't have any legislative responsibility that could be used and harnessed for crime control purposes.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

So one of the things I think I've always railed against, is committees that are unnecessarily large for no apparent purpose. I always think that as a committee grows, its capacity to make decisions is inversely proportional to its size.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yes. And you get the lowest common denominator response.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

After a while it just becomes a massive room full of people who are just defending their own little fiefdoms. So does that mean then taking that idea with what you're just saying, is that if police are looking to do this, they should look for partners who actually have some legislative tools they can wield. So they actually bring us a decent stick to the party.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yes, that's right. And what I've also, and this might sound very-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

And they can bring some carrots, but if they bring a stick, that really helps.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

You need to incentivize, as well as have the stick. And I've been a proponent of dyad partnerships. I think multi agency partnerships become very, very complicated. The smart teams were multi-agency, but there was only-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

And that's was in Oakland?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

That was in Oakland. But that was only really three or four agencies and they had very specific roles.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Dyad teams.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah dyads are where you've just got the police partnering with one other entity, the nature of the relationships and the terms of engagement become very clear. They're really, really crystal clear as to what the problem they're working on, what the legislation is that they're activating, the people that they're working with and for the police it becomes, "Okay, we've got this problem, we've got this partner and we use this approach." Now that completely goes against the whole problem solving principle of having a huge amount of flexibility to work on the nature of the problem and I understand that-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

But you still see there are benefits.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

I see there's a lot of benefits because I think that one of the issues that police that are working at the grassroots level, they struggle with having enough time to look holistically at the problem, they struggle with-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

End up with shallow problem solving.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Exactly. And I think that the need to engage with a whole range of different entities, there's a lot of transaction costs in that, so it takes a long time to build the rapport, to build the trust between the partners. Whereas a dyad partnership, where the police are building that relationship with one other partner, the building of the trust and building a working relationship with them, the time that they spend building that, they can actually then capitalize on.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Do you have some examples of this?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah, in the ability school engagement partnership program we've been running. That's a partnership just between the police and the schools, it's using very, very specific legislation around the truancy laws, where the parents are held responsible, the police that are recruited into the program, they're not recruited full time, they're just regular beat officers, but they've responded to an expression of interest that they're interested in participating in this program and the schools that they're working with and the teachers that come into the ASEP conference, the ability school engagement partnership program conference-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

That's a bit of a mouthful, isn't it?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah, call it ASEP. They start to get to know the school representatives, so it-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

So in a way it sounds like it's got the necessary formal components from the top down, to give it top cover and to bring that formal arrangement. But it sounds like you've also got people working on the ground who are using informal relationships.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yes, this is this hybrid model. So it takes into account the on the ground formulation of relationships between the two entities, but it's got structure and it's got support from the top, which creates a sustainable model. It's not something that the police have to justify over and over, in terms of their engagement, it doesn't require the schools. Now it has the top down, not just from the police, but from the Department of Education as well, so it requires that level of dual top down. Now you imagine a multi agency partnership and you're trying to get five agencies all to agree to something, we could be sitting here for 10 years, you would grow a very long beard, I'd be a very old woman. So this is where the dyad partnerships, I think, have some traction.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

There's a tendency in some cities and some places, to want to build these big coalitions because they think we have more people involved, it'll definitely improve things, but that's disastrous.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

It's an absolute disaster and we've got that going on in Queensland, where I live. And very well meaning, but they spend half their time agreeing to their terms of reference and the capacity to get anything done, is extraordinarily difficult. And I'm not saying that negotiating these partnerships between two entities is easy-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

But it's got to be better than doing it between a dozen.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

It's absolutely better than-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

And you don't water down any effects either, you don't have to pander to any agencies just to keep them involved even though they don't contribute very much.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

That's right. The other really big factor that sits in behind here, is we've talked a lot about police legitimacy and all the training that sits in behind police legitimacy. What we have found is that the way that the schools talk to the parents, the way that the schools talk to the kids, is so procedurally unjust it's not funny. So the way that the police engage with the young people and with the parents, has much better results and what we're finding is that the schools are actually learning from the police, which who would've thought.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Yeah. That goes against the existing ethos and belief.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

That's right. So we started doing a lot of training with the police around teaching the principles of procedural justice and how they bring that into the ASEP conferences. We're now doing it in the school districts.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Now tell me, when you talk about procedural justice, how do you explain that?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

within the context of the ASEP conferences, it's about conveying dignity and respect, being neutral in their decision making, giving some voice, I mean, some voice for the young people, some voice for the parents, communicating the legislative responsibilities of the parents and what the consequences are. You're going to be fined a thousand dollars if your child doesn't go to school. That's a teaching moment, but if it's done in a way that is not conveying what the motivation is that sits in behind why it's better for your child to go to school and if that's not conveyed in a fair way, you get a backfire effect. So what we found was that the schools were horrible, the teachers were absolutely horrible in the way that they would convey this legislation.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

So in what way, because this surprises me about teachers because they're supposed to be the ones that are experts at talking to kids.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

They are supposed to be. But when we started to do our role playing and this is going back several years ago now, the teachers were much more authoritarian, they were much more dictatorial about, you haven't got your kid to school and this is all your fault and really not good communication. Sometimes the kids weren't going to school because if they got to school 10 minutes late, then the teacher railed up against them and shamed them in front of their class. They're walking in and making smart ass comments about why the child's late, not understanding some of the difficulties that some of these kids are coming out of.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Crappy parents and stuff.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Well, really difficult families, really, really difficult home situations. So changing the dialogue of the schools as to how they communicated their own legislation, has been a major part of building this partnership.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

The voice component, I think, is really interesting because having seen more and more students coming through the universities, we do seem to be having an almost generational effect of kids who are now much more aware of the much bigger world and that's possibly down to social media and the internet and less confident about their place within it.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

I think that the capacity for the child to communicate with what they see as authority figures, where they're treated in a respectful way, then you get a much better understanding and a better outcome. And we've shown that in the pilot, we're now upscaling that trial to a thousand kids to look at some of the variability across different types of groups of kids.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

And are you exploring this in an experimental way?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

We've got three big school districts, randomly allocating a thousand kids to fair mental control condition, we've got the police across the three school districts, there's actually a cluster randomized controlled trial where the schools are actually randomly allocated into experimental control condition for lots of operational, as well as it meets the statistical power test. And from an operational point of view, it's complicated to have some kids in the school getting the experimental treatment, others not.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

That sounds great. When do you think you're going to have results?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

About 10 years time. No.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Welcome to academia.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

So the negotiations across the schools and the police, have taken about nine months, and if it'd been a multi agency partnership, it would've probably taken five years.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Terrifying, yes.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

So we're just starting recruiting now-

Jerry Ratcliffe:

By the time you'd had got there, everybody forgotten what they were doing in the first place.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah, that's right. So we should have all of the kids recruited by the end of 2020. So within a year.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

And yet you still think that these programs should have a sunset clause?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

I do. I think that they need refreshing, they need rethinking. I think that if you're going to upscale it, even if you're going to upscale it across the whole state or across the whole, in Australia, we have data for a million people in 10 different school districts. So do you upscale it across the whole of the state? I think it needs really careful thinking about how you negotiate the partnership and make sure that there's a sunset clause. I do think two years, two or three years is about right.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Organizations can evolve of that period of time as well.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

They change significantly. Yeah.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

And what else is going on in Queensland then? What else are you working on?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

We're working on a lot of child exploitation.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

[inaudible 00:32:04] in the word research on that.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Yeah. The transmission of child exploitation material, we've got a randomized controlled trial where we're randomly allocating a new risk assessment tool. It's actually a decision support tool for how a triage staff manage the massive increase in child exploitation material referrals coming into the Australian federal police.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

What's been driving that?

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Well technology's really driven the massive increase. I mean, six years ago, they used to get 3000 referrals a year coming in, now there are 18,000 a year referrals. I mean, it's exponential. So of course that puts a huge amount of pressure on the triage team and the tools not really appropriate, the forms of offending has really changed a lot over that period of time, so the tool is really out of date. So we've got that going on. We've got a whole range of systematic reviews on countering violent extremism, different interventions. So yeah, fun.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

Well, you've got lots going on, I should let you get back to it, Lorraine, thank you very much, indeed.

Lorraine Mazerolle:

Great, thank you, Jerry, and hope everyone finds that interesting.

Jerry Ratcliffe:

You've been listening to episode 19 of Reducing Crime, recorded in San Francisco in November, 2019. Other episodes, look at reducingcrime.com or the usual podcast places. New episodes are on Twitter at [_reducingcrime](https://twitter.com/_reducingcrime). Be safe and best of luck.