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Abstract

From the 1990s onwards, the New Zealand Police followed a global trend of progressively becoming involved in overseas peacekeeping and development deployments that over time changed from operational interventions to deployments that were more developmental in nature. While development concepts within these New Zealand Police development interventions have been committed to in principal, there has been little or no research undertaken as to how New Zealand police perceive and undertake their roles within these interventions. Using a post-development framework this research explores how these development interventions and the subsequent expectations for the role of the New Zealand police officer during development interventions overseas were created. A survey and interviews were conducted with a small number of New Zealand police officers who have deployed within these interventions to identify their perceptions of development practice so as to compare with the expectations of the development programmes.

My research predominantly finds that New Zealand police officers place a high value on their prior New Zealand policing experiences. In implementing development programmes there was an overwhelming recognition by the research participants for the need to form positive relationships by listening and acknowledging another’s culture. This recognition of the benefits of positive working relationships has led this research to conclude that a recognition of the importance of the personal agency of New Zealand police officers could contribute to recognise and support the personal agency of their development partner to achieve realistic and desirable development outcomes for the intended beneficiary, provided programme design is constructed to incorporate this approach.
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Chapter One: Introduction
1. Introduction

This research project investigates the deployment of New Zealand police officers to developing countries. There has, since the 1990s, been a significant global increase in police from one state deploying to another to assist in the development and strengthening of the policing services in post conflict, fragile or developing States (Greener, 2011b, p. 184). The New Zealand Police has deployed officers, on direction of the New Zealand Government, to these development assistance interventions. The increasing use of overseas police is due to the idea that for development to take place issues of security must be addressed; this includes developing the host-State's security institutions (Holm & Eide, 2000, pp. 2-3). It is now generally accepted that such development interventions are needed and there has been much discussion on the concept of the reform of these security institutions overall. There has been little study, however, given to the specific circumstances of such interventions (Krogstad, 2012, pp. 261-262).

As a New Zealand Police officer who has deployed to Solomon Islands and Timor-Leste as part of New Zealand development programme interventions, I came to realise that whilst these development interventions contain elements of policing, in reality the interventions transcended the policing role and its tasks. Police officers, when working in New Zealand, generally have a very clear idea of the parameters and expectations of their job. Yet when deployed to another country they find themselves working in completely different contexts in terms of culture, political systems, political stability, security threats, standards of living and social cohesion. Police officers must not only navigate these obvious differences in their working environments but must also adapt to another, quite different role, that of someone helping to develop skills and abilities in others rather than carrying out law enforcement duties. With this in mind, I wanted to further explore the complexity of the development interventions that New Zealand police officers work in. I wanted to examine the frameworks they must work within and untangle how New Zealand police officers perceived the development interventions they were involved in. This is to understand how the development interventions and their frameworks actually constrained or enabled them in carrying out their work. Whilst this research has a strong focus on the experiences of a ‘donor’ partner within development, it aims to contribute to improving the delivery, effectiveness and relevance of a development intervention to the intended beneficiaries of that intervention.
The aim of this chapter is to offer readers an introduction to this research and the questions underlying this change. While development and security continued to merge, there remain gaps in the knowledge as to understanding how the actors involved in security reform to support the process of development can contribute in more meaningful ways. The involvement of New Zealand police in development is key in this study. The means to undertake this will be explored through a post-development lens and address issues on power and agency.

1.1 The Research Problem

Bevan (2011, p. 2) points out that there has been little research on how Police officers involved within overseas development interventions conceptualise their activities and actions. Cuddy (2012, pp. 2-3), similarly, highlights that while both New Zealand and Australian police have been involved in overseas development interventions for the last 15 years and there has been research available on Australian interventions and the experiences of Australian personnel, there has not been the same examination of personnel within New Zealand-led or managed interventions. This raises the question that if little is known on how New Zealand police conceptualise their place within development interventions, how can these interventions be designed so that the expectations of the development program and the police officers implementing them are aligned? This in turn leads to questioning the potential effectiveness for the implementation of such development programmes. If one partner of a development programme is uncertain of what their contribution involves then this may have an adverse effect on the programme as a whole and therefore reduce the value of the development programme for those people it is meant to benefit.

1.2 Research Aim and Questions

This research aims to undertake an exploratory approach to understanding New Zealand police involved in development interventions overseas. The history, circumstances, structures and systems that create the frameworks which influence and potentially shape the perceptions of New Zealand police officers involved in these interventions must be considered. This study's intention is not to present an argument on what is right or wrong but to provide a narrative of the New Zealand Police (NZP) and its place in the arena of
development. By addressing individual perception, the study aims to improve the knowledge of the actual outcomes of police interventions in development and specifically how this particular occupational group understands their placement within these interventions. The main research aim is:

*To compare how New Zealand Police officers perceive development practice to New Zealand development programme expectations.*

To explore this aim there are three primary research questions and affiliated objectives designed as the means to answer each question.

**Research Question One**

In what way are the New Zealand Police involved in overseas development?

**Objectives**

a) To explore the history of police officers participation in development interventions overseas.

b) To understand the recommended practices involving police for development interventions overseas.

c) To analyse overseas development interventions that New Zealand Police officers are involved in.

**Research Question Two**

What are the gaps between the expectation of New Zealand Police officer involvement during development interventions and the actual outcome?

**Objectives**

a) To explore development practices involving New Zealand police officers that achieved good outcomes.

b) To identify areas involving New Zealand police officers where outcomes were not being met (and the reasons for this).

**Research Question Three**

How do New Zealand police officers perceive New Zealand Police practice within overseas development programmes?
**Objectives**

a) To identify the roles that New Zealand Police officers associate themselves to in development interventions
b) To identify the preparation for New Zealand Police officers for development interventions at an organisational and personal level.
c) To explore the challenges that New Zealand Police officers experienced.
d) To explore the enablers that New Zealand Police officers found contributed to achieving planned outcomes.

**1.3 The Project Framework**

A literature review was carried out to explore and provide the background and history of the New Zealand Police and police in general within international development interventions. This literature review was also carried out to identify the contemporary and recommended practices and issues within policing development initiatives. Following this a qualitative methodology was chosen to explore how New Zealand police officers have perceived their deployments. A qualitative approach offers an acceptance of multiple realities through the study of small in-depth cases (Mohan & Stokke, 2000; O'Leary, 2013, p. 86). A document analysis was undertaken of plans, reviews and evaluations of New Zealand overseas development interventions involving New Zealand Police within Timor-Leste. This was to not only help to understand the framework that New Zealand police officers are expected to work within but to also identify from external evaluations and reviews what processes, alongside the perspectives of New Zealand police officers working within these kinds of programmes, had contributed or detracted (O'Leary, 2013, p. 140 & 141) to development outcomes. Following on and contributing to the document analysis, a survey and interviews were conducted of New Zealand police officers who have deployed overseas within development interventions. This deeper exploration of those surveyed and interviewed considered how the perceptions of a particular organisational group (New Zealand police officers) might be formed while working within development programmes and how they grasped meanings and used their interpretations to make sense of their experiences (O'Leary, 2013, pp. 114, 116 & 117). The research framework, while seeking the richer descriptions from qualitative experience, combined information and data from different methods not only as a means to explore or broaden
the research but also as a means to triangulate to confirm any subsequent conclusions (O’Leary, 2013, p. 94).

1.4 Research Method - Document Analysis

The first main area of research undertaken was a document analysis. This document analysis was conducted on the plans, reviews and evaluations of New Zealand development interventions involving New Zealand police officers. The plans, primarily designed by New Zealand Aid/The New Zealand Aid Programme, represented the mutually agreed goals and objectives of the development intervention between New Zealand and Timor-Leste. They stipulated how goals and objectives would be met while utilising the New Zealand Police as implementers. The reviews and evaluations were carried out by independent contractors. An analysis was undertaken to identify any gaps within the plans (expectations) and the recorded outcomes (from the reviews and evaluations) in the use of New Zealand police within these interventions. This was a qualitative exercise where information from text had to first be interpreted and then categorised, refer to Appendixes A1 and A2, to identify any occurrences or trends (O’Leary, 2013, p. 224).

1.5 Research Method - Survey and Interviews

The second main component of this research was a survey and interviews with New Zealand police officers who had deployed overseas as part of development interventions. In line with the nature of this research, the survey and interviews that were conducted were qualitative in nature. This approach was adopted so that in exploring a particular group of people, namely New Zealand police officers engaged in development overseas, a larger picture was able to be built through the diversity of an individual’s understanding (O’Leary, 2013, p. 115). The initial survey consisted of a number of demographic questions as well as questions related to identifying what the participants perceived as their roles within the deployment. They were also asked what challenges and successes they had experienced whilst on deployment.

On the 7th of September 2015 a survey link and information sheet, refer to Appendix B, was emailed to 28 people who have previously deployed as New Zealand police officers within development interventions. This survey was conducted through the web based provider Survey Monkey. The survey received 19 responses. Six follow up interviews
were conducted from the 24th of September 2015 to the 29th of September 2015 by telephone or the telecommunication programme Skype with survey participants who had provided their details for a follow up interview.

The subsequent interviews were semi-structured, comprising of a number of key questions that allowed for participants to provide open responses within the conversation depending on the participant’s area of expertise, experience or just general interest in a particular line of questioning and subject matter. An open response is where respondents provide answers in their own words and are able to communicate what they wish (O'Leary, 2013, p. 191). This was an attempt to have participants share their thoughts and experiences rather than answering simple, short response questions. I aimed to capture the experiences and perceptions of the participants that would be highlighted and prioritised as a means to understanding what their experiences had been like and what they had meant for them, including what had been learnt (Chambers, 1997, 2013b; O'Leary, 2013, pp. 119-120).

1.6 Ethics

Prior to the fieldwork being carried out I sought ethical clearance from Massey University and an in-house ethics review process was conducted by a panel of two academics, Dr Gerard Prinsen and my supervisor Dr Maria Borovnik. I was asked to reflect on my methodological approach, positionality and my fieldwork plan. A ‘Notification of ‘low risk’ research/evaluation involving human participants’ was then submitted, and the project was evaluated as ‘low risk’.

As a New Zealand police officer myself, who has deployed overseas within development interventions, there were a number of issues for me to consider that required exploration prior to and during the research. This research required an acknowledgment of my own biases, necessitating a self-reflection on my personal history and identity and how this inevitably influences the interactions and subsequent research outcomes. There was the need to consider how a relationship that acknowledges both power and social relationships was to be established with the participants (Etherington, 2007). In this context, the New Zealand Police have a rank system where positional power is apparent and I was aware that as a police officer I hold rank above and below potential research participants. Therefore, it was important to be considerate of how relationships with participants would develop. Van den Brink and Steffen (2008, p. 57 & 58) argue that with power inequalities there are dominance relations among the actors that may potentially affect thoughts and
actions. Hence, in order to overcome the issue of power, due to rank structure, initial contact with potential research participants to participate in the survey contained clear advice that participants would remain anonymous and that there was no obligation to participate. People that had been approached understood there was no obligation or pressure to participate in the survey.

Another aspect to consider was using personal contacts and networks to make contact with participants. Considered was that while my personal networks were helpful in establishing a rapport they also potentially implied social obligations that could possibly influence the interview. Particularly, in relation to interviewing people, I had to consider my levels of familiarity with the person I was interviewing (McConnell-Henry, James, Chapman, & Francis, 2010, p. 3; Platt, 1981, p. 78 & 79). While the means undertaken to manage these potential issues was through the clarification of my role as a researcher (McConnell-Henry et al., 2010, p. 3). What I found in the interviews was that the interviewees appeared to be more than willing to share their experiences. While alert to the multiple subjectivities brought to this research, I felt it was our shared experience of having deployed overseas that made the dialogue more open and authentic.

1.7 Limitations

For many qualitative studies the selection and grouping of data does not follow a pattern, rather studies based on subjective decisions made by a researcher might lead to a situation where no two researchers will finally come up with the same data, even if they had investigated the same unit of investigation under the same research question, at the same time and with the same methods (Diefenbach, 2009, p. 885). Such subjectivity might become a limitation as this also affects the relative weight that should be given to participants accounts when compared to documenting the reality (Shilling, 1992, p. 70). Another limitation was that the surveys and interviews were conducted with a relatively small number of participants. The conducting of surveys and telephoned interviews also reduced opportunity for closer contact where other forms of communication, such as body language or opportunities for clarification were potentially lost.

1.8 Development Theory and Project Structure

This research investigates New Zealand police officers perceptions of development. It does so by examining New Zealand police officers as ‘policing experts from the West’
working as a component of New Zealand development programmes overseas. These police officers, while attempting to solve problems, intentionally or not, intervene in the social events around them. They do this whilst monitoring their own actions and acknowledging the exercise of power associated to their placement which affects the agency and relationships with those they are meant to partner with, in the development intervention (Long, 1990, p. 8). In order to carry out this research it was necessary to understand the paradigms, processes and structures that have contributed towards creating those development programme plans which have been placed on New Zealand police officers working overseas. Further to this, it was also essential to understand the personal agency of these officers participating in these programmes in that the choices they make are also influenced by the belief in one’s effectiveness in performing specific tasks and skills, (Groves & Hinton, 2004, p. 28; Long, 1990, p. 6; Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006, p. 45).

Development theory, relating to power and agency, viewed through a post-development lens, was used to undertake this research. Post-development acknowledges that there is not one universal truth but rather that the world is made up of diverse voices. It puts the idea of development into play and that the ideal of development is contested (Blaikie, 2000, p. 1045). However, the idealisation of development is often accompanied by the setting of performance targets and numerical measures of success as a way of ‘driving’ the change that is desired. Yet, much development literature is littered with examples of how this approach is more likely to lead to failure rather than success. This is often put down to weak implementation rather than weak conceptualisation (Mowles, 2010, p. 151). Considering this conceptualisation, De Vries (2007, p. 27) advocates that development is not just about the materialisation of what is planned but just as importantly it is about sustaining the capacity to desire a different kind of society that is not yet defined, a conceptualisation of what can be achieved. Post-development not only looks at how development shapes and constitutes people and places but also examines how development actors have agency to re-imagine to shape places and development and seek alternatives to it (McGregor, 2009, p. 1696).

For those actors within development, post-development writers such as Kothari (2005) and Escobar (1988, p. 430) consider how the development industry was professionalised, in particular by the West, in that people working in the development arena become experts. It purports that knowledge has become restricted and held by these experts who
identify problems, create theories or allow objects to emerge that can be named, analysed and later transformed into a policy or a plan to be followed. It is this systemising of relationships and the restriction of knowledge that sets the rules and agenda for the contemporary discourse on development that, in turn, becomes a form of power and control over others (Escobar, 1988, p. 430; 1997, p. 86 & 87). This is particularly relevant to the practice of sending New Zealand police to work in other countries as this practice could be viewed as New Zealand police officers being considered ‘the experts’ who hold the right kind of knowledge as opposed to the host-State police. Such situations, if not handled correctly, could in turn stifle the very agency of the people they are required to support.

Post-development theory has been influenced by post-structuralism which is the study of the systems of knowledge that produce the object. It is concerned with understanding the processes of how meaning and content have passed through a system (Cilliers & Spurrett, 1999; McKinnon, 2007). This research brings about understanding how systems, structures and organisations have shaped the development interventions that these New Zealand police officers find themselves working with and in. There are limitations in that approaches to development often adopt macro-level analysis that overlook the important micro-level processes in development (Shilling, 1992, p. 69 & 70).

Individual agency, as a means of development, has been identified as important as small changes or shifts within a system can lead to greater changes within a larger system (Groves & Hinton, 2004). It is this individual agency of development practitioners or implementers that is relevant to this research. Long and Long (1992, p. 272) call the interplay between the structures of development and the agency of people working within those structures, the development interface. The authors explain that it is this space in which the culturally-encoded discourse, power, agendas and priorities of different development actors intersect. These discourses have, more specifically, intended and unintended consequences for human action, evoking different responses from people to similar structures, even if the conditions that create and hold those structures appear the same (Long, 1990, p. 6). In general terms, the notion of agency attributes to the individual actor the capacity to process social experience, conceptualise and devise ways of coping within the limits of uncertainty and other constraints. Long’s (1990, p. 6) concepts are relevant to this research by addressing how New Zealand police perceived their environment and made decisions to act within it. But development is also about expanding
freedoms, such as free agency, capability and choice for intended beneficiaries (Desai & Potter, 2008, p. 44), therefore how those structures enabled or constrained those whom New Zealand police officers interacted with becomes just as relevant.

Critics of post-development argue that post-development tends to misrepresent people and places and also represents development as homogenised (McGregor, 2009, p. 1694). It is also argued that post-development creates an impression that contemporary development is a problem where only certain things can be said or done. For some post-development theorists this can mean taking an anti-development stance who heavily critique and reject the current practices of development altogether (Corbridge, 1998, p. 138 & 148; Ziai, 2004, pp. 1045-1060). In exploring the historical politics and power relationships that shape development and in the case of this research, the history of development interventions involving New Zealand police, it becomes important to not reject what has happened in the past. Through this study I wanted to highlight the importance of seeing that there is more than one way of shaping the world and to recognise that in doing this, other possibilities and spaces become available. Post-development teaches us not to take that space for granted (Desai & Potter, 2008, p. 35 & 36).

1.9 Research Structure and Chapter Overview

Chapters Two and Three are comprised of a literature review. In Chapter Two, why and how police are being utilised within development interventions overseas is examined through a historical and contemporary lens. Chapter Three then examines the literature concerning the local and regional landscapes that have shaped the systems and structures for New Zealand Police development interventions overseas. Chapter Four, the document analysis, examines and compares two development programme case studies from Timor-Leste that involved New Zealand Police by examining the management tools of the plans and reviews and evaluations of those programmes. Chapter Five presents an analysis of the survey and interviews with New Zealand police officers who have deployed overseas within development interventions. The concluding Chapter Six discusses the theoretical, methodological and practical implications by comparing the findings of the survey and interview results with the document analysis and literature.
Chapter Two: Literature Review; Police in Development Interventions
2. Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of police involvement within development. In doing so this chapter contributes to research question one; *'In what way are the New Zealand Police involved in overseas development?'* Firstly the history of police officers participation in development interventions overseas is explored. Following this the challenges around using police for development interventions are discussed in conjunction with the concept of forming partnerships within these kinds of development interventions. Finally the contemporary approaches and recommended practices involving police for development interventions overseas are examined.

2.1 Police in Peacekeeping Operations and Development

Throughout the last decade of peacekeeping operations, the United Nations (UN) has utilised the phrase multidimensional peacekeeping operations to acknowledge that the range of tasks within peacekeeping operations has increased. Peacekeeping has evolved beyond being primarily a multi-national military intervention to also include the concept of peace building (United Nations, 2000; 2015a, p. 3). This, Holm and Eide (2000, p. 3) explain, has arisen because issues around security are interwoven with perceptions of the future that are also necessary to promote development. Activities that were not part of what was previously the traditional peacekeeping role now include improving governance, a recognition of human rights and economic development that since 2003 have been included in almost all new peacekeeping missions (United Nations, 2000; 2015a, p. 3).

From the 1990s, as part of these changing peace operations, there was a significant increase in the contribution of police for these kinds of missions. These contributions included the use of police for the development of host-State policing institutions through the process of reform, restructuring and rebuilding (Greener, 2009; United Nations, 2011a). Initially Western States were heavily involved. In 2001 five of the top ten police contributing countries for UN deployment were developed States (Durch & Center, 2010, p. 10). Since then these numbers have dropped and the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia have reduced police involvement and numbers within those UN missions that still provide the bulk of policing in pre and post-conflict policing (Connery & Sharland, 2014; Hills, 2015b, p. 1; World Federalist Movement, 2014, p. 2). The reasoning for the decreasing numbers of developed-States participating in UN missions appears varied but interlinked. Durch and Center (2010, p. 10) point out there was an increased call for public
order management that less developed countries could readily provide in comparison to technical skills. However, also cited as a reason for a decrease in the participation of developed States contributing towards police development are the rising inefficiencies and costs within UN missions that some member States are unwilling to continue to support (Russel, 2013; Westhead & Aulakh, 2013). Fleitz (2002, p. 77 & 111) points out that these inefficiencies are directly linked to idealistic and political aspirations that have been put ahead of operational realities. Hills (2015a, p. 146), in examining United Kingdom police deployments, puts it more directly in explaining that the officers themselves are mostly inexperienced in working overseas in different environments and therefore become ineffectual.

Yet the demands for police for UN missions are still rising. Greener (2009, pp. 124-125) warns that with the situation where developed States are committing less police, conditions could be created that exacerbate the divide between States, where wealthier States either pay contractors or poorer States to police those areas of high risk. This in turn could lead to a garrison effect where wealthier States seal themselves off from those States characterised by a lack of law and order.

### 2.2 The Politicising of Policing Development Interventions

While UN missions are political constructs, the UN has a legitimate basis for its actions, bestowed upon it through consensus by member States. However other policing development interventions that are carried out by individual States as a component of foreign aid programmes may become problematic (Claude, 1966, p. 373; Higate & Henry, 2009, p. 470; Stenning & Shearing, 2005, p. 169). This is because at an individual State level there are different motivations for intervening in another State’s affairs. Foreign donor aid is often consistent with the donor’s own interests rather than the issues or priorities identified by the recipient. Police development programmes carried out as foreign aid have raised such concerns and questions such as in whose interest is it that the interventions are carried out and who will benefit from the reform and the appropriateness of the kind of police model being introduced into a post-conflict environment (Brogden, 2005; Marenin, 1998, p. 155 & 156; Stenning & Shearing, 2005, p. 169)?

In this context Rajagopal (2007, p. 1363) highlights how the United States (US) has amalgamated security with development through the assertion that poverty can make weak States vulnerable to terrorist networks and drug cartels within its borders, justifying in
some cases a militarised kind of intervention. In 2005 it was estimated that while at least 90% of US bilateral assistance for police programmes was for capacity building, the goals were not linked to reform (Bayley, 2005, p. 206). In Afghanistan the reform of the Afghanistan police through the US Defence Department saw US efforts that were geared towards military training and support while removing or ignoring training on community and democratic policing, as well as domestic violence and women’s rights. This approach was seen as a failing to meet not only the short-term need for security but also the long-term requirement for establishing the rule of law, prioritising the concerns of external actors at the expense of local needs (Friesendorf, 2011, pp. 1,86,87,90,91; Greener, 2011a, p. 221; Murray, 2007, p. 118). This reform of the Afghanistan Police, Greener (2011a, p. 221) says, was nothing more than a post 9/11 agenda as its focus was primarily on security rather than the development of a police service that would meet the needs of the local communities.

Burnell (2008, p. 504) calls such designs, that may or may not be motivated by a national interest and aligned to other objectives within programmes, as multiple goals. The realisation or perception of multiple goals can also cause a reaction from the supposed beneficiaries. In 2004 a report for an Australian Police deployment to Bougainville, a former protectorate of Britain under Australian administrative control up until 1975, revealed that the intervention was seen by some parties as a form of re-colonization by a former colonial master (Chin, 2005, p. 193; National Archives of Australia, 2015; RT, 2015). Such sensitivities and perceptions can ultimately have a significant impact on the intervention for both sides. That particular case resulted in Australia having to withdraw from Bougainville at a significant cost (Dixon, 2005). Ultimately, as Goldsmith and Posner (2002, p. 118) state, while nations may provide legal or moral justification for their action's, their legal or moral justifications cleave to their interests and when their interests change so does the rational for their action. Development interventions then further require that donors and recipients should not only have identical, or at least closely aligned, preferences (Martens, 2005, p. 646), but they must also have as Baaz (2005, p. ix) says the material differences or the means to realise their goals.

2.3 Participation and Partnership Within Policing Development Interventions
Greater calls for aid effectiveness and efficiency eventually resulted in demand for the increased participation of those with whom the interventions were meant to benefit. At an
international level, the concept of participation through partnership was ratified as a core tenet of the Paris Declaration in 2005 as a means to deliver aid more effectively at all levels (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2008b; Wood et al., 2010). In terms of Policing Development interventions, the application of those concepts took some time to appear at an implementation level which is demonstrated by de Heyer (2012) in a study of 23 missions involving international police from a period of 1999 to 2007. The study found that when planning for policing interventions did occur there was often no indication of local participation in the planning or subsequent evaluations. However, an examination of UN documents does shows a growing awareness of the concept of partnership for United Nations Police. The 2011 report to the General Assembly on UN Policing had a section on ‘partnership’ that provided details on the creation of partnerships at an international and regional level (United Nations, 2011b, p. 15 & 16). The 2014 UN policy on Police in Peacekeeping operations and political missions is more specific in that it directs that UN Police (UNPOL) shall base their mandate implementation on a comprehensive strategic plan. The resulting plan should form a joint vision with host-State authorities that is developed in collaboration with the host-State and is subject to joint evaluation in partnership. (United Nations, 2014a, pp. 10, 11 & 17). With such plans, as Spratt (2011, p. 1 & 2) highlights, it is also important to recognise that not all planned interventions have the power to deal with human problems that are often resistant to change and are prone to fragmented responses, as is found in international development. This also requires what Eyben (2010, p. 2 & 7) says is a focus on processes and people, rather than results to become successful.

Tolley (2011, p. 39), in exploring the rhetoric around partnership in development, argues that the rational of using the partnership concept is primarily about building ownership as a means to achieving development goals that trade on shared power and trust. The end result creates the illusion of partners together in a good ‘relationship’ with mutually-shared ambitions, projects, strategies and outcomes. So, while the presentation of partnership is positive, the existence of unclear meanings then poses the question: in what way and for whom and does this partnership work? Even if partners are involved in planning or decision making it is also the degree of involvement that is likely to determine the degrees of success. For example a recent comparative study conducted by McLeod (2015) on Community Policing structures within the post conflict countries of Timor-Leste and Solomon Islands in which New Zealand was involved, concluded when there was
more extensive involvement from those whom the interventions were meant to benefit produced better results.

Irrespective of the vagaries around what partnership is at a structural and procedural level, using police for peace building requires that host-State organisations must be an integral part of the planning process as a means to create national ownership (United Nations, 2014b, p. 2). This requirement necessitates an appreciation that partnerships are never neutral and that power relations shape the boundaries of partnerships (Tolley, 2011, p. 39). This means that to achieve change in development also requires an understanding where power lies, such as understanding that the political elites in a country will have their own political and cultural agendas. These agendas may be positive, negative or neutral in nature when applied to the goals of the intervention (Grabosky, 2009, p. 221; Groves & Hinton, 2004, p. 31).

In terms of peace building interventions, Unsworth (2009, p. 892) writes that the provision of technical support is not the solution. A greater understanding of the shared responsibility of the problem and what the key issues are that impact either positively or negatively on the policing role is the solution (Grabosky, 2009, p. 220). A significant component of police reform, typically carried out by non host-State actors, has recently been conducted through the process of capacity building and development (Caparini, 2014, p. vii; United Nations, 2015a).

### 2.4 Capacity Building Within Policing Development Interventions

In exploring the concept of capacity development the UN (2006, p. 7 & 8) provides a definition in that capacity development is a long-term process in which individuals, organizations, institutions and societies develop abilities to perform functions, solve problems and set and achieve objectives. It is broken into three inter-related levels of the individual, institutional and societal. Separating groups and organisations from individuals, the UN (2006, p. 7 & 8) defines that capacity development for individuals is “to embark on a continuous process of learning and adapting to change, building on existing knowledge and skills and enhancing and using them in new directions”. However the concept of capacity-building and development has long been viewed as challenging to define within the development community and when done so the definition can be general and vague (Caparini, 2014, p. 5 & 6).
The lack of a clear or concise definition has implications for the implementation of police capacity-building and development activities. While the newly promulgated UN (2015a, p. 36 & 40) guidelines on Police Capacity-Building and Development provides the UN with a framework for identifying the areas of intervention, the guidelines do not explain at an individual level how UN Police are meant to manage themselves and others when interacting at the field level. However, as Ubels, Acquaye-Baddoo, and Fowler (2010, p. xviii & 6) emphasise, capacity develops as much through relationships between actors as it does within individual organizations. The significance of relationships, they say, involves not only unleashing collaboration but also being able to deal with power and politics. For many post conflict or fragile States, it has long been highlighted that policing services can be heavily politicised and act as an instrument of the State. They can also be factionalised and these factions inside such organisations may have different motivations, points of view and interests (Baranyi & Salahub, 2011; Enloe, 1976; Neild, 2001). There is then a requirement for systems and abilities that work with and through these differences in points of view and power to achieve effective collaboration. More specifically Long and Long (1992, p. 272) explain, capacity development becomes more about supporting structures and enablers to make decisions that deal with the complexities of power and relationships. Power can include the power from being seen as a knowledge expert who can fix problems that others cannot (Escobar, 1988, p. 430; 1997, p. 86 & 87). This ability to make the right decisions in the development context, Groves and Hinton (2004) believe, is determined by personal agency.

2.5 Personal Agency Within Policing Development Interventions

At an individual level, personal agency is the capability to originate and direct actions from decisions for a given purpose. This in turn is influenced by the belief in one’s effectiveness in performing specific tasks as well as actual skill (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006, p. 1). However many police officers coming from different environments deploying to different States can have issues. As Skolnick (2005, p. 264) writes, there are distinct cognitive tendencies in police, as an occupational group, where police officers, as a result of combined features of their social situation, tend to develop ways of looking at the world that are distinct to themselves. Goldsmith (2009, p. 131) says, that for police officers deploying overseas, the transition from the specific work environment of being a police officer, that has different roles to working overseas developing other police officers and
institutions, can create a dichotomy in expectation. For example, Harris and Goldsmith (2012, pp. 1029-1031) evaluated 120 interviews with police officers working within Australian Police deployments, focusing on the three key areas of partnership, capacity building and community engagement. They found that Australian Police officers primarily still saw their roles as that of policing rather than of persons involved in developing host-State police officers.

In the development context, Groves and Hinton (2004) emphasise that personal agency requires a recognition that the process of development is unpredictable and fluid, requiring flexible and adaptive procedures. In recognising that, people working in the development context must have the appropriate behaviours and attitudes for working in different contexts (Chambers, 2013a). Goldsmith and Dinnen (2007, pp. 1106-1107) have recommended for police preparing themselves for working overseas to:

1. Learn about the foreign setting in considerable detail before active engagement.
2. Display a degree of reflexivity and humility about the objectives behind police building and how these might be perceived and responded to locally.
3. Adopt a methodology of practice that is flexible and adaptive to local circumstances, including the ability to defer to local knowledge and methods in developing appropriate measures.
4. Practise a kind of institutional reform that is not limited to the short-term technical aspects of police service delivery, but rather is grounded in the broader set of political relations, informal as well as formal, that constitute the terrain of police building.

These preparatory recommendations emphasise that such changes, if required, are not the sole responsibility of the individual. Groves and Hinton (2004) highlight that in development practice individuals must also be encouraged by their organisations to act flexibly and creatively in ways to promote relationship building to also break down power imbalances. How New Zealand incorporates those approaches involving New Zealand police officers will be explored later in Chapter Four.

2.6 Chapter Conclusion

This chapter discussed that over time the role of a police officer deploying overseas has evolved from just that of peacekeeping. There are now development components within
interventions that focus on the reform, restructuring and rebuilding of other police services. They require not only technical support but a consideration of the political and social implications of the intervention for interaction with the host-State and host-State Police to define and implement realistic goals for the country of concern. It appears that there has been structural change to include such development concepts as partnership and capacity building to achieve reform. However, within these police deployments the way those concepts are interpreted and applied at the development interface have connotations at the individual level that includes the managing of power inequalities. These connotations also require support at an organisational level for best effect. Just as importantly there remains a need to consider that the use of police officers from one country to another requires a reorientation from being a police officer to being a police officer involved in developing other police officers that best meet the needs of the beneficiaries of the intervention. How New Zealand deployed its police within this changing environment will be explored in the following chapter.
Chapter Three: Literature Review of New Zealand Police Deployments
3. Introduction

This chapter contributes to analysing the overseas development interventions that New Zealand police officers are involved as a final objective of research question one ‘In what way are the New Zealand Police involved in overseas development?’ This is undertaken by exploring the history of New Zealand Police contributions and involvement in peace keeping missions and long term deployments for reform, restructuring and rebuilding. To understand New Zealand’s placement within the geopolitical environment and the use of New Zealand police the background, makeup and characteristics of the New Zealand Police as an organisation will be examined. A mapping of the changes in the types of New Zealand Police deployments is then undertaken. How these changes are now aligned to the New Zealand Governments pursuit of overseas development that has its focus on the Asia Pacific region is shown. Also examined is the formation of the New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID), later named as The New Zealand Aid Programme, (also to be referred to as NZAID) and how its structural and political changes have affected New Zealand Police deployments. Finally discussed are the similarities to and cooperation that New Zealand has with Australia in terms of policing interventions. This comparison shows the structures and systems that formulate New Zealand’s past and current placement within the role of policing development interventions.

3.1 Background and Formation of New Zealand Police

On the 29th of January 1840, as part of the colonisation process of New Zealand, the first five police officers arrived in New Zealand from Australia to act as a guard for William Hobson, the soon to be Governor (Anderson & Killingray, 1991, p. 55). From 1898 the New Zealand Police (NZP), as a single national service, historically began modelling the London Metropolitan Police which identified police as being a professional organisation that serve the community while originating from and being part of the community (Emsley & Shpayer-Makov, 2006, p. 158; Senior, 1997, p. 43 & 44). This policing model has continued to serve the New Zealand Police especially after adopting Community-Oriented Policing (COP) as a major policy in the late 1980s, later incorporating problem solving within its implementation (Coquilhat & New Zealand Police, 2008, p. 13 & 15). Such a model of a community based professional service was seen as a desired characteristic for international police in post conflict countries where there is a need for de-militarization and the bolstering of civilian control (Greener, 2011a, p. 233). In 2015 there was
approximately 8700 sworn police officers (O’Connor, 2015, p. 2) serving a population of approximately 4.5 million people in a country that in 2015 was considered 11th on the OECD global better life index, that measures a country’s perceptions as to quality of life (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2015a).

To cope with an increase of New Zealand police deploying overseas the International Services Group (ISG) was formed in 2004 within the New Zealand Police Headquarters to become the point of contact and management for those deployments (Greener, 2013, p. 6; New Zealand Police, 2015b). However, as with many other developed countries, there are constraints on the numbers of New Zealand police available for long term deployment. With no standing police capacity for such work, recruitment must be rotated from police districts and there is a discretionary nature as to who will deploy (Greener, 2011a, p. 229; Greener, 2013, p. 6). In October 2014 there was a commitment of 33 New Zealand police officers on long term capacity building deployments (New Zealand Police, 2014, p. 4).

3.2 The Focus for New Zealand Police Deployments Within the Asia-Pacific Region

As there has been no comprehensive work published that details and describes the history of New Zealand Police deployments, I conducted a mapping exercise as part of this research to identify the history and range of changes to New Zealand Police deployments. This was undertaken to understand why and how these changes had occurred as part of the issues within this study. The deployments mapped were those that were of a peacekeeping, reform, rebuilding and restructuring nature that also represent a longer term commitment to an intervention. Information relating to the timing of deployment, country deployed to, numbers of New Zealand police officers deployed, nature of the intervention as well as the sources of information were placed into a series of tables to compared and identify any patterns and changes to deployments.

The mapping exercise is summarised in Table 1 and it shows that the New Zealand Police have been deployed overseas since 1909. Prior to 2000 almost half of these deployments were to UN peace keeping operations as highlighted in Table 1. From 2000 the number of New Zealand Police deployments overseas almost doubled. Yet as deployments increased, support to UN peacekeeping operations dropped. Since 2000 there has only been one contribution to a UN peacekeeping operation and that closed down at the end of 2012. There are currently no New Zealand police deployed to any UN peace keeping operations (United Nations, 2015b). In spite of this New Zealand holds a seat on the UN Security
Council for a two year period that commenced in January 2015 (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2015e, p. 13). Of the six UN missions the New Zealand Police participated in, only two had a development component to it, as highlighted in Table 2.

Table 1 New Zealand Police overseas deployments 1909 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Deployment Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>(Butterworth, 2005, p. 232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>(The Auckland Star, 1928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>(Butterworth, 2005, p. 233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>UNFICYP</td>
<td>(Brown, Barker, &amp; Burke, 1984, p. 223 to 225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>(Butterworth, 2005, p. 229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>UNTEAT</td>
<td>(Morgan, 2011, p. 2; Shipley, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Bougainville</td>
<td>BCPP</td>
<td>(McAlister, Pisi, Darroch, &amp; Busil, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>IPMT</td>
<td>(Goff, 2000, 2002b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>SIPP</td>
<td>(Goff, 2002a; New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>RAMSI</td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Bougainville</td>
<td>BCPP</td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Op Highland</td>
<td>(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2013a, p. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner</td>
<td>(Fraenkel, Madraiwiwi, &amp; Okole, 2014, p. 44; Solomon Star, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>ISF</td>
<td>(Clark, 2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 United Nations deployments involving New Zealand police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Deployment Name</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>UNMIT</td>
<td>(King, 2006b; New Zealand Police, 2012b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>Nuku’a alofa riots</td>
<td>(King, 2006a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>(Island Notebook, 2007; New Zealand Press Association, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>(Fraenkel et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Pitcairn Island</td>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>(Department for International Development, nd; Northern News, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>TPDP</td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>(Matangi Tonga, 2011; Ministry of Information and Communications, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>CPP</td>
<td>(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>TLCPP</td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>West Papua</td>
<td></td>
<td>(New Zealand Government, 2013; Pearl &amp; Arnaz, 2014; Santos, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Cook Islands, Kiribati, Tuvalu, Niue, Tokelau, Vanuatu &amp; Samoa</td>
<td>3Ps</td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bougainville</td>
<td>BCPP</td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 United Nations deployments involving New Zealand police
With increasing requests for peace support operations from other countries and the United Nations, the New Zealand government developed four criteria to determine whether or not to contribute to a particular peace support operation:

1. The strategic implications of the operation, including its effect on security, the humanitarian situation and New Zealand’s relationships with other countries.
2. The nature of the mission – the legality of the proposed mission and mandate under international law.
3. The possible repercussions for New Zealand agencies involved in the proposed operation.
4. The question of whether New Zealand can assist the fragile or post-conflict state in other ways (Capie, 2014).

These criteria, combined with the following factors, appear to have contributed to the changing situation for police deployments in that rather than increasing the number of UN deployments they were reduced. These factors are: firstly, the growing concerns around the efficiencies and associated costs of police being deployed within UN missions (as mentioned in Chapter 2) (Fleitz, 2002, p. 77 & 111; Hills, 2015a, p. 146); and secondly, the changing nature of security, economics and politics within the Asia-Pacific Region. In relation to the Pacific, New Zealand has long had security, economic, political and environmental interests in the South Pacific region. These arise from geographical proximity, a shared maritime environment, cultural and historical links between the Polynesian populations of New Zealand and other Pacific Island States, missionary and educational contacts, trade, investment, and migration flows (Thakur, 1993). In the South-East Asia region, New Zealand has recognised that to be involved is also to take part in the institutional changes taking place in the region. New Zealand has, since 1989, played a
role in the Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) after both New Zealand and Australia were invited to join in 2004. Such participation was summed up in 2007 when New Zealand’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) stated ‘New Zealand must continue to develop positive relationships and make contributions to regional affairs that underpin our participation’(Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2007, pp. 19-21). From the 1990s there has been a shift to New Zealand’s identity being that of a Pacific nation and this coupled with a growing number of unsettling incidents within the Asia Pacific region, that Australia named the ‘arc of instability’, created a realisation that politics did not rotate around the old superpowers. This change in the geo-political situation resulted in a narrowing of focus by New Zealand to this region (Dobell, 2006; Kerslake, 2010, p. 13 & 14; Rumley, Forbes, & Griffin, 2006; Thakur, 1993, p. 76 & 77). These security concerns resulted in what some called a new and powerful ‘doomsday’ stereotype of the South Pacific, promoting the idea of Pacific islands as ‘failing’ States by both Australian and New Zealand Pacific experts. Others, however, took a differing view in not judging Pacific Island States harshly as they are still in the process of development and retain traditional sources of cohesion (Baird, 2008, p. 37).

Finally, a review of the management of MFAT in 2001, found inefficiencies and a lack of effectiveness in how the two billion dollars spent in the previous ten years for Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) programmes had been used (Grossman & Lees, 2001, p. 91). The result of the review was the formation of New Zealand Aid (NZAID) in 2002 (later renamed as the New Zealand Aid Programme) that was to focus its efforts primarily in the Pacific region to support New Zealand’s interests in growth and security (Banks, Murray, Overton, & Scheyvens, 2012; Grossman & Lees, 2001, p. 6 & 33; Robson, 2002).

Since NZAIDs’ formation in 2002 (Robson, 2002), all of the New Zealand Police deployments have occurred within the Asia-Pacific region, with the exception of a deployment to Afghanistan in 2005. The changing nature of New Zealand Police deployments is further highlighted in Table 3, which shows that only two deployments, post the formation of NZAID, did not have the elements of reform, restructure or rebuild within the intervention.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Region &amp; Country</th>
<th>Deployment Name</th>
<th>Elements of Reform</th>
<th>Rebuild</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Pacific/Solomon Islands</td>
<td>SIPP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Goff, 2002a; New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Pacific/Solomon Islands</td>
<td>RAMSI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Pacific/Bougainville</td>
<td>BCPP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Middle East/Afghanistan</td>
<td>Op Highland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2013a, p. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Pacific/Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Fraenkel et al., 2014, p. 44; Solomon Star, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Asia/Timor-Leste</td>
<td>ISF</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Asia/Timor-Leste</td>
<td>UNMIT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(King, 2006b; New Zealand Police, 2012b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Pacific/Tonga</td>
<td>Nuku’a alofa riots</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>(King, 2006a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Pacific/Cook Islands</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Island Notebook, 2007; New Zealand Press Association, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Pacific/Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Fraenkel et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Pacific/Pitcairn Island</td>
<td>Police officer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Department for International Development, nd; Northern News, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Pacific/Tonga</td>
<td>TPDP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Pacific/Tonga</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Matangi Tonga, 2011; Ministry of Information and Communications, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Asia/Timor-Leste</td>
<td>CPP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Pacific/Cook Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(New Zealand Agency for International Development, 2008a; New Zealand Police &amp; Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2013, p. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Asia/Timor-Leste</td>
<td>TLCPP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Pacific/Cook Islands, Kiribati, Tuvalu, Niue, Tokelau Vanuatu &amp; Samoa</td>
<td>3Ps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Afghanistan appears to have been an exception to the Asia Pacific focus for three reasons; it supported the UN, offered an opportunity to work more closely with NATO and was an important part of restoring the bilateral security relationship with the United States of America, which had been strained after New Zealand adopted nuclear-free policies in the 1980s (Capie, 2014). Those development interventions within the Asia Pacific region have since forged closer relationships between the New Zealand Police, the New Zealand Aid Programme and Australia, weighing the balance of power towards Australia and New Zealand (Boswell, 2010, p. 83). This will be discussed in more detail in the following sections.

### 3.3 New Zealand Police and the New Zealand Aid Programme Relationship

In July 2002 the Minister responsible for overseas aid and development, Matt Robson, formally announced New Zealand’s first dedicated developmental aid agency – New Zealand Aid (NZAID), as solely dedicated to the elimination of extreme poverty in the world (Robson, 2002). The formation of NZAID was a result of the Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) review that recommended separating ODA from MFAT. While the creation of NZAID was primarily concerned with efficiency, it also sought to reconcile the philosophical disconnect between ODA and MFAT missions. The provision of ODA was about fulfilling partner government’s needs, while MFAT dealt with New Zealand’s foreign policy. NZAID, as semi-autonomous from MFAT, had its own budget and poverty reduction was to become NZAID’s overarching goal. The significant means to achieve poverty reduction was through quality aid design and delivery using sector based approaches that focused on good governance. NZAID’s goal at the time was to focus its efforts primarily in the Pacific region where New Zealand had a vested interest in growth and security (Banks, Murray, Overton, & Scheyvens, 2012; Grossman & Lees, 2001, p. 6 & 33; Robson, 2002). In 2008 NZAID was reabsorbed back into MFAT, being rebranded as the New Zealand Aid Programme and its focus shifted from poverty.
reduction and diversified livelihoods to economic growth, whilst the geographical focus remained in the Pacific region (Banks et al., 2012).

This focus on economics and security as a mechanism for the delivery of aid and development has resulted in changes in how New Zealand is viewed with its commitment and involvement for aid and development. For example, in July 2015 New Zealand was ranked 8th out of the top 27 wealthiest countries in the Commitment to Development Index (CDI) (Krylová & Barder, 2015, p. 2). The CDI is produced by the Centre for Global Development (CGD), a US non-profit think tank based in Washington, D.C. that focuses on international development. The index ranks all of the member nations of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) measures on “development-friendliness” (the DAC is a forum of 29 countries to discuss issues surrounding aid, development and poverty reduction in developing countries (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2015d)). This measures their potential to help poor countries with their policies in seven policy areas: aid, trade, investment, migration, environment, security, and technology. The index penalises countries that give with one hand, for instance through aid or investment, but take away with the other, through trade barriers or pollution. (Krylová & Barder, 2015, p. 1) New Zealand ranked the highest performer in trade, just above Australia, because of its low agricultural subsidies and low tariffs on imports from developing countries. It also ranked top in the Service Trade Restrictions Index (Krylová & Barder, 2015, p. 3 & 5). In the area of security, New Zealand, together with Norway and Denmark, took the top spots for their significant contributions to internationally sanctioned peacekeeping and humanitarian interventions and for ratifying major arms control treaties and the Rome Statute which created the International Criminal Court. However it was noted by the CDI that New Zealand, like Greece, tended to channel aid through lower quality multilateral agencies (Krylová & Barder, 2015, p. 5 & 8).

In comparison to the above study, a 2015 Development Cooperation peer review of New Zealand by the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee found that New Zealand was considered to be a ‘good global citizen’ that was mostly a result of a development friendly approach in trade and the environment (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2015e, p. 15 & 25). Further acknowledged was the advocacy and support for Small Island States in the Pacific that New Zealand confirms it would be involved with for some years to come. However the review suggests that New Zealand expands it’s humanitarian responses to natural disasters or conflict beyond the Pacific (Organisation for
Economic Cooperation and Development, 2015e, pp. 19, 21 & 25). Also, in terms of contribution the 2014-15 estimated contribution of US $489 million, equivalent to 0.27% of gross national income, was well below the 0.39% for DAC members and did not compare well with other countries with similar population, size and economy (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2015e, p. 41).

During the period of 2005 to 2011, with the primary focus in the Asia Pacific region, the New Zealand Aid Programme invested over NZ $75 million, approximately one and a half percent of the total aid programme, in development interventions to support policing (The Law and Development Partnership, 2013b, p. 12). Development interventions that support security structures are allowed through the Development Assistance Committees guidelines of which New Zealand has been a member since 1973. The guidelines for the development of police in other countries, unlike military, can be claimed as Overseas Development Assistance (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2008a, p. 2; 2015c). The use of New Zealand police officers in development interventions has resulted in a situation where New Zealand works in co-operation with Australia in policing development programmes.

3.4 Alliance with the Australian Police

The Asia Pacific focus has also forged a stronger trans-Tasman alliance between the New Zealand Police and the Australian Federal Police (AFP). The AFP was formed in 1979 and is responsible for Australian Police deployments (Australian Federal Police, 2010, p. 12; 2015b). In 2008 this relationship was described as the most important of all the New Zealand Police’s foreign law enforcement relationships. There are regular continuing bilateral meetings between the Australian Federal Police and the New Zealand Police regarding off shore missions as well as programme and project work in the Pacific (New Zealand Police, 2008, p. 26; 2012a, p. 38). Table 4 shows all New Zealand Police deployments and highlights if there was no presence of Australian Police within those interventions or country. It can be seen in Table 4 that the majority of New Zealand Police deployments the Australian Federal Police, or Australian Police prior to the Australian Federal Police forming, have either played a part or have been present in country.

In this context Greener (2009, p. 62), comments that Australian and New Zealand authorities have recognized that each country can undertake competent and complementary roles in places traditionally seen as part of the other’s area of interest.
Boswell (2010, pp. 81-82) in conducting a study of policing in the Pacific, however, advises caution on such relationships and approaches. While Boswell (2010, pp. 81-82) acknowledged Australia and New Zealand genuinely want to advance development in the Pacific, adds no country enjoys being labelled as a failing or failed state as it means it can only be fixed by those with the power and resources. This kind of unequal power in turn can breed resentment, frustrating western ideas of progress which typically wants to move things along.

The Australia New Zealand relationship, as Ayson (2006, p. 38) says only tends to become energised when Australia and New Zealand are both focused on security challenges in the South Pacific. Yet both Australia and New Zealand are continuing to support each other and are following similar patterns both in terms of police deployments and development assistance. Australia, like New Zealand, has significantly reduced its police contributions to UN missions and as of March 2015 has 15 police officers working in the UN mission (UNFICYP) in Cyprus (United Nations, 2015b), reducing all other activities to the Asia Pacific region (Australian Federal Police, 2015a; United Nations, 2015b).

**Table 4 New Zealand Police deployments with an Australian Police presence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Deployment Name</th>
<th>Australian Police present in country</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>UNFICYP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(Australian Federal Police, 2010, p. 84; Brown et al., 1984, p. 223 to 225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Deployment Name</td>
<td>Australian Police present in country</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>SIPP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(Australian Federal Police, 2010; Goff, 2002a; Plowman, 2003, p. 126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>RAMSI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(Australian Federal Police, 2010, p. 66; New Zealand Aid Programme, 2013c, p. 5; New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Bougainville</td>
<td>BCPP</td>
<td>Australia arrives 2004 but leaves 2005</td>
<td>(McAlister et al., 2006, p. 4; New Zealand Police, 2015a; The Law and Development Partnership, 2013b, p. 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(Fraenkel et al., 2014, p. 44; New Zealand Police, 2007; Solomon Star, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>Nuku’alofa riots</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(Australian Federal Police, 2010, p. 73; King, 2006a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(Australian Federal Police, 2010, p. 175; Fraenkel et al., 2014; New Zealand Aid Programme, 2013b, p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>TPDP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(Australian High Commission Tonga, 2013; New Zealand Aid Programme, 2012; New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Deployment Name</td>
<td>Australian Police present in country</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(Australian Federal Police, 2010; Matangi Tonga, 2011; Ministry of Information and Communications, 2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virtually operating in tandem since the late 1990s to 2014, both Australia and New Zealand have contributed very similar amounts of their gross national income (GNI) to overseas development assistance (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2015b). The biggest discrepancy between the two countries occurred from 2011 to 2013 with a drop in ODA from New Zealand. This in part has been recognised as the negative effects caused by the 2011 Canterbury earthquakes (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2015e, p. 11). In 2014 both Australia and New Zealand both contributed 0.27% of their gross national income for overseas development assistance (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2015b).
3.5 Parallel Structures of the New Zealand and Australian Police and Aid Agencies

In relation to police deployments, New Zealand and Australia have since duplicated the structures for these deployments. For example the counterpart to the New Zealand Police’s International Service Group (ISG), that manages overseas police deployments and programmes is the Australian Federal Police’s International Deployment Group (IDG) that was formed in 2004 just before the New Zealand Police ISG in 2005 (Australian Federal Police, 2015a; The Law and Development Partnership, 2013b, p. 12). Similarly, the New Zealand Aid Programme’s development counterpart is the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAid). The relationship was strengthened when their respective governments signed the Cairns Compact on Strengthening Development Coordination. This was endorsed in 2009 by all members of the Pacific Islands Forum (Coxon, HilaryTolley, Fua, & Nabobo-Baba, 2011, p. 6). AusAid, like NZAID, had been autonomous from its parent agency, the Australian Department of Foreign affairs and Trade (DFAT). Similarly AusAid like NZAid was brought back into DFAT in 2013. There have been similar concerns to those in relation to NZAID’s absorption back into MFAT of the inevitably of the aid budget being used to promote national interests (Banks et al., 2012; SBS World Australia, 2013).

3.6 Characteristics of New Zealand Police Deployments

Table 5 is an examination of the types of interventions used by New Zealand Police in reform, rebuilding and restructuring activities funded by NZAID. It shows there are two main themes that run through the interventions which are: the mentoring and training of host-State police and Community-Oriented Policing.

Table 5 New Zealand Police overseas programmes funded by NZAID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Countries with COP used</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NZP in country</th>
<th>Theme &amp; General Tasks</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>RAMSI</td>
<td>35-10</td>
<td>Executive police powers &amp; Advising working with Solomon Island Police/mentoring and training</td>
<td>(Fraenkel et al., 2014, p. 8; New Zealand Aid Programme, 2013b, p. 6; 2013c, p. 5; New Zealand Police, 2014, p. 4; 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Countries with COP used</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>NZP in country</td>
<td>Theme &amp; General Tasks</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Op Highland</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>Mentoring to Senior Afghan Police &amp; Train the trainers at academy on community information &amp; refresher courses</td>
<td>(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2013a, p. 2 &amp; 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>CPP</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Develop community policing model, mentor &amp; train on COP</td>
<td>(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2013a, p. 2; New Zealand Police, 2015c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>TPDP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trainers &amp; mentors to new recruits. Included a Commissioner until 2014.</td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2015a; Peek, White, Weg, &amp; Fukofuka, 2011, p. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring &amp; training / technical assistance on a short term basis each year for leadership development programme, installation of a radio communications network, support for outreach to youth</td>
<td>(New Zealand Agency for International Development, 2008a; New Zealand Police &amp; Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2013, p. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>TLCPP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To increase capacity to implement COP and to mainstream COP across the police service.</td>
<td>(Dinnen &amp; Peake, 2013; New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011; New Zealand Police, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>West Papua</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Training, mentoring support, curriculum development and community engagement</td>
<td>(New Zealand Government, 2013; Pearl &amp; Arnaz, 2014; Santos, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Cook Islands, Kiribati, Tuvalu, Niue, Tokelau, Vunuatu &amp; Samoa</td>
<td>3Ps</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training and support activities to improve prosecutions, youth, alcohol, road safety, operational emergency response &amp; community policing</td>
<td>(Australian Federal Police, 2015a; New Zealand Police, 2013, 2015b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Firstly, for New Zealand led interventions the role for the intervention is mainly through the provision of New Zealand police officers to mentor and train host-State police, which are people centric in approach. Training for mentoring has been given to New Zealand police officers who are to deploy overseas (New Zealand Police, 2015b). A trainer for the company that had delivered the mentoring training later made general comments in a web site interview about the characteristics of New Zealand police officers that might pose difficulties in applying mentoring. Within the interview New Zealand police officers were described as ‘real elite action men’ who would need to slow down, reflect and think more in getting others to think differently. (McNicoll & Drake, 2013). The exception to being a mentor or trainer was the Australian led Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands (RAMSI) that uses the term advisor (Hayward-Jones, 2014, p. 14).

The second theme found within the policing interventions was that of Community-Oriented Policing (COP) which is apparent throughout most of the interventions. However, the geographical proximity to New Zealand appears to determine if COP is a major component of the programme. For those countries that were further away from New Zealand, COP appears throughout the intervention and in subsequent interventions this appears to transition to a focus on strengthening across all aspects of policing and governance. However, for those states closer to New Zealand, COP is merged within other activities and is not the sole focus. Brogden (2004, p. 635 to 636) in examining the use of COP in conflict environments highlights that COP is often used as a panacea from the West that has appeal for politicians as a solution to what are usually complex issues. Brogden warns against the dangers of misunderstanding and the imposition of models that do not suit the context.

With the focus on the Asia Pacific region, the more recent police deployments are also now mostly operating in countries with a better quality of life than those prior to the formation of NZAID in 2002. The 2015 OEDC evaluation of New Zealand’s development assistance commented that many of New Zealand’s priority countries are no longer in a least development country category (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2015e, p. 42). Table 6 aligns New Zealand Police deployments with the country of intervention where Human development index (HDI) statistics are available.
The HDI was created to emphasize that people and their capabilities should be the ultimate criteria for assessing the development of a country, not economic growth alone. The HDI does not reflect on inequalities, poverty, human security, and empowerment but rather is a summary measure of average achievement in key dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, being knowledgeable and having a decent standard of living (United Nations Development Programme, 2015j).

Table 6 New Zealand Police deployment comparison to Human Development Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Region and Country</th>
<th>Deployment Name</th>
<th>Year &amp; HDI of Country</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Pacific/ PNG-Bougainville</td>
<td>BCPP</td>
<td>2000 0.423</td>
<td>(McAlister et al., 2006; United Nations Development Programme, 2015c, p. 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NZAID formed 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Pacific/ PNG-Bougainville</td>
<td>BCPP</td>
<td>2005 0.452 2014 0.505</td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2015a; United Nations Development Programme, 2015c, p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Middle East/Afghanistan</td>
<td>Op Highland</td>
<td>2005 0.399 2012 0.463</td>
<td>(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2013a, p. 2; United Nations Development Programme, 2015a, p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Asia/Timor-Leste</td>
<td>ISF UNMIT/CPP TLPDP</td>
<td>2005 0.505 2005 0.505 2014 0.595</td>
<td>(Clark, 2006; King, 2006b; New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 7; New Zealand Police, 2012b; United Nations Development Programme, 2015g, p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Pacific/Kiribati, PPDVP 3Ps</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005 0.575 2014 0.590</td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2013; Pacific Prevention of Domestic Violence Programme, 2015; Turnbull, 2011,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Region and Country</td>
<td>Deployment Name</td>
<td>Year &amp; HDI of Country</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Pacific/Tonga</td>
<td>PPDVP Nuku’alofa riots TPDP Commissioner</td>
<td>2005 0.693 2014 0.717</td>
<td>(King, 2006a; Pacific Prevention of Domestic Violence Programme, 2015; Turnbull, 2011, p. i; United Nations Development Programme, 2015h, p. 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows that in relation to New Zealand Police deployments, from the creation of NZAID in 2002 (Robson, 2002), in seven of the 12 deployments that have had a development component to them up until 2015, the New Zealand Government has placed, or attempted to place New Zealand police officers to undertake senior management posts within the police service of the host-State country or to be in a position of influence to effect the interventions within the country.

**Table 7 Positions of power for New Zealand police in deployments from 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Development programme name</th>
<th>NZ police officer holding positions within the host-State Police</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bougainville</td>
<td>BCPP</td>
<td>No although attempts were made to secure a superintendents post through the Papua New Guinea authorities within the Bougainville Police</td>
<td>(The Law and Development Partnership, 2013a, p. 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Op Highland</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2013a, p. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>Development programme name</td>
<td>NZ police officer holding positions within the host-State Police</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>ISF</td>
<td>Yes; Senior Police UNMIT posts were held by New Zealand Police within the pilot areas</td>
<td>(Clark, 2006; Emmott, Barcham, Taimoor, &amp; Soares, 2010; King, 2006b; New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 7; New Zealand Police, 2012b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Pitcairn Island</td>
<td>Police Officer with 1 x local Police</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Cousins, 2013; Department for International Development, nd; Northern News, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>3Ps</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tokelau</td>
<td>3Ps</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(New Zealand Police, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>Development programme name</td>
<td>NZ police officer holding positions within the host-State Police</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>West Papua</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Programme stopped before even really starting</td>
<td>(New Zealand Government, 2013; Pearl &amp; Arnaz, 2014; Santos, 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.7 Chapter Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to describe how New Zealand Police deployments have evolved and how the structures and systems have influenced these deployments over time. It was found that New Zealand, despite currently holding a seat on the United Nations Security Council has followed a global trend in that developed countries are reducing the number of police officers deployed to UN peace keeping missions. New Zealand is now focusing on interventions that are aligned to the security and economic interests held by the New Zealand Government. These interests are located primarily in the Asia Pacific region and are closely aligned to the same interests that the Australian Government has in terms of security and trade. The result of these security and economic interests has meant that since 2000 there has been an increase use of New Zealand police officers predominantly in the areas of mentoring, advising and training as a means of capacity building for host-State Police within the Asia-Pacific region.

Beyond the immediate Pacific region the tenet of Community-Oriented Policing is used, likely as a political tool, while closer to home these interventions take a more operational strengthening role where it is not uncommon for a New Zealand police officer to occupy or be in a position of influence within the host-State Police. The increasing need for New Zealand police officers for development purposes has also resulted in an alliance between Australian Police, New Zealand Police organisations and their respective development aid agencies. The Australian components of police and aid agencies have followed similar developments in their evolution and modalities for police deployments. This alliance has resulted in Australia and New Zealand influencing the direction of policing within the Pacific region. While it appears such interventions are appreciated by the recipients, there are risks in being a provider of resources and being seen as the ones who can fix problems. This dynamic is contributing to creating power imbalances between donors and recipients and power imbalances and if not handled properly, could frustrate future development
interventions. The programme management tools that are used to define review and evaluate the intervention for the use of New Zealand police officers within these development interventions will be examined in the following chapter.
Chapter Four: New Zealand Police Overseas Development Programmes, Case Study of Timor-Leste
4. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to conduct a document analysis on overseas development programme documents for Timor-Leste for two interventions that have taken place, the Community Policing Pilot (CPP) and the Timor-Leste Community Policing Programme 2011-2015 (TLCPP). These interventions were in part managed by New Zealand and involved New Zealand police. These documents are the basis of the framework New Zealand police officers work within. As well as setting the expectations of the development interventions and directing the actors involved towards achieving the desired results and the activities, they also review and evaluate the performance of the programme to meeting programme outcomes. This analysis is linked to the survey and interviews conducted on New Zealand police officers who have deployed overseas which are discussed in the following chapter. Prior to conducting the analysis of these programme documents this chapter will first explain the procedure used to examine and analyse the documents. It establishes a background context which was obtained from some of the documents analysed and other sources for the various interventions.

4.1 Plans, Reviews and Evaluations

Different planning modalities, including results frameworks and log frames, have become the means in which to plan and manage development interventions (Hummelbrunner, 2010, p. 1; United Nations Development Programme, 2011, p. 20). In principal they serve as the means in which to think critically in describing the goals, objectives and include the necessary actions, including the allocation of resources, to meet these planned goals or objectives. (Bullen, 2014; Merriam-Webster, 2015; United Nations Development Programme, 2011, p. 7 & 53). To assess the progress of goals or objectives or to determine if they have been achieved the management tools of monitoring and evaluation are used in the lifecycle of these plans and reviews and are often used as part of the monitoring process (United Nations Development Programme, 2011, p. 8 & 9). There is a distinction between a review and an evaluation. A review is a ‘snapshot’ in the life of an initiative that tends to focus on operational issues or the effectiveness of governance and project management structures to improve implementation. Evaluations determine the extent to which intended and unintended outcomes are achieved and how they have affected stakeholders (Australian Government, 2013, p. 2).
4.2 Procedure Undertaken for the Document Analysis

This analysis contributes to the second research question and its associated objectives, ‘What are the gaps between the expectation of New Zealand Police officer involvement during development interventions and the actual outcome?’

Programmes and projects involving New Zealand police officers in Timor-Leste were selected for this document analysis. This was because NZAID and the New Zealand Police have either controlled or had oversight over the plans, monitoring and evaluation for those policing development interventions. Examined were the past plans, monitoring and evaluation reports for policing development programmes in Timor-Leste, refer to Table 8.

Table 8 Programme documents examined for Timor-Leste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing Pilot (CPP) - Becora and Suai Timor-Leste</td>
<td>Redacted</td>
<td>New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing Pilot Programme Timor Leste; Independent Review</td>
<td>(Emmott et al., 2010)</td>
<td>The NZAID Programme website (open source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste Community Policing Programme 2011-2015</td>
<td>Redacted</td>
<td>New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Evaluation of TimorLeste Community Policing Programme (TLCPP) and Hametin Koperasaun Hamutuk Polisia ho Komunidade</td>
<td>(Peake, Wilson, &amp; Fernandes, 2014)</td>
<td>The NZAID Programme website (open source)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programme plans were obtained through The New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade pursuant to a request made under New Zealand’s Official Information Act 1982. Some information deemed sensitive, such as author’s names and the background to the intervention had been redacted. In those cases the source of the document is instead given within Table 8. The plans used for overseas development are what The NZAID Programme currently refers to as ‘activity design documents’ (New Zealand Aid Programme, 2015). Review and evaluation documents were available from The NZAID Programme website (open source), those documents are highlighted in Table 8.

For development initiatives, NZAID as a member of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) follow the DAC standards set for planning and monitoring and evaluation (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2015c, 2015d).
However in examining the documents listed in Table 8, it was noted that there was not only different formatting for each of the documents but also inconsistencies in how goals, objectivities, activities, outputs, indicators, and expected outcomes and impacts were described. Similarly for the reviews and evaluations, highlighted in Table 8, how the DAC meaning of the criteria were interpreted and subsequently presented within the review and evaluation documents was also mixed. This inconsistency made it difficult to understand not only how well the programmes and projects had performed overall but also to compare in order to see where changes or patterns were occurring.

A table was formed in which each development intervention in the country case study was placed; refer Appendix A1 for the Community Policing Pilot Programme Timor-Leste (CPP) and Appendix A2 for the Timor-Leste Community Policing Programme (TLCPP). The documents were examined and certain information was categorised into certain sections and later compared to identify any consistencies or patterns. This in part became a qualitative exercise where some information for each category had to be interpreted from the text of the documents.

The first section within each Appendix of A1 and A2 of the activity design documents highlights the resourcing and time period for the development intervention by identifying the commencement and duration of the intervention, number of New Zealand police involved and partner agencies from the documents in Table 8.

The second section of the activity design documents then highlights what was expected to be achieved or the desired outcomes from the activity design documents (plans) by identifying aspects of the intervention were that could be categorised as the;

- **Goal**: A broad statement about what the program or initiative intends to accomplish. It is also the intended long term outcome (Institute for Law and Justice, 2011).
- **Objectives**: Expected achievements that are well defined, specific, measurable, and derived from the goal(s) (Institute for Law and Justice, 2011).
- **Activities**: Efforts conducted to achieve the objectives (Institute for Law and Justice, 2011).

Following each activity design document within Appendix of A1 and A2, the respective review or evaluation documents in Table 8 were then examined to identify what had been
the perceived outcomes or achievements involving New Zealand police in Timor-Leste. Here the DAC criteria for monitoring and evaluation (The DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 2010, p. 13 & 14) were used to categorise within Appendixes A1 and A2 as;

- **Relevance**: The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor,
- **Effectiveness**: A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives,
- **Efficiency**: An economic term that measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs
- **Impact**: The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended,
- **Sustainability**: measures whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.

Following this, also searched for within the evaluation and review documents, refer Table 8, was commentary made by the reviewers and evaluators about the design and implementation of the intervention. These were mapped and categorised into the section titled as overall general comments on design and implementation within Appendixes’ A1 and A2.

Lastly, considered within the table for each of these programmes or projects was the recommendation by the United Nations (2014b, p. 2) and Unsworth (2009, p. 982) of the need to include development interventions processes that promote a greater understanding of a shared problem between the plan's stakeholders so as to create National ownership and partnerships. However, as Tolley (2011, p. 30) says, that for this to happen there also needs to be a reciprocal relationship in terms of power and trust. The documents refer Table 8, were then examined to identify if any structures or processes were present that would either create a greater understanding of the problem and/or share power. They were also categorised within Appendixes A1 and A2 under the heading of either ‘Shared understanding of a problem’ or ‘Sharing of power’.
4.3 Background and Setup of Development Programmes in Timor-Leste Involving New Zealand Police

In 2006 New Zealand Police deployed as a component of the UN Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT). In 2008 while New Zealand Police were part of UNMIT, the New Zealand Government received a direct request from the Government of Timor-Leste for New Zealand to help build capacity in the area of Community-Oriented Policing (COP). Approval was given by the local UN leadership for the New Zealand Police and NZAID to design and implement a capacity building intervention for COP within UNMIT using New Zealand police. Subsequently a COP pilot, entitled the Community Policing Pilot (CPP) to be carried between the Timorese National Police (PNTL), New Zealand Police and NZAID was designed (Emmott et al., 2010, p. i; New Zealand Agency for International Development, 2008b, p. 5). The goal of the pilot was made up of two parts, firstly to support the PNTL in developing a COP model and secondly, to pilot the model in the subdistricts of Becora and Suai. The initial phase of the pilot was to utilise five New Zealand Police community training modules, a draft Community Police officer job description and a draft Community Policing strategy, all provided by the New Zealand Police. Implementation was to be achieved by a coordinator and trainer plus up to 14 New Zealand personal working within UNMIT, providing support, advice, training and modelling. The pilot finished after 14 months in 2010 (Chinn & Everett, 2008, p. 5; Emmott et al., 2010; New Zealand Agency for International Development, 2008b; New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 7).

In 2011 the Timor-Leste Community Policing Programme (TLCPP), designed to run for at least four years, commenced (New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 8). This coincided with the drawdown and exit of UNMIT at the end of 2012. While New Zealand police continued to work within UNMIT, they were separate from this new programme that was in the process of start-up (New Zealand Police, 2012b). Goals for the programme were not stipulated in the programme design document, rather they were described as intended impacts. These impacts translated into building safe and secure communities through effective and efficient COP in Timor-Leste (New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 8 & 18). Implementation was through three work streams that were managed by two in country New Zealand police officers. The first was to build on work already undertaken by the PNTL COP Unit and provide support at a strategic level in the continuing development of a COP model relevant to the Timor-Leste context. The second was to focus on accessing
and supporting the development of COP training. A third part was to support the operationalising of those interventions. This involved other New Zealand police officers flying in and spending up to a total of 12 weeks a year in country to mentor PNTL in the implementation of COP within selected districts (New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, pp. 19-22). Those fly-in mentor numbers were later reduced to an unknown number of full time in country mentors (Peake et al., 2014). The programme, in referring to the need to work with other Aid organisations within Timor-Leste, highlighted the activities for community consultative mechanisms carried out by The Asia Foundation which were funded by NZAID. Emphasised within the TLCPP programme design was the need to coordinate with and identify opportunities for joint action between these two programmes (New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 11; Peake et al., 2014, p. 1).

4.4 Common Findings on Outcomes and Achievement for Development in Timor-Leste Involving New Zealand Police

When the reviews and evaluations for the CPP and TLCPP were compared for actual results, (refer to the Outcome and Impact section Appendixes A1 and A2 section), all the reviews and evaluations highlighted the relevant nature of the intervention within a post conflict country (Emmott et al., 2010, p. 7; Peake et al., 2014, p. 4). In assessing the effectiveness of the interventions it appeared that the reviewers and evaluators found the interventions were effective for attaining some objectives such as delivering training or programme setup within the activities and objectives of the intervention (Emmott et al., 2010, p. 19; Peake et al., 2014, p. 4). While there were degrees of efficiency found in the interventions by aligning activities to other agencies, the reviewers for the CPP believed this was largely subjective. The evaluators for the TLCPP pointed out that this aligning of activities was a doubling up, in turn creating confusion for the PNTL (Emmott et al., 2010, p. 19 & 20; Peake et al., 2014). In terms of assessing the overall impact of the interventions both assessments thought that they were unable to determine what the overall impacts of the contribution by New Zealand Police were (Emmott et al., 2010, p. 22; Peake et al., 2014, p. 30). As to assessing the sustainability of the interventions, the CPP reviewers believed that the pilot had not run long enough while for TLCPP the evaluators pointed out that the Government of Timor-Leste needed to remain enthusiastic on the topic of Community-Oriented Policing (Emmott et al., 2010, p. 33; Peake et al., 2014, p. 32).
4.5 Common Findings on the Design of Development Interventions in Timor-Leste Involving New Zealand Police

In the general comments section, as seen in Appendixes A1 and A2, the CPP and TLCPP were compared as to the nature of the respective intervention design. Both assessments commented on both interventions as having a lack of understanding of the context for operating within Timor-Leste. Both reviewers and the evaluators stated that this lack of understanding was seen to have contributed to aspirational goals and poor objective definition (Emmott et al., 2010, p. 8; Peake et al., 2014, p. 20). Of relevance in dealing with context, within the CPP general comments section, refer to Appendix A1, were comments about the incompatibilities between the New Zealand COP model and the COP model favoured and progressively being developed by the PNTL (Emmott et al., 2010, p. 6). This incompatibility was not picked up on in the TLCPP programme evaluation, but it was noted within the activity design documents for the TLCPP that the ‘NZ Community Policing model’ was again part of the reference in implementing the programme (New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, pp. 16, 17 & 19).

For both interventions, what was commented upon was a lack of or incorrect monitoring frameworks. The reviewers and evaluators explained that for both interventions they were unable to provide a clear picture of the contribution or impact that New Zealand Police activities made to meeting programme expectations (Emmott et al., 2010, p. 9; Peake et al., 2014, p. 5). Nevertheless, in the shared understanding of a problem and power sharing section, refer to Appendixes A1 and A2, it was found that the CPP and TLCPP had been inclusive in terms of the design with the existence of power sharing structures such as steering and management committees (New Zealand Agency for International Development, 2008b, p. 19; New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 29). However, the plans do not describe how power would be shared and the evaluations and reviews do not mention if such power sharing structures were successful. There is also no mention of how the PNTL would participate in the power sharing structures or how they perceived the power relationship between the New Zealand Police and the PNTL.

4.6 Chapter Conclusion

This chapter aimed to contribute to research question one ‘In what way are New Zealand Police involved in overseas development?’ and research question two, ‘What are the gaps between the expectation of New Zealand Police officer involvement during development
interventions and the actual outcome?’ Specifically this was achieved by examining and comparing the management tools of plans, and monitoring and evaluations reports that have been used for New Zealand Police overseas deployment interventions within Timor-Leste. Both interventions involved New Zealand police officers working with the host-State police to develop the capacity in the field of Community Oriented Policing. Collectively the interventions are perceived to be of value to the country of intervention and highly relevant. However collectively while there had been some achievement and objectives met within the interventions, overall it appears that in meeting the main goal of each respective intervention these were not met. The designs of the interventions acknowledged the need to power share as well as the need for all parties to have a greater understanding of a mutual problem. There were several consistent themes, or gaps within these interventions that appear to have reduced the success of the interventions from an organizational design level. The goals and some objectives were identified as being too aspirational or were outside the scope of the intervention. The reviews and evaluations of the programs also identified a consistent issue with poor monitoring and inconsistent reporting which made it more difficult to measure the impact and the associated effectiveness of the activities of the New Zealand police. Linked to this level of achievement and poor goal and objective setting was an insufficient understanding of the country context which includes setting unrealistic time scales and staffing levels. The interventions were only for Timor-Leste; they do, however, show some consistent patterns and trends. How these trends and patterns manifest will be seen in Chapter 5, in how New Zealand police officers place themselves within these development interventions.
Chapter Five: Key Findings of Survey and Interviews with Individual Police Officers
5. Introduction

A component of this research was a survey and a small number of follow up semi-structured interviews with New Zealand police officers who had been deployed as part of New Zealand development programmes. This chapter presents the key findings of the survey and interviews. To begin with a description of the survey and interview framework and how they were conducted is explained, followed by a discussion of the demographics of the research participants. The survey and interview results are then grouped under sections titled; why New Zealand Police are deployed, how they were prepared, how they identified their roles and tasks and what they saw as achievement and challenges while on deployment. The chapter concludes by summing up the findings.

5.1 Survey and Interviews

The survey and interviews were designed to contribute to the objective within the third research question, ‘How do New Zealand police officers perceive New Zealand Police practice within overseas development programmes?’

Within this question, four objectives were outlined. They are;

1. To identify the roles New Zealand Police officers associate to in development interventions
2. To identify the preparation for New Zealand Police officers for development interventions at an organisational and personal level.
3. To explore the challenges that New Zealand Police officers found detracted from achieving planned goals.
4. To explore the enablers that New Zealand Police officers found contributed to achieving planned outcomes.

The purpose of these objectives was to gain a sense of New Zealand police officer’s power and agency. The strategy of conducting a survey followed by an interview was for the survey to obtain perspectives on the practices by New Zealand police officers within deployments and then for the interviews to carry out a more personal in-depth exploration on those perspectives within the deployments.
5.2 Survey and Interviewee Demographics

The survey was sent to 28 people, all of whom have been deployed overseas within the capacity as a New Zealand police officer. Nineteen people responded. All the respondents were in the 40 to 55 year age range with the exception of one male who was under 40 years and one male who was over the age of 55. The roles of the survey respondents within the New Zealand Police covered a broad range of duties from front line policing and investigations to youth aid, prosecutions, family violence, community policing, training and managerial positions. The respondents had deployed to Afghanistan, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Bougainville, Vanuatu and Cook Islands with twelve respondents deploying once, seven deploying on two occasions and one deploying more than three times. Eleven of the respondents from the survey indicated that they were willing to be interviewed further in relation to their responses. Subsequently six persons were interviewed and asked a series of five questions which expanded upon the survey questions. The ranks and gender of the survey and interviewee participants are shown in table 9.

Table 9 Ranks and gender of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Rank</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioned Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Commissioned Officer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No longer in New Zealand Police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioned Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Commissioned Officer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No longer in New Zealand Police</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Participants Views on the Reasons Why New Zealand Police are Deployed

Within the survey the participants were asked to explore their perceptions as to why they believed New Zealand police officers were deployed. The majority of the survey responses spoke about New Zealand’s obligation to assist in crisis situations occurring in other
countries and in developing the capacity of other police services. This obligation to help combined with a personal desire to have a new or challenging experience was also given as a reason why people deployed as is demonstrated by a number of the follow up interviewees who said they wanted to deploy to help others.

I wanted to deploy for a sense of adventure plus to take my skills and apply them for humanitarian reasons. I saw it as an opportunity to work in another place with other cultures that is tied up with social responsibility, I wanted to help.

My initial reason for deploying was to experience international policing and hope to help out in another place.

A smaller group of five persons acknowledged in the survey that police deployments were politically motivated and served to enhance or fulfil New Zealand Government interests. Later when followed up in the interviews there certainly was acknowledgement of how the deployment revealed that politics and power could shape a deployment as found in this interview quote:

‘Deployment changed my views on how overseas cultures operate when compared to New Zealand. I learnt how hierarchies shaped how power and responsibilities were held by people. I observed the differences within Timor how often power that was held in high positions had so much more influence on getting people to do everything that they were told to do and how people just did it’

Some respondents said that they believed that New Zealand police officers were deployed because they performed well in peacekeeping and development roles due to their skill level and professionalism.

Those last answers overlapped with another survey question in which the participants were asked if they agreed or disagreed with the statement that New Zealand Police are said to perform well when deploying overseas. Nearly all respondents agreed that New Zealand police officers perform well when deployed, although some said that this appeared to be the case when compared to the performance of police officers from other countries. One survey respondent summed up this sentiment:
“I think we perform well in comparison to the rest of the deployed police components and on the back of well-intentioned and engaged individuals. However in the context of our overall ability and capacity as a police force, I think we under-achieve considerably”.

This perception of better performance was put down to the following reasons. Some respondents said that because the New Zealand Police were generally unarmed and operated with a community policing philosophy, they had more experience at resolving issues and conflict without resorting to force. However, the majority of respondents said that the reasons that New Zealand police performed well was due to New Zealand's multicultural and diverse society. Many of the respondents felt there were a number of characteristics associated to being a New Zealander that contributed to this, such as an ability to communicate well, form relationships, a strong work ethic, personal integrity, being friendly and having adventurous natures. The following survey quote is very succinct on this topic;

“I believe it is the typical 'Kiwi' nature of being humble, open, kind and generous that endears New Zealand police officers to their counterparts which creates a situation where they are willing and eager to please and perform as requested which ultimately produces quantifiable results”.

This association that identified participants with being a New Zealander or a New Zealand police officer during performance overseas was also picked up in some of the follow-up interviews;

“I definitely think that being a Kiwi helped me in doing this. I had to model my behaviour and show how to deal with others”.

“I got an increased appreciation of being in the New Zealand Police its agency and how we have the ability to operate at many different levels”.

In Chapter Two Goldsmith and Dinnen (2007, pp. 1106-1107) and Groves and Hinton (2004) highlighted the importance of preparation for deployment. Within the survey a number of questions were asked to identify what prior preparation had helped the participants achieve their tasks within country and if any briefings helped them understand their prescribed roles. Many of the survey respondents identified that their general policing
experience gained was seen as the most helpful in preparation, giving similar answers to this following response;

“My previous police history has been predominately the main area of preparation that I used to achieve my assigned tasks within country”.

Two people also cited their experience and qualifications as teachers, gained prior to joining the New Zealand Police, as helping them in their tasking to develop and carry out training. Three people said that being able to talk to people who had recently deployed was helpful and two people said that there were no preparations that helped them achieve their tasks. Only two people mentioned that the pre-deployment training received was helpful and one of those two people said that it was the practical components of the course, such as the off road driving training, which were helpful.

When the survey participants were asked if they had been prepared in regards to understanding what their role was before they deployed and if that preparation had been helpful, 16 replied that they had been briefed and three said that they had not been briefed. Of those who were briefed, two found their briefing not helpful, four found it slightly helpful, seven found it moderately helpful and four found it very helpful. No one thought it was either helpful or extremely helpful, although two people said that the language training and cultural awareness they had received was helpful, as was learning about the history of the place they were to be deployed to.

Nearly all of the interviewees, when asked what advice they would give to New Zealand police preparing for a first time deployment, said that having realistic expectations was important, as demonstrated in these two similar quotes;

“Set realistic expectations about what can be achieved”

“Don’t expect to change the word overnight and not to go on deployment with high expectations”

In summary while only a few of the research participants acknowledged the political nature of these types of deployments, the majority believed that the reasons for the intervention were humanitarian in nature, many of them felt that being a New Zealander or the experience of being a New Zealand police officer had value. A number of research
participants identified that knowing more about the culture and history of the environment they were deploying too would also have better prepared them.

5.4 Role Identification and Tasks

Chapter Three had identified that the roles assigned to New Zealand police within development interventions was that of mentor, advisor and trainer. In the survey, participants were asked to choose from those three roles and to explain what role they had best associated themselves to. Referring to table 10, most preferred to see themselves as advisors. One person described their role as to “Work alongside detectives and senior ranking members and guide or assist with any of their day to day work”. One person checked the box ‘advisor’ but then added that although their official title was advisor, their role was more that of a trainer.

Table 10 Role identification by survey participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Identification</th>
<th>Advisor</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey participants were later asked what were the main tasks expected of them whilst on deployment. Five of the survey respondents indicated that their role was the same as their task, for example, their role was that of an advisor and their main tasks during deployment was advising. All the other respondents listed multiple tasks which included advising, mentoring, training, reporting building relationships, liaison, program management, budgeting, coaching, training development, education, recruitment and leading. One respondent mentioned capacity development as a task and two said that their task was advising when they previously said their role was that of a mentor. Two respondents described their role as advisor but said most of their tasks involved training and developing training such as;

“Although deployed to RAMSI with the title of ‘advisor’ the reality was that we were training poorly skilled counterparts on a day to day basis”.

One respondent said they were a trainer but described their tasks as that of a coach. Several people described their roles as more that of a supervisor, ensuring host-State staff came to work and carried out their duties.
In the subsequent interviews that were carried out some of the interviewees advised that people deploying needed to understand how their roles related to their tasks, for example;

“Understand what it is that you are trying to do and its impacts. What is the link with what you do to making real outcomes?”

“Make a connection between doing and development and that the role of us going there is to support the host police to do their job and not to do their job for them”.

It appeared from the variety of respondent’s answers that there was a broad definition of what the role of the New Zealand police officer was in deployment when compared to the programme prescribed role. Yet also identified, from having been on deployment, was the need to understand the linkage between the actions of the New Zealand police officer with their host-State counterparts for programme outcomes.

5.5 Achievement

The survey respondents were asked to list what they had seen as successful activities and describe why they thought they were successful. The activities listed were those associated to Community-Oriented policing and training. An over-whelming response as to why these activities were thought to be successful was that the respondents identified that they had buy-in and participation by the host-State Police. Other activities that seemed to have good results were more general in terms, such as co-locating with host-State staff or working closely together which resulted in police working as a team, instilling a sense of pride and ownership in their duties.

Some of the interviewees also described that how New Zealand police operated together helped towards results;

“I saw the local police observe how well we the New Zealand Police worked together and consulted each other. This was a big plus in showing the local police how to work”.

At a personal level when interviewed about what they saw as to how they had improved as individuals many of the interviewees acknowledged they had learnt or had improved upon certain soft skills such as listening, communication and cultural awareness
“Mostly I learnt about how important it was to respect and get an appreciation of another person’s culture as a way of working with them”.

“Combined I believe I have learnt to communicate in a way that people understand me”.

For most of the respondents, they found that when there was participation and engagement by the host-State Police, this led to a learning experience for the research participants where certain soft skills relating to communication and an appreciation of cultural awareness became important.

5.6 Challenges

The most common challenge that the survey respondents found were the work practices, levels of motivation and ethics of the host-State Police with some participants feeling that the local staff wanted the visiting police to do most of the work. Conversely, two people thought that the main challenge to overcome was their own unrealistically high expectations of the local staff to perform to the same level as New Zealand police officers.

Five survey respondents said that the language barrier was the main challenge whilst two people thought that cultural differences were a challenge. This also came out in some of the interviews in that some of the participants recognised that getting to know the local context was relevant;

Several respondents identified that working with the Australian Police as part of RAMSI in Solomon Islands was an issue. This was because the direct and less culturally sensitive approaches of some Australian police officers were seen to be a barrier to achieving good results with the local police. Other respondents had found working within the UN with so many different police forces, who had differing policing approaches, was challenging as there were numerous work practices and viewpoints.

Several respondents thought that a lack of preparation and consultation with the host-State Police prior to deployment, in particular the local police commanders, had meant that there was no real commitment to be a part of the development intervention. As a result of this, some respondents thought that a succession of New Zealand police officers in deployment were imposing their own ideas with little regard or understanding of what had been done before and what the local staff needed. Conversely one respondent wrote
"Our lack of investment in creating aid frameworks means that successful outcomes are often dependent on the skill set of the mentor or advisor".

Three respondents felt that it would have been helpful to have had more specific information on what their particular roles and tasks were going to be with clear direction on what the desired outcomes were. One respondent identified that the lack of a mentoring framework detracted from their ability to achieve good results whilst others had noted that there was no plan or framework in place to allow incoming staff to effectively build upon the work of previous officers. Some of the interviewees also saw that the high expectations that were placed on them were very unrealistic. This was not just for reaching programme goals but also for compliance such as reporting as this quote from an interview demonstrates:

“We were so worried within our policing institution on these unrealistic expectations and fulfilling the compliance activities associated to this we actually couldn’t get achieve anything as much as what we could have”.

Nevertheless a majority of the survey respondents explained these challenges were able to be reduced or overcome when there was a degree of patience and perseverance by each police officer involved. Yet many of the persons interviewed, while acknowledging the deployments were challenging, also described such challenges as a personal growth experience, as the following two quotes show;

“The deployment was absolutely worthwhile. It was also the toughest thing I have ever done as my boundaries were really pushed”.

“I think deployment changed my views about myself as a person as it really stretched me”.

Some the interviewees felt that the challenges they had seen local people undergoing also changed their views on the world, instilling both an appreciation for coming from a safe wealthy country while acknowledging the difficulties for those in their country of deployment:

“I believe my experience made me more humble on understanding how the world is. I realised what we have in New Zealand should make us more grateful for what we have. For example I saw how Solomon Island
children valued what little they have. There was on one occasion I saw a young child place a plastic bag around his neck to use as a cape, something like batman. Here was this child using a bag and getting enjoyment out of a very simple thing. It made an impression on me”.

In exploring the challenges further, the respondents were asked what strategies they had in mind to reduce future challenges. The respondents had mixed feelings about future challenges. A number believed that a greater focus on realistic program planning was required. This was summed up by one response in a follow up interview:

*When I first went I had high expectations but when I got there after some time I realised what we had been told as to what we could achieve was unrealistic.*

Some of the survey respondents believed that ensuring the buy-in of host-State Police of all ranks through the process of greater consultation in the planning phases was the way to ensure the appropriateness and sustainability of the intervention. One person wrote that the New Zealand Police should have a better understanding of the context in which they are deploying into so they can develop a "fit for purpose perspective of needs".

To make improvements it was also suggested that the New Zealand Police, as an organisation, needed to develop a more comprehensive pre-deployment training framework which could be adapted to different contexts to help staff understand their prospective roles and duties. This included identifying and selecting appropriate people for those roles and duties. Other people said that having a greater understanding of the social, historical and political context into which they were deploying would have helped them, whilst four police officers said that being able to talk to people who had recently returned from deployment would have been beneficial. One person expanded on this, saying that it would have helped to have been given examples of what has worked in the past and what the intended outcome is. Also mentioned was a need to ensure that the right people were being deployed for the right reasons, as opposed to unqualified staff being deployed because of their personal relationships with those who select those being deployed or those people who only have a financial motivation to deploy.

Also from the interviews, a question in which the respondents were asked what kind of advice they would give persons who were about to deploy, an overwhelming response
given was for the need to form relationships inside the country. Further advice given described what should be done when forming relationships, such as taking the time and not imposing views. The following quote illustrates this;

“Everything is about relationships but firstly you have to build the relationship on their terms. Regardless about how you feel about some things about what others do, you must try and see how they see the world. You might disagree with them or not fully understand but you have to get over this.”

It appeared that many of the research respondents found the work practices and motivations of host-State Police to be somewhat challenging and that perhaps what some saw was a result of a lack of consultation with host-State Police. Comparisons were also made with other international police such as Australia police officers who were perceived to be more direct and less culturally aware. While many of the research participants said that better programme design and more engagement with host-State Police alongside realistic goals and objectives, could overcome some of the challenges, what was of overwhelming importance was the need to foster positive relationships. Some participants stressed the need to not go with high expectations, to be patient and to also treat deployments as a learning experience.

5.7 Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has highlighted key findings and themes that emerged from the surveys and interviews that were conducted. Different views and opinions were expressed. It contributes to research question three ‘How do New Zealand police officers perceive New Zealand Police practice within overseas development programmes?’ Specifically this was achieved by identifying the roles New Zealand police officers associate themselves to, soliciting perceptions as to what they saw as the challengers and enablers within their interventions and including what they saw as the necessary preparation required for deployment. Consistent opinions given were that a majority of the New Zealand police officers perceived the identity of coming from a multicultural diverse society such as New Zealand with strong work ethics and prior New Zealand policing experiences, associated community policing as well as being unarmed as helpful in deployment. Some of the responses also ‘benchmarked’ or compared these abilities with other international police
or host-State Police. There was recognition at the implementation level to develop relationships as a means of achievement.

Having been through the experience of deployment, many participants expressed the opinion that unclear definitions around achievable goals and improper planning for the context had led to unrealistic programs. Most participants preferred to identify themselves as advisors followed by mentor, then a trainer, rather than the prescribed programme role of mentor. Participants saw the experience of deployment as having been a means to develop personally not only in the areas of listening, communicating and cultural awareness but to gain a greater appreciation of their current status compared to others. In the following and final chapter these key findings will be discussed alongside the theoretical and practical implications resulting from this research.
Chapter Six: Discussion and Conclusion
6. Introduction

The aim of this research has been to compare ‘How New Zealand Police officers perceive development practice to New Zealand development programme expectations’. Primarily this has been about identifying the structures and process within the development interventions that New Zealand police officers work in and then comparing them against the perceptions of the New Zealand police officers who had worked within these interventions so as to identify any constraints or enablers.

There were two conclusions for this research that had interconnectivity in determining a third conclusion. The first one is that there has been insufficient consultation with partners and the development of frameworks which has resulted in partnership gaps in recognising or mitigating power differentials, as discussed in Chapter 4. The second significant finding is that there are distinct cognitive tendencies and practices associated to New Zealand police officers that are likely to continue within development programmes, as discussed in Chapter 5, which requires recognition and acknowledgement. Combined these circumstances have lead to the third main finding, that these programmes that do not sufficiently conceptualise what can and cannot be achieved when using New Zealand police. Each of these findings will now be discussed alongside the reasoning as to how these conclusions were reached with reference to what each finding means to development.

6.1 Partnerships and Power Sharing Within Development Programmes Involving New Zealand Police

New Zealand security and economic interests, as discussed in Chapter 3 appear to be part of the motivation as to why New Zealand becomes involved in development interventions. But for mutual benefit to occur, Grabosky (2009, p. 220) says that within development all stakeholders should have a shared understanding as to the problems and issues. Then any subsequent plans and actions towards implementation should then form a joint vision with host-State authorities that is developed in collaboration with the host-State and is subject to joint evaluation and partnership (United Nations, 2014a, pp. 10,11 & 17). Tolley (2011, p. 39) in exploring the rhetoric around partnership, states that some approaches can create an illusion of partners working together in a good ‘relationship’ with mutually-shared ambitions, projects, strategies and outcomes. The document analysis (Chapter 4),
identified that New Zealand development activities in Timor-Leste involving New Zealand police officers did have structures that equated to mechanisms to bring people together as a means to power share and work in partnership. However, in practice these structures seem more paternalistic or perhaps were a token gesture to give an impression of power sharing and partnership. This is because when the documents relating to the programme interventions were examined there was no follow up in the reviews or evaluations as to how well these mechanisms functioned or even if they were being used in terms of joint decision making. These findings were echoed in Chapter 5 in the results of the survey and interviews carried out with New Zealand police officers who often made reference to the lack of buy in by local police confirming the ability to gain traction in developing partnerships requires genuine involvement where at least both donors and recipients need identical or closely aligned preferences (Martens, 2005, p. 646).

Eyben (2010, p. 2 & 7), in Chapter 2, pointed out that these kinds of outcomes are also the result of different world-views. This is because those that design the interventions are more concerned with issues such as poverty, basic needs, women and results rather than a more relational mode of thought concerned with connections, patterns and processes. Eyben (2010, p. 2 & 7) calls this mode of thought relationism, where there is a focus on people and the processes to deal with them rather than actual results. Perhaps, to undertake such partnerships at the implementation level in a less formal manner would require what Guijt (2010) refers to as ‘messy partnerships’. A ‘messy partnership’ has a more people centric approach that allows for differently-positioned actors and stakeholders to get a better grasp of systemic issues through the mutual communication of their partial knowledge of the system. Taking a less structured or more informal approach provides neutral spaces where partners can meet without any prior commitment, letting events develop at their own pace as an emergent process. An approach such as the one described above might be a suitable alternative to current practice involving New Zealand police who have prescriptive goals and objectives. This is because, as research participants observed in Chapter 5, that matters progressed when programme activities brought many people together (referred to in some cases as stakeholders) and improvements were readily made through consultation and collaboration. Also comments were made about co-location by the research participants with host-State counterparts, saying that it made their work easier and contributed to better outcomes because they ended up working together as a team, instilling a sense of pride in what was being achieved. This co-location, where
partners share the same work space, Cannella, Park, and Lee (2008, p. 770) point out, not only reduces conflict between parties and increases effectiveness by ensuring that knowledge is shared and understood but provides a shared context where others can recognise the differences and the constraints that their partners experience. For New Zealand Police it appears that when activities occurred or when co-location existed this became a space not only for mutual discussion to take place but for opportunities to occur whereby those who are partnered with the New Zealand Police had the potential not only to engage but to also participate as part of their agency. However, when structures are required as a matter of process to maintain an equal footing, pre-existing structures could have been used for better effect, rather than working or steering committees, as found in the document analysis. As discussed in Chapter 2, McLeod (2015) in examining and comparing consultative structures between the Solomon Islands and Timor-Leste for NGO related Community-Oriented Policing programmes, found more successful outcomes had been reached when pre-existing traditional structures that allow for greater participation were used to communicate, consult and thereby effectively power share, than those structures created by development interventions.

6.2 Recognising the Use of New Zealand Police Officers Within Development

This research concluded that the development programmes involving New Zealand police officers as implementers have not fully realised or understood either the challenges or potential of utilising New Zealand police officers in these kinds of interventions. Both Skolnick (2005, p. 264) and Goldsmith (2009, p. 131) write, as previously discussed in Chapter 2, that when dealing with police deploying overseas there are distinct cognitive tendencies in police who as an occupational group develop ways of looking at the world particular to themselves as police officers. These cognitive tendencies Skolnick (2005, p. 264) and Goldsmith (2009, p. 131) say, may create difficulties when they deploy from the specific work environment of being a police officer, to working overseas developing other police officers and institutions. For New Zealand police officers the challenges or opportunities they face primarily relate to perceptions of power and how they viewed themselves and their relationships within the deployments.

Chambers (2013a), as discussed in Chapter 2, advises that working in development is about having the appropriate behaviours and attitudes for working in different contexts. Competitiveness or a desire to take over or be in control, common attributes required of a
professional police officer, as well remaining in a ‘policing mode’ as described by Harris and Goldsmith (2012, pp. 1029-1031) in Chapter 2, are not what is required. Goldsmith and Dinnen (2007, p. 1106) state that working in police development requires the need to display a degree of reflexivity and humility about the objectives behind police building and how these might be perceived and responded to locally. Many of the research participants displayed empathy and a recognition that they came from a country that made them far better off in terms of wealth and opportunity than the countries they had deployed to. Yet, a number of the survey respondents also ‘benchmarked’ the New Zealand police as being better workers, friendly and outgoing or more culturally sensitive compared to the host-State Police or other International Police. Bevan and MacKenzie (2012) found anecdotally that the New Zealand police within Timor-Leste were talked about in a positive manner but concluded this was perhaps due to stereotypical assumptions, as they found some New Zealand police officers spoke and acted in ways that were not as inclusive or tolerant as others perceived.

These perceptions, combined with the intervention programme design, create and contribute to this very situation in that being deployed creates an impression that a New Zealand police officer is an expert from the West as described by Kothari (2005) and Escobar (1988, p. 430) which can become a form of power over others. In Chapter 5 many of those surveyed or interviewed had a preference to be seen as a knowledge expert, despite also recognising the importance of developing good relationships. When asked to describe the role that they thought best described their relationship with their host-State counterparts, many of the research participants did not see themselves as mentors but rather as trainers or advisors, even when mentoring was the actual position description and some had received training on mentoring for deployments (New Zealand Police, 2015b). For each of the roles of trainer, advisor or mentor, a different kind of relationship is implied with differing connotations about power and control. There is a developmental advising relationship where the advisor empowers the student to explore all options and participate fully in the decision making process. Alternatively, prescriptive advising directs and dictates, thus empowering the advisor (Bland, 2003, p. 7).

The training relationship can also be problematic as the background to police training is generally militaristic and behaviour oriented and though this may be helpful for learning technical and procedural skills, it does little to promote non technical competencies such as problem solving, judgement or leadership (Birzer, 2003, p. 31). There is also the
concept of mentoring, formed between a mentor and protégée. This is where the mentor offers assistance that focuses on the sharing of experiences and insights while reflecting upon areas of mutual interest and concern. Mentoring however relies upon chemistry between individuals to actually work to help form emotional bonds and involves the negotiation of power and the interests of all involved (Billett, 2002, pp. 40-41; Hansman, 2002, pp. 45-46; Long, 1997). So while the majority of the research participant’s emphasised good relationships were required, the kinds of relationships that needed to exist to overcome such issues or to promote or enable both the participation and agency of those they were meant to partner with, were not mentioned in either the document analysis, survey or interviews.

The identification, however, by some of the research participants for the need for a clear definition of roles and the need for a framework to work within does appear as a request for something that could explain how these relationships could best be utilised or continued. Perhaps this, as Long (1990, p. 8) and McGregor (2009, p. 1696) describe, is where development actors attempt to make sense of the power relationships. Considering this request for clear role definition and frameworks and in considering the kinds of relationships needed, Boswell (2010, p. 81) found in a study of international policing in the Pacific that many of the interviewees for whom those interventions were meant to benefit did compare Australian and New Zealand police, who were in country. It was observed that these two groups did in fact work in different ways and feedback indicated New Zealand police tended to work more alongside the intended beneficiaries. This approach is also echoed in a request from police within the Pacific who requested for officers from New Zealand and Australia to be seconded to work alongside local staff as a preferred means of development (Tapp, Robinson, Seruvatu, & Schofield, 2006). The re-evaluation and re-labelling of the roles of police officers, from mentor, trainer to advisor to someone working alongside, potentially overcomes the restriction of other world views and forms of conceptualisation and creativity that is needed while working in development (Escobar, 1988, p. 430; 1997, p. 86 & 87; Eyben, 2010, p. 2 & 7; Mowles, 2010, p. 151).

6.3 Conceptualising Development Interventions Involving New Zealand Police

Mowles (2010, p. 152) and De Vries (2007, p. 27) in Chapter 1 say that for development to occur there requires not only a desire for a different kind of society but a need to conceptualise the development that should occur. This study found that the desired vision
or the planned outcomes of such programmes, involving New Zealand police as implementers, are incomplete or are not fully understood and originate more from New Zealand’s world view, as described by Eyben (2010, p. 2 & 7). Highlighted in the document analysis in Chapter 4, were comments by the reviewers about the incompatibilities between the New Zealand Community-Oriented Policing (COP) model and the COP model favoured and progressively being developed by the Timor-Leste Police (Emmott et al., 2010, p. 6; New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, pp. 16, 17 & 19). This despite the Police of Timor-Leste having developed their own model of COP in 2009 (Governu Timor-Leste, 2009; Policia Nacional de Timor-Leste, 2013).

The different approach to COP taken by the PNTL compared to the New Zealand Police is an example of what happens when there is a failure to have a shared understanding of the problems or issues and to identify identical or closely aligned preferences (Grabosky, 2009, p. 220; Martens, 2005, p. 646). Such outcomes indicate that the designers of the programmes have either not only failed to understand what has been occurring in country but have also failed to go beyond what the PNTL and other stakeholders have conceptualised as to what COP means to them. There has also been a lack of conceptualising as to how these programmes might be carried out or implemented. This directly relates back to the first two previously discussed findings that there were insufficient frameworks and consultation with partners and the requirement of a recognition of the cognitive tendencies of New Zealand police.

Baaz (2005, p. ix) mentioned in Chapter 2, points out that the other world point of view not only relates to different dreams and visions but to the material difference and means to realise those dreams. An example of this is readily demonstrated in relation to the implementation of the programmes. The document analysis identified a consistent pattern whereby the reviewers and evaluators, who reported for programmes involving New Zealand police in Timor-Leste, believed that the goals and objectives for some of the interventions were too aspirational or unrealistic. On some occasions they had also pointed out that the objectives and goals went well beyond the control of the intervention or were not actually part of the intervention. Specifically this was echoed by a number of the research participants in Chapter 5 who noted that after arriving in country they realised that many of the intervention goals, objectives and time frames were unrealistic. When considering that The World Bank (2011, p. 11) estimates that basic governance transformation progress in relation to institutional transformation for countries that have
suffered civil war takes on average 41 years in the case of rule of law matters, the goals and objectives, described in the development interventions in Chapter 4, do appear unrealistic due to the very short time frames ranging from 18 months to 4 years and the small numbers of personnel provided. These large time frames also question the value of the use or attempted use of New Zealand police to take up shorter term positions of control and power within a host-States police, as shown in Chapter 3. Such attempts to take up controlling positions also potentially run the risk as being perceived as a form of neo-colonialism, similar to what happened with the Australian police in Bougainville, as described in Chapter 2 (Chin, 2005, p. 193; National Archives of Australia, 2015; RT, 2015).

This inability to fully conceptualise what could be achieved and how it could be achieved was also recognised by some of those surveyed and interviewed. Some research participants pointed out that in the interventions they were involved in there was what they saw as a lack of understanding of the context and a subsequent lack of engagement with the host-State Police that in turn meant degrees of success were reliant upon the skill sets of individuals rather than the programme itself. Eyben (2010, p. 15 & 16) records similar actions that often occur in aid programmes, noting that while there may be plans in place what can also occur is a planned opportunism where individuals, through communication and learning from the initial effects of an intervention, will proceed with no certainty of what will happen next, relying more upon self organising networks rather than imposed hierarchical ones.

6.4 Post-Development Theory in Practice Involving New Zealand Police

Post-development not only looks at how development shapes and constitutes people and places but also examines how development actors have agency to re-imagine so as to shape places and development and seek alternatives to it (McGregor, 2009, p. 1696). The use of a post-development lens for this research has enabled a recognition of the value of what both Chambers (2013a) and Groves and Hinton (2004) in post-development emphasise, that to undertake development requires a recognition that a complex non-linear approach is required as the way in which to understand how power and relationships can affect any endeavour but to potentially seek other more people centric ways, as described by Eyben (2010, p. 15 & 16). Here it has to be acknowledged that the resources deployed by the New Zealand Government, through the utilising of New Zealand police officers, is
a strategy that in reality is one that attempts to utilise individual personal agency of New Zealand police to influence those that they partner with to make change. This is described by Groves and Hinton (2004) as a means of development that has been identified as important because small changes or shifts within a system can lead to greater changes within a larger system. However, as this study has found such a strategy has not been successfully applied as the framework or the designs of the interventions they work within are not suitable for such an approach.

This research proposes that in these types of programme designs that involve New Zealand police, the goals and objectives could be less prescriptive and instead the designs could be more people centric and have a greater focus on how people can interact rather than what should be achieved, where objectives for the implementers are more related to opportunities. For police officers, rather than being led to deliver specific goals and objectives, an ‘opportunism’ could be integrated into the programme design as a way to conceptualise that New Zealand police officers work alongside other police partners within their countries as described by Tapp et al. (2006) and Boswell (2010, p. 81). Indeed when the interviews were conducted some of the interviewees (see Chapter 5) were quite specific in identifying that it was not the role of New Zealand police officers to do the job of the host-State police, but to support them in their job. This working alongside creates the iterative environment where ideas are shared, refined and understood as a means to establish what Grabosky (2009, p. 220) describes as the shared vision of the future alongside the issues and problems. Opportunities when presented are seized to form self organising networks creating the ‘messy partnership’ as described by Guijt (2010). In effect this is the development interface as described by Long and Long (1992, p. 272) where the structures of development and power and the agency of people are acknowledged and allowed for as part of the concept. Such methods also account for the police type characteristic as shown in Chapter 5 and expressed by Skolnick (2005, p. 264) and Goldsmith (2009, p. 131). The document analysis was unable to describe any impacts directly attributable to the New Zealand police. However, there were a few occasions in this study where New Zealand police described how better outcomes were obtained with their partners when colocation or activities created space for more discussion and participation. This means New Zealand police officers within development interventions could be measured more on how they work with others to create a space for partners to plan and implement their goals.
6.5 Conclusions

This report started with a need to understand how police officers are being utilised in the contemporary sense within development. It then looked deeper into how New Zealand has employed its police officers within development and the reasoning for this. Combined this showed how the frameworks and interventions for programmes involving New Zealand police are designed. The adoption of a post-development lens has enabled a different viewpoint from the current contemporary approach within programmes utilising New Zealand police within development programmes. This research aimed to compare how New Zealand police officers perceive development practice to New Zealand development programme expectations. A comparison was aimed at a better understanding not only of how New Zealand Police conceptualise themselves as part of these development interventions, but also became a means to better understand the interventions themselves. It incorporates the importance of understanding how a particular group, New Zealand police officers, are being involved and thereby draws conclusions on how they might best be used as a means for development. Specifically those conclusions were reached in seeking the richer descriptions from the qualitative experience, combining information and data from different methods as a means to triangulate and to confirm any subsequent conclusions. The main recommendations that this research suggests for future development programmes involving New Zealand police officers is not to achieve end results. Rather New Zealand police officers could be involved as being part of a process where their roles are described more as one that encourages and provides space where partners might develop and explore their own agency.
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Appendix A 1: Document examination Community Policing Pilot Timor-Leste

### Documents examined

1. Activity design document Community Policing Pilot - Becora and Suai - Timor-Leste:
   a. Author’s details redacted when document provided by Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
   b. Citation (New Zealand Agency for International Development, 2008b)
   c. Cited in Chapter 4 as part of Document analysis and in Chapter 3 to map New Zealand Police deployments

2. Community Policing Pilot Programme Timor-Leste Independent Review:
   a. Authors: Sue Emmott, Manuhuia Barcham, Taimoor Ali Khan & Eduardo Soares
   b. Citation = (Emmott et al., 2010)
   c. Cited in Chapters 4 as part of document analysis

### Information gathered from the Activity design document Community Policing Pilot - Becora and Suai - Timor-Leste

#### Duration
- September 2008 to March 2010
- New Zealand Police numbers:
  - Full time 2
  - To assist 17

#### Partner agencies:
- United Nations Police (UNPOL), New Zealand Police, New Zealand Aid & Timorese National Police (PNTL).
- Others: The Asia Foundation (TAF) & Australian Federal Police (AFP)

#### Goal (summarised)
- Support PNTL to develop a Community Policing Model & pilot in Becora and Covalima

#### Objectives (summarised)
- a) Design and implement a framework for a Community Policing programme
- b) Inputs required by PNTL, UNPOL, NZ Police, NZAID and other stakeholders
- c) A long term Strategic Plan for Community Policing developed
- d) PNTL academy with the capability and training resources to provide effective recruit and in-service training in community policing
- e) Monitoring framework

#### Activities for NZP (summarised)
- 1. Support/advice and 'In Service Training' of PNTL
- 2. Identify agreed reporting requirements to PNTL and UNPOL
- 3. If resource plan is required, assist in drafting
- 4. If training plan is required, assist in drafting
- 5. Brief incoming contingent introducing staff to key partners etc
- 6. Pilot update and workshop etc visit
- 7. Introduce Strategic component associated to Community Policing
- 8. Training based on modules to PNTL staff along with train the trainer’s delivery
- 9. Training made available to Oecusse PNTL staff
- 10. Pilot hand-over to PNTL

(New Zealand Agency for International Development, 2008b, pp. 7, 13, 16, 17, 22 to 25, 28)
### Outcomes and Achievements: Gathered from the Community Policing Pilot Programme Timor-Leste Independent Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant as an intervention both in the broader justice sector and has played an important role in the on-going development of community policing for the PNTL</td>
<td>Effective in that it has achieved much of what it set out to do</td>
<td>Satisfactory, evidence of some efficiencies and some inefficiencies largely subjective</td>
<td>Cannot be reliably assessed in the short timeframe of the pilot</td>
<td>Too small and too short to bring about sustainable change in a complex security environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Emmott et al., 2010, pp. 7, 19, 20, 22 & 33)

### Overall general comments on design & implementation

1. Design document reads as a blueprint for community policing without the specific context of Timor-Leste
2. Ambiguous whether CPPP is a New Zealand Police pilot or an UNPOL pilot
3. No analysis of capacity that already existed,
4. No baseline data available against which progress could be measured
5. Many of the activities constitute activities towards objectives rather than objectives towards the goal
6. Objective 3 A long term Strategic Plan for Community Policing developed: unrealistic as it requires political agreement as well as technical agreement from the Government as well as PNTL. Outside the control of NZP
7. The approach in Suai strongly project focused, raising issues of sustainability
8. Cross-cutting issues of gender, conflict prevention and human rights not reflected explicitly in either the design of CPPP or in its review and monitoring activities
9. Weak monitoring system did not show change in PNTL and therefore meant CPP remained static
10. System for monitoring and reporting was oriented to NZAID and NZP needs, questions ownership
11. Lack of ownership by PNTL of donor-oriented governance arrangements might have been increased had decision making been transferred into the Governments structures

(Emmott et al., 2010, pp. 9 to13,16,17,19)

### Recommended approaches identified within intervention design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared understanding of a problem</th>
<th>Sharing of power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steering committee, Consult on plan design with PNTL. PNTL approves criteria for monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Steering committee, agreements for monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(New Zealand Agency for International Development, 2008b, pp. 7, 16, 19 & 33)
Appendix A 2: Document examination Community Policing Programme Timor-Leste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Author’s details redacted when document provided by Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Citation = (New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Cited in Chapter 4 as part of Document analysis and in Chapter 3 to map New Zealand Police deployments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Joint Evaluation of Timor-Leste Community Policing Programme (TLCPP) and Hametin Koperasaun Hamutuk Polisia ho Komunidade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Authors: Gordon Peake, Bu Wilson, Joao Almedia Fernandes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Citation (Peake et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Cited in Chapters 4 as part of document analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information gathered from the Activity design document for the Timor-Leste Community Policing Programme 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>New Zealand Police numbers</th>
<th>Partner Agencies:</th>
<th>Others:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2011 to 2015</td>
<td>Full time 2</td>
<td>Timor-Leste Police (PNTL) &amp; The Asia Foundation (TAF)</td>
<td>Australian Federal Police (AFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part time 3-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, pp. 1, 8, 28, 31, 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Safe and secure communities, through effective and efficient community policing in Timor-Leste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives (Summarised)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. PNTL has national community policing policy, strategy, action plan, systems and procedures in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. PNTL has developed programmes to address community policing issues and being implemented at District, Sub-District and Suco levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. PNTL has effective national partnerships and consultative mechanisms to promote community safety and security and being implemented at District, Sub-District and Suco levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. PNTL has recruit and in-service community policing training programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities for NZP x 19 (Summarised) Permanent In Country NZP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support PNTL to develop a community policing model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support the CPU Commander and staff in the development, institutionalisation and implementation of community policing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assist development of programmes to address community policing issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate with donors/agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support institutional development of the PNTL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. With CPU Commander develop understanding of and support for community policing among national political, community and church leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. With CPU Commander strengthen working relationships and establish consultative mechanisms with government ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Support PNTL training centre, to assess in-service community policing training needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assist in facilitating training-of-trainers courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 42 to 45) | 11. Maintain links with District Commanders/senior managers between mentor visits.  
12. Work with the Training Centre Commander and staff  
13. Assist in identifying and facilitating the involvement of relevant government and non-government organisations  
**Part time NZP 12 weeks a year**  
14. Support PNTL senior managers responsible for community policing activities at district levels.  
15. Involve all PNTL staff with training and on-the-job support for community policing  
16. Establish community engagement mechanisms and specific programmes.  
17. Develop draft work plan to strengthen community policing at national and district levels.  
18. Undertake with PNTL baseline assessment of community policing systems  
19. With PNTL established targets in relation to outcome and output level  

(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, p. 19 to 22)
### Outcomes and Achievements: Gathered from the Joint Evaluation of Timor-Leste Community Policing Programme (TLCPP) and Hametin Koperasaun Hamutuk Polisia ho Komunidade (HAKOHAK) report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely relevant. Community policing has evolved from a marginal position to one increasingly central to the identity of the Timorese police (PNTL).</td>
<td>Extensive New Zealand experience brought to the institutionalisation of community policing in Timor-Leste. Extremely hard to know what effect of TLCPP work in terms of training has been since the programme began.</td>
<td>Two programmes have sought to increase their efficiency through steps taken to align their activities. But for PNTL two programmes working on similar issues is confusing.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Sustainability of community policing programming in Timor-Leste depends on the continued enthusiasm of the Government of Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Peake et al., 2014, pp. 4, 5, 32 & 30)

### Overall general comments on intervention design & implementation

- Very ambitious outcomes
- TLCPP’s delivery model queried whereby solitary advisers, often unversed in relevant languages assigned to cover a handful of districts/ Some PNTL thought programme was intrusive
- No clear exit strategy
- TLCPP’s reporting regime is difficult to understand. Terms were used interchangeably causing confusion
- Although design proposed a particular focus on domestic violence, gender was less of a focus within the programme
- Delays in getting agreements from design to implementation between NZP MFAT and Timor-Leste Government
- Program is inclusive but no central ‘node’ of decision-making authority
- Lack of clarity in reporting lines covering relationships
- Little in the programme’s monitoring regime that allowed evaluators to gauge the TLCPP adviser contribution.
- Lack of clarity on what to report on and how to report

(Peake et al., 2014, pp. 4, 5, 28 & 29)

### Recommended approaches identified within intervention design

- **Shared understanding of a problem**
  - Steering committee, Management Committee, plan jointly designed, monitoring and work plans to also be jointly designed

- **Sharing of power**
  - Steering committee, Management Committee. Resources will also be provided to PNTL to support implementation of the programme.

(New Zealand Aid Programme, 2011, pp. 10, 12, 59 & 60)
Appendix B: Participant Information Sheet

Dear participant,
I am contacting you not as a work colleague, but as a student who is conducting research for my Master’s degree through Massey University, Palmerston North New Zealand.

The purpose of my research is to examine the role of the New Zealand police officer within contemporary overseas development interventions. I would welcome your experiences to contribute to this research.

To achieve this I would like to invite you to take part in this research by participating in an online survey and follow up interview. The survey is open until the 27th of September 2015.

Access to the survey is by clicking on the following link.
https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/NZPDevInt

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate you must indicate at the beginning of the survey that you have consented to participate in the survey. The survey is anonymous and participants cannot be identified.

At the end of the survey you may also indicate if you would also like to be contacted for a further follow-up interview. Your contact details will be required for the follow up interview.

Your participation will be kept confidential throughout all stages of the research.

Your rights as a participant in this research at anytime are:
- Without explanation you may withdraw from the survey (or interview).
- You may decline to answer any particular question.
- You may ask any questions about the study.
- You provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used.
- You may request a summary of the project findings at the end of the study.

If you experience any technical difficulties please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you very much for your participation. Kevin Brennan

If you have any questions about the research please contact;

Kevin Brennan (Student)
Email: [Redacted]
Phone: [Redacted]

Dr Maria Borovnik (Supervisor)
Institute of Development Studies
School of People, Environment and Planning
Massey University, Palmerston North New Zealand
Email: [Redacted]
Phone: [Redacted]

“This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Dr Brian Finch, Director (Research Ethics), telephone 06 356 9099, extn 86015, e-mail humanethics@massey.ac.nz.”
A comparison of New Zealand police officers' perceptions of development practice within New Zealand development programmes: a research paper presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of International Development, School of People, Environment and Planning, Massey University, Manawatu, New Zealand

Brennan, Kevin J

2015