

# Private security and local law enforcement research paper example

[Law](#), [Security](#)



\n[[toc title="Table of Contents"](#)]\n

\n \t

1. [Criminal Law](#) \n \t
2. [Difference between Private Security and Local Law Enforcement](#) \n \t
3. [Conclusion](#) \n \t
4. [References](#) \n

\n[/toc]\n \n

## **Criminal Law**

Hess and Orthmann (2008) stated that a private security is a profit-oriented enterprise that offers services for personnel, equipment and a practice for the purpose of preventing losses due to human error, calamities, emergencies, catastrophe and criminal behavior. The services of private security caters to the needs of specific persons, companies, commercial establishments and other organizations that require firmer security measures than what is provided by the local law enforcement. Some of the individuals who seek private security services are politicians, celebrities and wealthy business. The clients of private security companies range from individuals, small, medium-sized to big establishments. The rich and affluent members of the community engage the services of private security to protect their luxurious homes and properties. On the other hand, commercial merchants and establishments including shopping malls, office buildings, banks and other similar units hire private security to protect their clients and safe keep their personal belongings. Private security services are very visible in any business agency or organization to ensure that their assets are

protected. For some wealthy personalities, they engage the services of private security company for the purpose of safeguarding their homes, mansions, cars, properties and important belongings.

Hess and Orthmann (2008) stated that the objective of private security services is to protect their clients against man-made risks including theft, fraud, employee subversion, economic sabotage, strikes, demonstrations, terrorist acts and other criminal offenses. Private security agencies coordinate with the local law enforcement to deter crimes and maintain peace and order in the community. Both of these two organizations ensure that the public is safe from any danger that may be caused by major infractions of law and the use of violence. These two entities cannot be considered as competitors of each other since they work for the common objective which is to maintain peace and order in the community and to promote the safety and well-being of the public.

According to Community Oriented Policing or COPS (2013), the success in community policing shall depend on building a fruitful partnership between the public and the local law enforcement agency. At the same time, the concerted efforts of private security agency and local law enforcement for the fulfillment of the shared goal to protect the public. Both entities should look for new opportunities to establish the team work and to enhance their problem-solving skills. The alliance between the local law enforcement and private security will be able to improve community policing and together attain the same objective to protect the public.

## **Difference between Private Security and Local Law Enforcement**

Local law enforcement agencies or public policing is a localized and a highly decentralized industry. The objective of public policing is focused on meeting its goals that revolve around its leadership, local politics, police culture and the outlook of the community that the agency serves (Allen and Sawhney, 2010). On the other hand, private police from the private security agencies, its objective is mainly on achieving success of the company in terms of profit and focused only on pleasing clients. Unlike local law enforcement the response of the security agency in terms of addressing crimes and deviant behavior is not solely based on morality and the law, but what the client views as important (Allen and Sawhney, 2010).

The goals of private security and local law enforcement differ in the sense that private security police focus on loss and not on the crime. They were hired by clients for the purpose of protecting the assets and properties of clients and engage in other activities that are not within the scope of crime control. In addition, the private police are focused on conducting surveillance and prevention of deviance and not in arresting criminals. They are not concerned with putting the criminals in jail or penalize them for their wrongdoing. Private police are designated to protect sprawling spaces of corporations, malls, corporate campuses and other massive private properties (Allen and Sawhney, 2010).

On the other hand, the local law enforcement's goals deal with crime prevention, maintain peace and order, identification of criminals and guarantee the security of the community. These officers are in charge in the

surveillance of public places such as schools, parks and other recreational establishments of the government. They are concerned with apprehending the criminals, sending them to jail and penalize them for the crimes committed against the public.

According to COPS (2013), one sworn law enforcement officer is equivalent to two private security practitioners that can serve as a force multiplier in order to effectively achieve the goal to increase national security. However, private security is privately funded which enables it to make use of the latest technology and information sharing which they can share with the local law enforcement. On the other hand, local law enforcement's operations come from limited resources which will be based on the budget allocation of each state.

Some of the specific duties of the local law enforcement include fighting terrorism, identifying suspicious packages, conduct surveillance and specialized risk assessment in the community, promote tourism safety and security, prevent bombings in schools and college campuses, investigate patterns of gang activity, prevent financial crime such as identity theft and forgery (Baker, 2011). On the other hand, the work of a private security agency is concentrated in protecting identified clients, which make the scope of work more limited as compared to the broader tasks of the local law enforcement which is mainly to protect the entire community.

In terms of possession and exercise of police powers, only the local law enforcement have the power to arrest and apprehend criminals, while private security police do not hold this power. The limitations on the exercise of special police powers and the fact that their activities are controlled by

the clients, private security police should be included in the private security industry (Allen and Sawhney, 2010). Security services protect both public and private places, and the same thing holds true for local law enforcement. The difference lies in their primary goals since law enforcement are directed to protect government interests, representing the public. On the other hand, private security is charged to protect specific interest, regardless of the fact that it is for public or private purpose (Allen and Sawhney, 2010).

The advantage of private security agencies is that they can function on their own decision using their own resources and procedures. On the other hand, many complaints have been reported against the local law enforcement due to the lack of administrative support, ineffective supervision, lack of training and equipment, political interference, inadequate opportunities for promotion and the criminal justice system itself will certainly drive the police officers to be dissatisfied with their jobs and commit corruption (Hess et al., 2011). In addition, the salaries of the police officers are not as competitive when compared to other the salary of employees of private security agencies.

## **Conclusion**

In my opinion, the private security is easier to maintain since the goals of such agency are confined only to the needs of their clients. However, based on the scope of work of the two agencies, I prefer the local law enforcement because its intention is to protect the people, whether they come from public or private sector. In the case of local law enforcement, the agency faces several issues such as criminal profiling and police corruption. The problems

of local law enforcement have to be acted on immediately so as to give continued service the public. Hence, it is essential to enhance the total benefit package and to give the police officers the sense of security and to make their job more appealing. The volume of work in the local law enforcement is stressful in nature considering the risk and dangers they are confronted with in their daily operation. It is imperative that the state must allocate funds to ensure that the police officers are adequately compensated. There is a great probability that the police will experience burnout due to job dissatisfaction. In the same manner, it is highly recommended for police leaders to shift to a proactive approach instead of a reactive approach in order to implement flexibility in the decision-making process of the department. This will be beneficial for both the chief and his subordinates to successfully achieve their shared objectives.

In terms of management, the local law enforcement carry-out their own leadership styles to effectively function as one department. In the case of private security agencies, their objective is to gain more clients for profit. Law enforcement usually implement the participatory style of leadership since it does not focus on keeping the control, but rather the emphasis is on how to motivate the police officers in achieving the goals of the department. In conclusion, both private security and law enforcement agencies must be able to impart to the police officers and their agents the proper attitude, skills and proficiencies to improve the overall performance of the agencies. It is noteworthy to mention that their employees should be satisfied with their jobs in terms of opportunities for growth, increased salaries and trained by good leaders to be able to encourage them to perform more efficiently.

Effective leadership is vital for all branches of the criminal justice system, especially in the law enforcement agencies since it deals with corruption, discrimination and abuse of power in the leaders. To become an effective leader of the law enforcement agency, the leader should live by example to show to his subordinates that he has the positive attributes of integrity, honesty, competence, courage, self-confidence and impartiality in decision-making. It is only fitting that a person of high integrity will earn the respect of his subordinates and staff. As a good leader, he knows how to supervise and leads the group to advocate positive attitudes in the accomplishment of the organizational objectives.

It is also imperative to change the police culture among the police officers by changing the the nature of policing having these two objectives: First is to decrease the influence of party politics and patronage or favoritism in giving job assignments; Second, is to treat all citizens equally, whether they may be rich or poor. Giving assistance and being of service to the public means that they should work for the benefit of the greater majority and not just in favor of the a single class, such as in the case of local politicians (Cole and Smith, 2007).

## **References**

- Allen, J. M. and Sawhney, R. (2010). Administration and Management in Criminal Justice: A Service Quality Approach. California: SAGE
- Baker, T. E. (2011). Effective Police Leadership: Moving Beyond Management. New York:



Looseleaf Law.

Braswell, M. C., McCarthy, B. R. and McCarthy, B. J. (2011). Justice, Crime and Ethics.

Massachusetts: Elsevier.

Cole, G. F. and Smith, C. E. (2007). Criminal Justice in America. California: Cengage

Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) (2013). Web. Retrieved from <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=2034>.

Demsey, J. S. and Forst, L. S. (2011). An Introduction to Policing. Belmont, CA: Cengage

Learning.

Gaines, L. K. and Worrall, J. L. (2011). Police Administration. Belmont, California.

Hess, K. M. and Orthmann, C. H. (2008). Introduction to Private Security. California: Cengage

Learning.

Miller, L. S., Hess, K. M., and Orthmann, C. H. (2011). Community Policing: Partnerships for Problem Solving. Clifton Park, New York: Cengage Learning.

More, H. W. and Miller, L. (2010). Effective Police Supervision, 6th ed. Burlington, MA:

Elsevier.

Ortmeier, P. J. (2006). Introduction to law enforcement and criminal justice, 2nd ed. Upper

Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Pollack, J. M. (2011). Ethical Dilemmas and Decisions in Criminal Justice, 7th ed. California:

Wadsworth Cengage.

Samaha, J. (2011). Criminal Procedure. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.

Swanson, C. R., Territo, L., & Taylor, R. W. (2012). Police administration: Structures,

processes, and behavior, 8th ed. Upper Saddle, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.