



APSAC Conference 2011 Paper
Fremantle, Western Australia
15 – 17 November 2011

DOES POLICE CULTURE IMPEDE THE ANTI-CORRUPTION IDEAL: AN UNRESOLVED DILEMMA

Celeste Lawson, PhD Candidate, Central Queensland University, Queensland

1. INTRODUCTION

Credited as being one of the most significant modern inquiries into police corruption, Queensland's Fitzgerald Inquiry (1989) set a benchmark in terms of the consideration of police culture as a contributing factor in the behaviour of officers. The Fitzgerald Inquiry found that the police culture allowed corruption to flourish. It was critical of many of the cultural elements identified as typical of police culture, using the example of the unwritten 'police code' which reinforced behaviour where misconduct could occur. The Fitzgerald Report made recommendations about the structure of the Queensland police organisation, including decentralisation and promoting a new policing philosophy in an attempt to prompt cultural change. Following in the footsteps of the Fitzgerald Inquiry, the New South Wales Wood Royal Commission (1997) also spent considerable effort defining police culture and attempted to explain how the culture allowed misconduct and corruption to exist. Like the Fitzgerald Report, the Wood Royal Commission also made significant recommendations in relation to cultural change. When Western Australia's Kennedy Royal Commission was conducted in 2004, it was expected that elements of police culture would be used to explain police behaviour.

The influence of police culture on corruption is not unique to Australia. In the United States of America in 1994, an Inquiry was conducted into the New York Police Department. Known as the Mollen Inquiry, the final report describes how corruption had flourished in New York "not only because of the opportunity and greed but because of a police culture that exalts loyalty over integrity; because of the silence of officers who fear the consequences of 'ratting' on another cop, ... because of wilfully blind supervisors who fear consequences of a corruption scandal more than corruption itself; because of the demise of the principle of accountability that makes all commanders responsible for fighting corruption in their commands; because of hostility and alienation between police and community ... [and the abandonment of] responsibility to ensure the integrity of its members" (Mollen, 1994). This view is consistent with the findings of the Fitzgerald Inquiry. Both the Wood Royal Commission and the Kennedy Royal Commissions supported Mollen's comments.

This paper will consider the complexity of police culture, and how its very existence is necessary for police officers to perform their duties. Using the Fitzgerald Report's recommendation of community policing as a case study, this paper will illustrate cultural change by tracing some of the changes that have taken place in Queensland since 1989. This paper presents evidence that although police culture still exists, it exists in a growing harmony with community policing. Whether this culture is corruption-resistant remains unresolved.

2. POLICE CULTURE

Organisational culture is the widely held set of shared attitudes, values and norms that contribute to the day-to-day interactions of staff. It is shared by all employees and is expressed in a variety of ways, both subtly and overtly. Employees have a frame of reference by which they understand the organisation and determine appropriate behaviour or communication (Daniels and Spiker 1994). As a formal bureaucratic organisation, the police organisation also has a culture.

The nature of the policing role has created a culture specific to that function. Like any organisational culture, police culture consists of widely shared attitudes, values and norms. What differentiates police culture from other organisational cultures are the strains that originate in the policing environment (Paoline, Meyers and Worden 2000). It is generally accepted that there is a direct connection between police work and a unique occupational culture (Chan 1999, Skolnick and Fyfe 1993, Manning and Van Maanen 1978, Reiner 1992). There are 'traditional' recurring features of police culture, many of which have assumed the status of something Loftus (2010) calls 'sociological orthodoxy'. These characteristics include: an exaggerated sense of mission towards the policing role and craving work that is crime-oriented and promises excitement; the celebration of masculine exploits; the willingness to use force and engage in informal working practices; suspicion; social isolation; defensive solidarity; cynicism; pessimism; and intolerance towards those who challenge the status quo (Reiner 1992, Bayley 1996). In the New York corruption inquiry, Mollen likened these characteristics with corrupt behaviours.

The impact of organisational culture is often unconscious by members of the organisation (Clampitt 2010). Therefore, police officers may be unaware of the influence that is being exerted on them by the organisation, or the influence they are exerting on others. Whilst most police officers would be aware there is a 'culture', they may be unaware of how that culture impacts their decisions and work performance.

3. THE FITZGERALD INQUIRY – A BACKGROUND TO COMMUNITY POLICING

During the 1970s and 1980s, regular articles appeared in the Queensland media relating to police corruption. This culminated in a series of articles in the Courier Mail in late 1986 and early 1987 containing allegations of illegal gambling and prostitution, and presenting a picture of a police service where the receipt of bribes was common place and organised crime syndicates paid for police protection (Dickie 1989). The intensity of media interest grew, and ABC's Four Corners broadcast *The Moonlight State* in May 1987, an expose on police corruption that could not be ignored by the Government. Acting Premier Bill Gunn commissioned an inquiry, now known as the Fitzgerald

Inquiry. The Fitzgerald Inquiry not only proved that the reported corruption existed, it proved that corruption was systemic and high-level. The Fitzgerald Inquiry resulted in Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen losing his stranglehold on Queensland politics; the Police Commissioner, Terry Lewis, being jailed; and the introduction of massive reforms in administrative accountability (including the introduction of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission; and the Criminal Justice Commission); and the reform of the Queensland Police Service. The Fitzgerald Inquiry highlighted police culture as enabling corruption to flourish. Among the recommendations relating to police reform, the Fitzgerald Report emphasised the limitations of a reactive approach to policing and proposed community policing as the primary policing strategy (Fitzgerald 1989).

Community policing is a concept that promotes police working with the community to solve problems, rather than 'typical' police functions that tend to take place after the criminal event. A crime is committed and it is reported, investigated and prosecuted. This is typical reactive policing. The aim of community policing is to be proactive by addressing the crime before it happens. Through interactions with the community and promotion of police, police officers can build relationships with the community, who will then be aware of crime and policing, and take precautions to prevent themselves from becoming victims of crime. The theory is that if a crime occurs, community policing will result in victims being less afraid to report the matter, and less fearful of becoming a repeat victim (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990).

Community policing was in an era of popularity internationally, and the Fitzgerald Report was influenced by this trend of policing reform. The Fitzgerald Report stated that police were too focused on solving crime and prosecuting offenders rather than developing prevention strategies, an approach that allowed limited scope for involving the community. Police were defending the community rather than cooperating with it. The Fitzgerald Report stated that effective policing required cooperation with the community and that police alone were not responsible for the prevention of crime. In order to solve crime problems, the Fitzgerald Report recommended that the community and other agencies should work in partnership with the police. The Fitzgerald Report drew upon the substantial body of research critiquing the traditional reactive style of policing. Until the Fitzgerald Inquiry, community policing in Australia was small scale and not well integrated into policing organisations (Fleming 2010).

The Fitzgerald Report's organisational recommendations were made within the context of this 'new' approach to policing. Even though some communities may have had close ties with police, the Fitzgerald Report stated that a formal arrangement would provide a continuing community policing strategy (Fitzgerald 1989, 230-233).

4. CHANGING CULTURE

The three key areas of reform most affected by the focus on a community policing philosophy were recruitment, regionalisation and civilianisation. Appropriate recruitment of mature, educated officers from the wider community would encourage community policing; the restructure of the police organisation would allow local police autonomy in their local neighbourhoods; and the process of civilianisation would promote the development of community partnerships. These reforms were also expected to contribute to cultural change. There are two problems associated with changing and

organisational culture: the first problem relates to the cultural characteristics themselves; and the second problem relates to imposing change on an organisation.

4.1. Problem one – cultural characteristics

Many of the cultural elements that allowed corruption to flourish in Queensland (and elsewhere), are the same elements that make police officers good at what they do. These elements are unlikely to change if police are to perform their expected function. For example in their study of evaluation criteria for police officers, Lilley and Hinduja (2006) found that the largest portion of rating items among all agency categories were designed to control or limit mistakes. Chan refers to this as officers learning to 'stay out of trouble' (Chan 1999, 110). Police officers have learnt to protect themselves, and Chan believes that this risk aversion and self-preservation has made police officers resistant to change and defensive about the protection of accepted rituals, beliefs and assumptions. Schein calls this 'anxiety-avoidance' (Schein 2010, 215). Chan believes many aspects of police culture have developed as anxiety-avoidance mechanisms. For example Chan quotes a study that found police officers preferred to be overly suspicious rather than overly trusting of people. If they are proved wrong, the officer may be unhappy but at least they are alive to appreciate the unhappiness. If an officer was trusting and this trust was misplaced, the consequence could be death. By not trusting anyone, there is no need to check the correctness of any assumptions. This is efficient because it protects the officer and saves time (Chan 1999, 113-115).

This is related to the 'unwritten police code' in Queensland, which 'punished' police officers who criticised other police. As the Mollen Inquiry (1994) found in New York, loyalty was valued more than integrity. The Fitzgerald Report used this as an example of why corruption was allowed to flourish since police officers would not 'dog' on other officers, nor investigate questionable performance (Fitzgerald 1989, 202). If the code was breached, the police officers would be ostracised, shunned. Yet, this cultural element is not necessarily a bad thing. It has the potential to save lives. Trust is provided to other police, which allows officers to do their jobs knowing that other police 'have their back'.

Officers are encouraged to conform to 'typical' police functions such as crime fighting (Garcia 2005). In her study, Garcia found that those officers who did not conform were stigmatised and labelled as 'deviant', using the example of police officers assigned to community policing roles (Garcia 2005, 66). Paoline, Meyers and Worden (2000) agree that police culture reinforces the law enforcement role rather than the service role of police officers. The strength of these cultural characteristics gives some indication as to the challenge of imposing change.

4.2. Problem two – imposing cultural change

There are two broad arguments in relation to cultural change. The first is that police culture has not, and will not, change; that the very role of policing reinforces the cultural characteristics that makes the police culture unique and unmalleable. The second argument is that police culture can, and has, changed; that recruitment practices, technology, and societal expectations have changed the way police go about their business, and therefore the way police culture impacts on police work. Whilst the first argument holds that cultural change is near impossible, the second argument suggests that cultural change is constant. Both arguments agree on the characteristics of police culture, the culture that evolved from the historical development of policing as a function of society, as already discussed.

The argument that police culture will not change stems from the belief that culture is reinforced by the police function itself. More precisely, it is the police officers' understanding of their role and function that informs their conduct. The police culture allows officers to manage the strains that originate in such a work environment (Paoline, Meyers and Worden 2000). In many cases, the transferral of culture is unconscious. Basic assumptions and ideologies have become so ingrained that they remain unquestioned, perceptions and ways of thinking have developed because of repeated successes in solving problems over extended periods of time (Holgersson and Gottschalk 2008). Schein's theory on 'anxiety-avoidance' (2010) reinforces behaviour that has been effective in avoiding painful situations, even if the original source of pain is no longer evident. This means the successful behaviour is repeated because it continues to 'work' regardless of whether a different type of behaviour would work just as well. Police officers had communicated culture through on-the-job socialisation and the culture was reinforced as officers adapted to the demands of the police role. Coleman (2008) quotes police research authorities Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990) and Kelling and Moore (1997) that traditional police culture made it difficult for police organisations to adapt their strategies and structures in response to the dynamic external environment and, therefore, change. The resistance to change has been recognised by academics for decades. Chan (1999) quotes a 1978 study that found that police culture was resistant to changes despite persistent efforts to change it. This was regardless of 'sophisticated technology, tighter organisational controls and new ways of policing' (Chan 1999, 101). This argument is valid for police researchers such as Loftus, who states that it is the function of police that dictates the culture, as opposed to individual characteristics, technology or societal expectations. Loftus believes that the timeless qualities of police culture endure because the basic pressures associated with the police role have not changed, and because social transformations have exacerbated, rather than reduced the basic definitions of inequality. In his study of a British police force, Loftus investigated the actions of police officers as indicators of police culture. He found that the views of contemporary police officers were similar to classic views, and that the traditional police culture endures. Loftus believes this is the case because the role of police has remained the same, and the basic pressures of policing are the same (Loftus, 2010).

The argument that police culture has changed, and is in constant change, is centred in the reform and innovations of policing (Chan 1999). Recruiting and technology are dramatic, obvious changes that have occurred within policing organisations in the past two decades. The composition of police forces has changed, as have departmental philosophies. This can be seen in Queensland, where in the past twenty years the organisation has undergone significant structural change, change of philosophy and change of policy, as a result of the Fitzgerald Inquiry. It was the Fitzgerald Report's intention that police culture would change as a result of this reform. Paoline, Meyers and Worden (2000) agree, stating that one might now expect to find greater variation in officers' attitudes, because of diversity of police officers and a changing work environment. Police officers have traditionally been white, heterosexual men. The change in recruitment practices means there has been a gradual rise in, and a concerted effort to recruit, non-Caucasian, female and gay and lesbian officers. Patterns of interaction have altered because of the demographic diversity now found in police officers who would not be readily accepted into the 'traditional' culture. Chan (1999) believes police officers and police organisations are not passive carriers of the police culture. They take an active part in the construction of their environments.

5. QUEENSLAND POLICE SERVICE COMMUNITY POLICING AS AN EXAMPLE OF CULTURE

Massive change has taken place in Queensland since the Fitzgerald Inquiry. Community policing has been implemented, albeit not in the form the Fitzgerald Report recommended. The community policing approach has been adapted to fit the requirements of the Queensland Police Service and has evolved into a recognised crime prevention approach to policing that works together with the traditional reactive approach. It is beyond the scope of this paper to analyse the reasons why there was an initial misinterpretation of the Fitzgerald Report's community policing philosophy (including an on-going resistance to the philosophy), but suffice to say when the recommendations were made in 1989, processes were put in place to ensure these recommendations were implemented. A series of reports by the Public Sector Management Commission (in 1993 and 1994) and the Criminal Justice Commission (in 1994 and 1996) included progress of the implementation. A review of the Queensland Police Service was conducted in 1996 (known as the Bingham Review) to report on the Fitzgerald Report's recommendations. In 2001, the Criminal Justice Commission compiled another report, which outlined the current level of reform in the Queensland Police Service. Community policing featured prominently as part of the recognised reform.

This paper is concerned with whether police culture is the same as the culture that allowed corruption to flourish, given the extent of reform and change experienced in the Queensland Police Service or whether the dominance of the policing role has reinforced the 'typical' culture within the organisation. Investigating community policing will achieve this. Changes in community policing and officer views towards the philosophy can reveal cultural discourse. Community policing is recognised as the domain of 'crime prevention', a specialist section introduced following the Fitzgerald Inquiry.

Two data collection methods were used. The first was a content analysis of Queensland Police Service policy, specifically position descriptions of police officers and the Operational Performance Review policy, and the second was interviews with police officers. The method of analysis selected for this study was critical discourse analysis. This method is both qualitative and interpretative. It is an ideal analysis method for this study because it is suited to the analysis of language, both written and spoken. This form of analysis will allow the study to determine the discourse of culture at both an organisational and individual level. Consistent with suggestions from police researchers Rosenbaum (2010) and Bradley and Nixon (2009), this approach combines 'policy and practice', not only taking an academic stance, but by also producing practical results. The analysis of position descriptions can establish both manifest and latent meaning at an organisational level: that meaning which is obvious and deliberate, and that meaning which is hidden or implied. Interviews are an appropriate methodology to demonstrate the behaviour of individuals (Sarantakos 2005, Van Riel 1997). Although hesitant to use interviews as a means of establishing knowledge of culture, Schein (2010) acknowledges that individuals are aware of actions. It is through the analysis of these actions that culture can be revealed.

Two position descriptions were selected for analysis: a general duties officer and the specialised crime prevention officer. At the time of analysis, the general duties position description had last been updated in March 2005 and the crime prevention position in October 2004. The position description for crime prevention officers was very broad and generic which afforded the individual officer a great deal of freedom in determining their individual role, while the position objective was essentially the

same as general duties. Position descriptions were divided into two sections: principal responsibilities and selection criteria. There were four principal responsibilities in crime prevention and six in general duties. Three were common to both. Two related to administration of budgetary and human resources. The third related to the implementation of community policing initiatives. The principal responsibility specific to crime prevention related to media representation. The selection criteria were the same except for the level of knowledge of legislation (sound for crime prevention officers versus thorough for general duties) and ability to research problems (for general duties) or complex problems (for crime prevention). The selection criteria relating to communication emphasised media management in the crime prevention position.

Content analysis can be used to describe the messages sent by an organisation, but not how the messages were received or acted upon (Weerakkody 2009). Interviews were used to illustrate how culture influenced the actions and beliefs of police officers. A 'purposive sample' (ibid. 2009, p.99) of crime prevention officers provides sufficiently rich data for interviews about their cultural experiences as a police officer. Ten officers were selected to provide an adequate cross-section of variables such as rank, experience, gender and geographical location within crime prevention. These officers ranged in rank from Constable to Senior Sergeant. A small sample size is acceptable in qualitative studies because of the in-depth nature of the information being gathered (Sarantakos 2005). Semi-structured interviews were conducted in November 2007 and the interview transcripts were coded using themes. Officers have not been individually identified as per ethical requirements of the Queensland Police Service.

5.1. Results

The study revealed evidence of a culture that emphasised characteristics necessary to perform policing tasks, as well as being susceptible of the risk of concealing corruption. The formal layout of the position description document and the classification of criteria as 'essential' reinforced the behaviour expected of police officers in those roles. Despite a broad and generic function, it was implied that if officers did not perform the functions as stated, they were not performing the function of a police officer. The tone of the document implied that the criteria were not negotiable. The very existence of a document such as a position description also implies that all officers are part of the same 'team'. When a person is appointed to the position, they join that group. The Queensland Police Service is sending an organisational message that the expectation on all officers is the same. This is consistent with the function of policing.

The impact of culture was also evident in the interviews. A number of crime prevention officers felt obliged to justify their role during the interview. Because the service-oriented role of a crime prevention officer is the opposite of the culturally acceptable law enforcement-oriented police officer, this justification was considered necessary, otherwise it would be assumed the crime prevention role was worthless or a waste of time, since it did not conform to 'real' policing. In a negative context, this imposition generally came from officers (either junior or senior) who saw crime prevention as distinct from traditional policing. This was a consistent perspective regardless of the length of service of the crime prevention officer or the geographical location. Surprisingly, officers reported being shunned because their role did not conform to the cultural ideal. Some officers stated that other non-crime prevention police believed the role was a 'nothing'.

Once upon a time nobody went and spoke to the [crime prevention officers]. Nobody knew what [we] did and that's why we probably had a reputation about having cuppas with people. ... Some junior staff don't see the big picture. They don't know how it all fits in. *Officer 1*

They don't see that crime prevention does anything. They just see it as tea and scones at Neighbourhood Watch type meetings. They haven't got a clue on what's done with crime prevention. *Officer 2*

I don't know what they think I do ... I don't think they understand, because I can't really define it, so once I can establish what it is, I can say well hang on that's not my role. *Officer 3*

But a lot of people think, like I did prior to joining the DCPC role, that it was a cushy job. That mentality. That we do nothing, we just swan around and have morning teas and cups of coffee, go and have a chat to the old ladies at the nursing home. That sort of mentality is what other people think we do. *Officer 7*

It's almost like a position that's non-existent. Why the hell would you want to go over to that position? They don't do anything. Yadda yadda yadda. *Officer 8*

It seems to me that those people that don't know what crime prevention is are the ones that will criticise. [They] will say things that it's warm and fuzzy and it doesn't have a practical application. *Officer 9*

The actual role itself is seen as a little bit of a wishy washy role. No real benefit to the QPS, to [station] staff. *Officer 10*

Officer 3 has 15 years service and moved from being the Officer in Charge of a small station to the crime prevention role. Her operational policing experience is extensive.

I'd only started the [crime prevention] job two weeks and I already had a lecture from someone saying we expect you to help us if we go to a blue. Just the mentality they have because I am not on the road, and how would you know what night shift feels like, and all I can do is laugh. *Officer 3*

Officer 4 recounted a personal experience where she went to a police social function and the conversation turned to policing experiences. As an officer with extensive general duties service, it was the first time she had attended a social event as a crime prevention officer.

Obviously in that sort of social setting what I'm doing as police work now isn't, it's not really classed so much as police work. So you sit there and say nothing because what you've got to say is just as uninteresting as a person who's not in the police. I really felt on an outer. And I was actually able to look at the conversation for the first time, and go 'Oh my God, are these people for real?' *Officer 4*

The impact of culture was also evident in a positive context by crime prevention officers. Some interviewees stated that they felt it was their responsibility to make the crime prevention role 'fit' so it was deemed acceptable to other police. Officer 4 said the strength of support towards crime prevention from other police had increased because of the effort she put into the role. Officer 1, in

crime prevention positions four years and current position one year, said she was a valued member of the policing team. She participated in weekly management meetings, and was involved in the District planning.

This is probably not only my opinion but what I am seeing across the state is I think we're being more valued. And we're being called upon more rather than just reactive policing. It's more of a holistic approach now. ... Now staff know that they can come to me and they will get something in return, and there will be a result. And so I'm finding that staff culture towards crime prevention is becoming increasingly favourable. *Officer 1*

Officer 9 stated he believed the reason why he and his partner were accepted was because crime prevention was part of management decision making, and because both officers had worked hard to explain their role to those not well informed. Officer 9 said the support had continued because of his ongoing effort to link crime prevention to other operational sections of policing.

It comes down in a lot of cases to the respect as an individual and I have a good relationship with all sections because they've been involved in different aspects of crime prevention. *Officer 9*

Officer 7 said her experience had noticeably improved in the last few years.

I've come from a general duties background, which was pfft crime prevention what a bunch of wanks, that sort of mentality. And I was one of them as well. And even when I started my role in the crime prevention unit, in 2004, which is not very long ago, I still had that mentality. But I had a bit of service as well. I came out just after Fitzgerald, so I'm still one of the baby boomers so to speak. I had a bit of the old way, a lot of the new way and a lot of the changes and things are progressing. *Officer 7*

Officer 10 had only been in a crime prevention role for three months, and the actual crime prevention position was introduced only 16 months previously. He was able to use the strength of police culture to 'improve' the position of crime prevention.

A lot of people didn't really fully understand the benefits of [crime prevention], and not trying to blow my own horn, but with the effort and the relationships, like I've been [here] for seven years so I've got a working relationship already with the outlying groups, so that reputation assists you in doing that [crime prevention] role. *Officer 10*

The nature and role of crime prevention has changed and evolved since the era of the Fitzgerald Inquiry. Most of the interviewees had not personally experienced the Fitzgerald Inquiry, and those that had had noticed the most change. They had noticed changes in policy and accountability and the manner of policing.

I think it's changing but then again I'm changing with time too, the way I'm thinking about it. So I'm probably picking up how the changes are happening with people in my era more so than the young ones. ... There's probably a lot of younger people too, like senior connies in particular that want to progress through the rank, that are thinking crime prevention I've got to up my crime prevention or community policing work. *Officer 7*

These changes can be analysed to interpret changes in culture. The Operational Performance Review provides a useful example of integrating the community policing philosophy into policy, and the effect of culture on this process. Introduced in 2001 as a formal means of making Districts more accountable to crime figures, the Operational Performance Review focuses on priorities as indicated in the Strategic Plan including personal safety; property crime; client service; planned and unplanned major and special events; unique and emerging issues; human resource management; financial management; and professional standards and ethical practice (Queensland Police Service, 2008). District Officers are required to stand in front of the Commissioner and a panel of senior executives, explain the progress of their district and answer any questions about the District performance. District Officers can face questions relating to anything from crime statistics to media perspectives. The highest priority in the Operational Performance Review relate to personal safety and property crime and how these offences are being addressed at a District level. The Operational Performance Review is statistically driven, and gives the District Officer the opportunity to explain responses to crime of which crime prevention is an element. Not all crime prevention officers were included in preparation or presentation of the Operational Performance Review.

Not asked for anything, not measured by anything. I s'pose all of those statistics on how good we're doing with crime and that sort of thing just come from the crime manager.
Officer 2

The District Officer is looking to get the DCPC actually involved in [the Operational Performance Review], but it hasn't got to it, it's more in just the planning stage, and it's all discussion, so we actually haven't got to that stage yet. *Officer 5*

However, some District Officers would include a crime prevention component in their Operational Performance Review as a means of showing they were planning for future crime reduction.

They're always looking at [crime prevention], it's an area that they see more and more that they can stand their District alone from the others. *Officer 4*

I think that because the service now has got those priorities, and because of OPR, when the superintendent and the AC [Assistant Commissioner], and the District Officers have to go before the Commissioner, and have to say what they've been doing, you know, part of that is crime prevention. And I think that therefore has made all of the Officers in Charge be aware of what crime prevention is and take some responsibility there. *Officer 1*

The use of the Operational Performance Review process showed the Districts operated differently to the way the organisation anticipated. There was scope in the Operational Performance Review to use the performance of crime prevention officers to promote crime prevention as part of an overall policing response. The organisation promoted crime prevention by stating primary organisational Outputs in the Strategic Plan. The Operational Performance Review reinforced this message by measuring the Outputs. Yet within Districts, there was no consistent recording practice of crime prevention activities amongst the officers. There was no policy relating to the measuring of crime prevention officer duties, so officers had developed their own recording practices. Officer 3 kept a log but it was not used by anyone for anything. It was not submitted.

I could rationalise my role a lot better if I could measure it somehow and I would be able to at least present to morning readouts and say as a result of going to all places that sell [volatile substances], break ins have been reduced 89 per cent. *Officer 3*

[The Crime Manager] gets a copy of my monthly return because he's my boss, but that's all, he never discusses anything that comes out of that. He doesn't really want to know. *Officer 2*

There was a common frustration crime prevention was a difficult concept to measure and communicate.

At least as general duties you can say I've written 12 tickets this week and arrested people, but in this role I'm not quite sure how to- That's my mission, to try and- I don't know actually, how to answer that. *Officer 3*

The duties performed by some of the crime prevention officers were considered after the fact in some cases. This meant the crime prevention officer felt like an afterthought in District policing.

Occasionally, it's not being utilised enough, but occasionally we get requests from the OCs [Officers in Charge] which is a direction coming from our District Officer for the OCs to utilise us for crime spikes. *Officer 4*

Only when something is wanted, I suppose the, the guidance or tasking is if we have a major hot spot of crime and they want the VIPs [Volunteers in Policing] to go out and do a letter drop or something like that. I go and ask daily is there anything that we want done, but often it's nup, nothing. *Officer 2*

And yet, Officer 1 felt included, valued and well utilised.

Gone are the days where I personally believe that crime prevention is viewed as kiddie cops and officers that go and have cups of tea and scones with the CWA ladies. I think that that's a very important part of it but I can see it being valued more on the big scale of things. *Officer 1*

Officer 1 made it clear she was supported well by her District Officer. She was also well informed about the Strategic Direction of the Queensland Police Service, more so than any of the other participants.

6. PARADIGM SHIFT

One of the Fitzgerald Report's main goals was to stop corruption in the Queensland Police Service. The Report made many different recommendations to achieve this, including the attempt to influence the police culture. Does changing culture impede the anti-corruption ideal? This paper has revealed two answers to this question. One – culture is difficult to change. Despite the Fitzgerald Report's recommendations, elements of the culture that concealed corruption are still evident. Two – this culture is necessary for police to perform their duties. The dilemma remains that the culture that allows corruption is the culture that conceals police to be successful in their legislated function.

This paper has used an analysis of community policing to reveal change in police culture since the Fitzgerald Inquiry. Community policing was a concept introduced by the Fitzgerald Report in a bid to address concerns with embedded corruption. Among the various other recommendations, community policing was a means of making police more accountable to the community, and to allow the community to assist with the role of policing. This philosophy required a paradigm shift for the police service, and for the officers required to implement it. Community policing is a different way of looking at policing. It is proactive compared to the traditional reactive. It seeks outside help in contrast to the inward focused arrest and prosecution model of policing. These are cultural contradictions in the beliefs and attitude of 'typical' police. But the Fitzgerald Report recommended many other changes which were implemented: recruiting, civilianisation and the structure of the organisation were all introduced to support the shift to community policing. Police culture resisted the change, and community policing was initially not well accepted. It was beyond the scope of this paper to deal with this aspect of community policing implementation. This paper was to reveal police culture using community policing as an example.

The Fitzgerald Report made recommendations with the intention to change police culture. The Fitzgerald Inquiry, and many of the Inquiries conducted after it, reported that police culture had the potential to conceal corrupt behaviour, and provide a climate where corrupt officers could operate with a guaranteed indemnity. By changing culture, the opportunity for the corrupt officers to get away with their corruption was reduced. But the police culture that conceals corruption is the same culture that allows police officers to be effective at their jobs. Officers need the trust and loyalty of their colleagues because of the nature of police work. Without that unspoken trust, police officers could place their lives in danger. Despite the different style of policing, community policing also displays these cultural characteristics. There is evidence of conformity and loyalty, as well as evidence that conformity and loyalty have been felt against officers working within community policing. However, it would appear that a paradigm shift has occurred towards community policing, that it is a valued and respected part of the overall policing process. The Operational Performance Review shows that District Officers need to consider community policing in order to achieve the best outcomes for their Districts, and junior officers are being more involved in community policing in order to secure promotions. This reveals that culture has not changed in terms of individual characteristics, but it has become more tolerant to a non-traditional policing style. The existing cultural characteristics have been extended to include acceptance of policing with the community.

This paper has not considered whether corruption occurs, and it makes no assertion that there are corrupt officers within the Queensland Police Service. This paper considers the culture within which police operate, the culture that has, in the past, protected the corrupt. This is the same culture that allows honest police officers the ability to be effective in their duties. This culture still exists. Evidence of this culture can be seen in community policing. This paper contends that culture is neither good nor bad, but exerts an influence on behaviour.

7. CAVEAT

The views expressed in this paper are not necessarily those of the Queensland Police Service. The interviewees do not necessarily represent a true indication of events in Queensland.

8. REFERENCES

- [1] Bayley, D.H. "Measuring overall effectiveness: Or police force show & tell." In *Quantifying quality in policing*, edited by L T Hoover, 37-54. Washington DC: PERF, 1996.
- [2] Blackler, J. "Historical Influences on Australian Policing." In *Violence and Police Culture*, edited by T Coady, S James, S Miller and M O'Keefe. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2000.
- [3] Bryett, K. *Policing in the community*. Sydney, New South Wales: Butterworths, 1993.
- [4] Bradley, D, and Nixon, C. "Ending the "dialogue of the deaf": evidence and policing policies and practices. An Australian case study." *Police Practice and Research* 10, no. 5 (2009): 423-435.
- [5] Chan, J. "Police Culture." In *A Culture of Corruption Changing an Australian Police Service*, edited by D Dixon. Sydney, New South Wales: Hawkins Press, 1999.
- [6] Clampitt, P.G. *Communicating for Managerial Effectiveness*. Edited by 3rd. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc, 2010.
- [7] Coleman, T.G. "Managing strategic knowledge in policing: do police leaders have sufficient knowledge about organisational performance to make informed strategic decisions?" *Police Practice and Research* 9, no. 4 (2008): 307-322.
- [8] Daniels, T, and Spiker, B. *Perspectives on Organisational Communication*. Wm. C. Brown Communications Inc, 1994.
- [9] Dickie, P. *The Road to Fitzgerald and Beyond*. Brisbane, Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 1989.
- [10] Finnane, M. *Police and government: Histories of policing in Australia*. Melbourne, Victoria: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [11] Fitzgerald, G. *Report of a commission of inquiry pursuant to orders in Council*. Queensland State Government, 1989.
- [12] Fleming, J. "Changing the Approach: Structural Reform in the Queensland Police Force." In *The Fitzgerald Legacy Reforming Public Life in Australia and Beyond*, edited by Colleen Lewis, Janet Ransley and Ross Homel, 118-133. Bowen Hills, Qld: Australian Academic Press, 2010.
- [13] Garcia, V. "Constructing the "other" within police culture: an analysis of a deviant unit with th police organisation." *Police Practice and Research* 6, no. 1 (2005): 65-80.
- [14] Holgersson, S, and Gottschalk, P. "Police officers' professional knowledge." *Police Practice and Research* 9, no. 5 (2008): 365-377.
- [15] Kelling, G.L, and Moore, M.H. "The evolving strategy of policing." *Perspectives on Policing No. 4* (National Institute of Justice & Harvard University) 1, no. 16 (1997).
- [16] Lilley, D. and Hinduja, S. "Organisational Values and Police Officer Evaluation: A Content Comparison Between Traditional and Community Policing Agencies." *Police Quarterly* 9, no. 4 (2006): 486-513.

- [17] Loftus, B. "Police occupational culture: classic theses, altered times." *Policing and Society* 20, no. 1 (March 2010).
- [18] Manning, P, and Van Maanen, J. *Policing: A View from the Street*. Santa Monica: Goodyear Publishing Co, 1978.
- [19] Mollen, M. *Commission to investigate allegations of police corruption and the anti-corruption procedures of the police department*. City of New York, 1994.
- [20] Queensland Police Service. "Statement of Affairs." 2006. http://www.police.qld.gov.au/pr/services/reports/soa_06/p0001.shtml (accessed June 3, 2008).
- [21] Paoline, E.A., Meyers, S.M. and Worden, R.E. "Police culture, individualism, and community policing: evidence from two police departments." *Justice Quarterly* 17, no. 3 (September 2000).
- [22] Prasser, S., Wear, R. and Nethercote, J. *Corruption and Reform: The Fitzgerald vision*. Brisbane: UQP, 1990.
- [23] Sarantakos, S. *Social Research*. 3rd. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- [24] Schein, E.H. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 4th. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- [25] Skolnick, J, and Fyfe, J. *Above the Law: Police and the Excessive Use of Force*. New York: Free Press, 1993.
- [26] Reiner, R. *The Politics of the Police*. 2nd Edition. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.
- [27] *Royal Commission Into Whether There Has Been Any Corrupt or Criminal Conduct By Any Western Australian Police Officer*. Final Report, Western Australia: Royal Commission Into Whether There Has Been Any Corrupt or Criminal Conduct By Any Western Australian Police Officer, 2004.
- [28] Rosenbaum, D. "Police research: merging the policy and action research traditions." *Police Practice and Research* 11, no. 2 (2010): 144-149.
- [29] Trojanowicz, R. and Bucqueroux, B. *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*. Cincinnati: Anderson, 1990.
- [30] Van Riel, C. "Research in Corporate Communications: an overview of an emerging field." *Management Communication Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (November 1997): 288.
- [31] Weerakkody, N. *Research Methods For Media And Communication*. South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [32] White, M. "Identifying Good Cops Early: Predicting Recruit Performance in the Academy." *Police Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (2008): 27-49.
- [33] Wood, J. *Report of the Royal Commission into the NSW Police Service*. New South Wales State Government, 1997.