



*ARC Centre of Excellence
in Policing and Security*

A Multivariate model of police deviance: examining the nature of corruption, crime and misconduct

Dr Louise Porter & Ms Celia Warrender

Contact email: l.porter@griffith.edu.au

Definitions of corruption

- Difficulties in assessing the extent of corruption
 - Differences in opinion as to how 'corruption' should be defined

2 perspectives:

- *What is and is not corrupt?* Defining what behaviour can be described by the term 'corrupt' (and how that may differ from other types of behaviour)
- *What types of corruption are there?* Distinguishing different types of behaviour under the term 'corrupt'.

What is and is not corrupt?

- Roebuck and Barker (1974) offer a loose definition, which involves any form of 'deviant, dishonest, improper, unethical or criminal behaviour by a police officer'

(p.423).

What is and is not corrupt?

- Punch (2000) distinguishes between 3 categories of police deviance:
 - *corruption* is the conventional understanding of taking something (such as a bribe), against your duty, to do or not to do something, as an exchange from an external corruptor
 - *misconduct* involves police breaking their own internal rules and procedures
 - *police crime* describes behaviour such as using excessive violence, drug dealing, theft and burglary, sexual harassment, and violating a person's rights.

What types of corruption are there?

- Skogan and Meares (2004):
 - *Proactive vs reactive*
 - *Personal gain vs organisational gain ('noble-cause' corruption)*
- Miller (2003):
 - *Individual vs Organized, internally networked*

Present Study Aims

- Empirically test these definitions of 'corruption'
- Explore how features of cases relate to each other
- Uncover any consistent patterns in features that might suggest particular 'types' of corruption
- Offer a fuller descriptive model of corruption in terms of *who* and *what* is involved and for what gains (*why*).



Such a model may help not only in knowing what we're dealing with but also inform tailored prevention methods

Data – Law reports (50 UK cases)

■ Pros

- Narrative account of events
- Details of who was involved
- Multiple sources of information (eyewitness, offender interviews, forensic, etc)
- Scrutiny by judge, jury, legal representatives, police etc.
- Accepted in court as true
- Other social research methods impractical for study of corruption

■ Cons

- Select cases known to CJS
 - A) prosecuting officers involved
 - B) appealing a case on grounds of unsafe evidence (due to some form of inappropriate police behaviour)

(representative?)

Methodology

- Cases content analysed for descriptive features to cover previous categories, who is involved and for what purpose.
- Cases examined for these features using MSA
- Used to compare individuals/cases with respect to their similarities across a number of variables simultaneously.

Variables:

Each case coded as to whether it involves;



* 4 cases unclassifiable

Results

<u>Problem</u>	TYPE A: Police Crime N=21	TYPE B: Noble Cause Misconduct N=16	TYPE C: Corruption N=9
<u>Factors</u>	Lone Constables Proactive Single acts Personal gain	Internal High rank (<i>or both</i>) Situation response <i>Single or ongoing</i> Noble cause	External High rank (<i>or both</i>) Reactive Ongoing Personal gain
<u>Potential Causes</u>	'Bad apples' Poor training or leadership	Poor understanding of consequences Peer pressure Social Support Groupthink	'Slippery slope' Lack of job satisfaction Criminal associations
<u>Potential Strategies</u>	Vetting, training, procedural controls and leadership	Staff support, culture, training, <u>audit</u>	Criminal associations policies, EIS, training/personal development, celebrating success

Conclusions

- MSA types support Punch's (2000) 3 way typology of corruption, misconduct and crime
- Provide more detail on the nature of those incidents and who is involved
- Good for descriptive purposes (we can define what we are looking at)
- Themes may provide a useful framework for further exploring causal factors (personality, background, social dynamics) as well as tailoring prevention efforts



Thank You!

Louise Porter

Research Fellow

ARC Centre of Excellence in Policing and
Security (CEPS)

Griffith University

l.porter@griffith.edu.au

Type A 'Police Crime'

- Includes excessive force, racism and harassment

Individual officers

- 'bad apples'?
 - gained support from police departments (Lersch and Mieczkowski, 2005)
 - removal of "problem" officers would decrease incidents
 - but even when individuals known to use excessive force are removed, further incidents still occur.

Constables

- Better leadership from higher ranks?
 - set a good example
 - communicate rules and procedures effectively
- Transformational leadership
 - personal transformation in followers
 - following leader's principles and rules due to internalisation and belief, not expectation of reward or fear of consequences.

Type B, Noble Cause Misconduct

Situation Response:

- officers were faced with a situation and then decided to commit the corrupt act rather than actively seeking or responding to corruption
- frequently involves manipulating evidence as well as breaking interviewing procedure.
- Perhaps officers working in these areas should be made particularly aware of the temptations to break the rules and the consequences of doing so (e.g. the effect on the case & public)

Type B, Noble Cause Misconduct

Internal:

- Officer influence?
 - overt peer pressure
 - unchallenging; social support for each other's actions
- 'groupthink' (Janis, 1972)?
 - *high stress*: under pressure to solve crimes
 - *belief in own morality*: monitoring society
 - *high cohesiveness*: strong cohesive police culture (Fleming & Lafferty, 2000; Sherman, 1985).
 - *absence of external audit*

Type B, Noble Cause Misconduct

- move to increasing external audit of Police behaviour
 - IPCC (UK); Citizen Oversight Panels (US)
 - Oversight bodies and ombudsman (AUS): investigate (or review evidence from internal investigations of) complaints or allegations of corruption and/or misconduct.
- systems are not faultless (such as strained relations and mistrust of each others' procedures and intent), but
 - highlight Police accountability
 - if organised effectively, can help facilitate relations between the Police and the public (Finn, 2000).

Type C 'Corruption'

- resembles Punch's (2000) definition of Corruption: *doing something against the officer's duty in exchange for money or gifts from an external corruptor.*
- typically high rank officers reacting to bribes from external sources over a period of time.
- Particularly dangerous as high ranks;
 - occupy a position of power that can affect the cases they are involved in
 - set the example to other officers that corrupt practices are acceptable

Type C 'Corruption'

- Miller (2003): officers vulnerable to bribes when they feel let down by their job (constantly passed over for promotion, feeling dissatisfied with their work).
- performance monitoring/personal development to motivate and reward staff in their work.
- elements of transformational leadership
 - individualised consideration/attention
 - intellectual stimulation
- Recognition, rewards, celebrating success