CULTURAL CHANGE IN ORGANIZATIONS AND COMMUNICATION: THE CASE OF COMPSTAT AS A PLANNED CHANGE MODEL

Yusuf YÜKSEL

yusufyuksel1976@gmail.com

Abstract

Communication and culture are most often studied independently in many fields. In contrast to other fields, communication scholars place communication at the center of analysis and view it as both creator and manifestation of culture. In this line of thought, culture and cultural change in any organization can be analyzed based on the communication practices and choices of people in that organization. The central purpose of this study is to examine the cultural change in a large police department (Newark Police Department) after the implementation of a popular planned organizational change model known as Compstat, which has been implemented by numerous police organizations in the USA over the last decade. For this purpose, 26 interviews were conducted with police officers. In addition, the main components of this model, Compstat meetings, were observed for six months to examine manifestation of the cultural change in the communication practices. The study revealed that there is certainly a cultural change in this police department after the implementation of Compstat model. While accountability, information sharing, 'can do mentality' and flexibility seem to be emerging values in this organization, the claims of Compstat to bring creativity, innovation, risk-taking and organizational learning were not observed at the desired level. Design of communication in the Compstat meetings should be reconsidered to bring a genuine, meaningful dialogue that allows for the development required for organizational learning, creativity, and innovation.

Keywords: Communication, culture, cultural change, organizational change, Compstat.

KURUMLARDA KÜLTÜREL DEĞİŞİM VE İLETİŞİM: PLANLI BİR DEĞİŞİM MODELİ OLARAK COMPSTAT ÖRNEK OLAYI

Özet

İletişim ve kültür genellikle bir çok disiplinde birbirinden bağımsız olarak çalışılmaktadır. Diğer disiplinlerden farklı olarak, iletişim alanında çalışan akademisyenler, iletişimi analizlerinin merkezine almakta ve kültürü inşa eden ve gösteren bir kavram olarak görmektedirler. Bu düşünceye paralel olarak, herhangi bir kurumun kültürü ve kültürel değişiminin o kurumda çalışan kişilerin iletişim pratikleri ve iletişim seçimlerine bakarak analiz edilebileceği söylenebilir. Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, ABD'de son on yılda bir çok polis teşkilatı tarafından uygulamaya konulan Compstat isimli planlı değişim modelinin uygulanması sonrasında, büyük bir il emniyet müdürlüğünde (Newark Polis Departmanı) yaşanan kültürel değişimi analiz etmektir. Bu amaca uygun olarak, algılanan kültürel değişimi anlamaya yönelik 26 mülakat gerçekleştirilmiştir. Ayrıca, kültürel değişimin iletişim pratiklerine yansımasını anlamak adına, Compstat modelinin temel bileşeni olan Compstat toplantıları 6 ay boyunca gözlemlenmiştir. Bu çalışma, Compstat modelinin uygulanması sonrasında bu emniyet müdürlüğünde kesin biçimde bir kültürel değişim yaşandığını ortaya koymaktadır. Hesap verebilirlik, bilgi paylaşımı, yapabilme mentalitesi ve kurumsal esneklik bu kurumda ortaya çıkan yeni kültürel değerler olurken, Compstat'ın yaratıcılık, yenilik, risk alma ve kurumsal öğrenme gibi iddiaları istenen seviyede görülmemiştir. Compstat toplantılarındaki iletişim dizaynının, yaratıcılık, yenilik, ve kurumsal öğrenme gibi değerlerin gelişmesi için gerekli olan gerçek ve anlamlı diyologlara izin verecek şekilde yeniden düşünülmesine ihtiyaç vardır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İletişim, kültür, kültürel değişim, kurumsal değişim, Compstat.

İLETİŞİM

Introduction

Culture is comprised of the values, communication patterns, stories, norms, rules, traditions, customs, and preferred practices and processes that emerge over time (Ruben, 2009). When we speak of the culture of an organization, it refers to the widely shared values, communication practices, stories, norms, and traditions of people in an organization (Hofstede, 1980). Although there is a reciprocal relationship between communication and culture, these concepts are most often studied independently in many fields. However, communication scholars place communication at the center of analysis and view it as both creator and manifestation of culture (Ruben and Stewart, 2005). That is, "culture is a product of social interaction mediated through communicative acts, and communication is a cultural artifact through which organizational actors come to understand their organization and their role within it" (Brown and Starkey, 1994: 809).

In this line of thought, culture and cultural change in any organization can be manifested in the communication practices and choices of people in that organization. As suggested by Thayer (1988), the real source of change can be found in what and how people communicate with one another given that cultural distinctions are created and the potential for cultural change occurs through the alteration of communication processes and mindsets. If there is a real change of cultural values and mindsets after a change model is implemented, there must also be a change in the ways that language is used and spoken in regard to organizational practices, relationships, and policies. As put into the more practical framework by Pacanowsky and Trujillo (1993), any type of organizational and cultural change can be observed in the physical and linguistic artifacts of the organization. These artifacts include addressing terms; routines of asking, greeting, turn taking; dress codes; room settings; design of communication (*who talks, with whom, how*); communication style (*formal vs. informal, open*); use of humor; labeling rules and other recurring practices; and other rituals, routines, rules and norms.

Compstat is the most recent and popular planned change model among police organizations in the USA. Compstat emerged in 1994 in the New York Police Department (NYPD) as a new, complex, multifaceted system (Bratton and Knobler, 1998). It was initially developed as a means to collect timely and accurate data about daily crime patterns to initiate tactics and strategies, increase the flow of information and communication among precinct commanders and departments, and ultimately increase performance and accountability (O'Connell and Straub, 2007). Over time, "the initiative has been transformed into a more comprehensive form in its structure and promises, claiming to instigate the changes needed in police organizations and boasting the ability to reduce crime by making police organizations more responsive to management's direction and performance indicators" (Vito, Walsh, and Kunselman, 2005: 189). Regular Compstat meetings are the most visible aspect of this model.

In the case of Compstat, it has been asserted that Compstat had certain impacts on the culture of the NYPD. In this particular organization, "there was a shift from a largely hierarchical, centralized, formalized management style with an emphasis on mistake avoidance, conformity, security, order, caution, and systematic rule application toward an adaptive culture, where the values of innovation, collaboration, creativity, flexibility, exchange of information, accountability, and problem-solving became dominant" (O'Connell and Straub, 2007, p. 77). Although this cultural shift may be true for the NYPD, it is likely that implementing these kinds of change models do not necessarily result in their intended benefits in all police or public organizations. Thus, there is a need to question the success or failure in each organization that implemented these types of models without making assumptions as to their inherent success.

Based on this ground, an attempt will be made in this study to determine whether Compstat changed the cultural values of another police organization (*Newark Police Department-NPD*) as intended and how these changes are manifested in the communication practices. More specifically, the claims of Compstat to bring such as accountability, creativity, organizational learning, information sharing, problem-solving, and flexibility will be analyzed by examining the communication practices during the Compstat meetings where particular cultural values are enacted and manifested. Specifically, the main questions are:

- *Was the introduction of Compstat perceived to have changed the cultural values of the organization?*

- *If so, how the change of cultural values is manifested in the communication practices of police in the Compstat meetings?*

To answer these questions, in addition to opinions expressed by police officers in interviews, an analysis of communication practices employed during the Compstat meetings will be used considering Thayer's (1988) and Pacanowsky and Trujillo's (1993) theoretical suggestion regarding change and manifestations of change.

Culture as a Concept

As one of the main points of interest in anthropology, the study of culture dates back to the 19th century. The concept of culture has been used by anthropologists to study ethnic or national groups through ethnographic and cross-cultural research (Raymond, 1976). The roots of organizational culture studies date back to the early human relations movement that originated in the 1940s; however, it was not until the early 1980s that the concept became a popular field of study in other areas.

Several factors have increased the recognition and popularity of cultural metaphor in both academic and practitioners circle. Especially, the increasing dominance of multinational organizations and organizational interaction (Tayep, 1994); the dissatisfaction of early studies that focused on structure, bureaucracy, and control to the exclusion of people: 'organizations without people' (Scott, 1998: 54), the awareness of cultural differences and the success of Japan's organizations, which is thought to be related to the culture of Japanese organizations (Eisenberg, Goodall and Trethewey, 2006); and finally the promotion of cultural change through consulting firms and popular publications as the core of organizational effectiveness and productivity (Peters and Waterman, 1982) were the main factors. Culture has been recognized as an innovative way to investigate life in organizations, predict most organizational practices, and increase quality, effectiveness, and productivity.

Although scholars differ on the generally accepted definition of culture, organizational culture has historically been described as widely shared patterns of beliefs, norms, rituals, symbols, and stories that develop over time. Schein (1985), a prominent scholar of the field, provided a comprehensive definition of organizational culture as,

> the pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invested, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 9)

Regardless of different definitions of this concept, most academicians agree on the important role that culture plays in organizations. Some scholars suggested an explicit or implicit link between culture and motivation, strong identification, control, and ultimately increasing an organization's productivity and effectiveness (Pettigrew, 1979). Some scholars view culture as a metaphor for understanding organizational life rather than a managerial tool that can be used to increase effectiveness. According to the scholars in this line of thought, culture guides the interpretation and actions of organizational members by defining appropriate and inappropriate expressions of behavior for various situations (Witherspoon, 1997). As Weick (1979) suggested, culture plays an important role in how members make sense of the organization, their evaluation of certain situations and appropriate behavior and expressions, including dress codes, working hours, leadership practices, and emotional responses. As shown, culture is essential in understanding organizations and the behaviors of organizational members.

Culture and Organizational Change

Because the world is changing in a rapid and dramatic way, no organization can remain the same and expect to survive. Thus, the majority of corporate and public organizations engage in planned efforts in an attempt to change their overall practices, structure, culture, and technologies through strategies and techniques or package systems of change that will keep them in line with the demands of governments, public needs, new technologies, legal requirements, and other normative and cultural pressures (Collins, 1995).

Regardless of its main purpose, any planned change effort must interact with the organization's culture. Increasingly, practitioners and scholars have begun to argue that the implementation of any planned change initiative is more about cultural change than about any specific practice. According to Cameron and Quinn (1999), most change programs (TQM, MBO) did not achieve the desired level of performance because the organization's culture remained the same. They suggested that if an organization's only intention is to change procedures, practices, and strategies without targeting the cultural features and goals, change will remain on the surface, and organizations will quickly return to the status quo. Based on this assumption, changing the organizational culture is claimed to be a key factor in successful change efforts.

Parallel to the increasing popularity of initiatives that directly target an organization's culture, the debate regarding whether culture can be managed or changed and if so, how, has become a prominent issue among organizational scholars (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). The dominant line of research treated culture as a concept that could be deliberately

created and changed by leaders and managers in order to build value consensus and thus increase organizational effectiveness (Martin, 1992). Despite the divergence of scholars on the nature and extent of control, studies in this camp view culture mostly as a variable that is subject to either complete or partial control of management under certain conditions following certain approaches. The other camp takes culture as a root metaphor for understanding and analyzing organizations. Scholars in this camp either support the idea that culture is not manageable or that it can be managed or controlled only with difficulty, and that management also may lead to unintended consequences. These two camps set the background for discussing this issue (Ogbonna and Harris, 2002a, 2002b).

Early studies of organizational culture were most often in the first camp and followed the idea that the creation of a strong, unifying organizational culture could be a solution to weak performance. Organizational leaders were viewed as the main actors who were able to create or change a culture, and they could build a strong culture by emphasizing a set of values and norms, adopting certain policies, rituals, and performances, and communicating vision (Bryman, 1999). This idea was promoted through consulting firms and popular publications that supported a universally appropriate, prescriptive list of cultural characteristics such as '*customer orientation*' and '*constant innovation'* that were applicable to all organizations (see Peters and Waterman, 1982). This literature drew attention to the culture of organizations known for their success by suggesting an explicit or implicit link between culture and effectiveness. Specifically, the attractiveness and simplicity of these solutions to poor performance increased the recognition and popularity of these publications among practitioners and thus brought about the idea that culture can be changed in accordance with these prescriptions (Ogbonna and Harris, 2002b). Despite the limited success of these efforts, Ogbonna and Wilkinson (2003) reported widespread attempts for planned cultural intervention in the UK. Proponents of this perspective also offered a lengthy list of approaches on how to manage and change culture in order to reach desired outcomes.

Since the late 1980s, most scholars in the interpretive and critical camp questioned the intellectual foundations of the link between culture and performance, manageability of culture, and the idea of a strong culture characterized by widely-shared values among organizational members by pointing out cultural diversity, conflicts, and ambiguity within organizations (Smircich, 1983). One group argued that cultural values and assumptions are deeply embedded in the individuals' subconscious, which is beyond the control of managers. At the same time, they argued that the transformation of organizations from modern to post-modern in their structure as well as greater competition, globalization, and technological innovations increased the organization's cultural diversity and complexity. As a result, the response and interpretation of organizational members to any sort of cultural intervention cannot be controlled. It may both lead to ethical dilemmas and unintended consequences for the organizations and individuals (Ogbonna and Wilkinson, 2003).

Another line of research in this camp provided a more realistic view of cultural change and argued that cultural control is difficult and slow, but not impossible (Hofstede, 1980). Similar to society's culture, an organization's culture may be influenced, although it may not be controlled completely (Ogbonna and Wilkinson, 2003). Rather, it may be influenced by some societal, national, and organizational conditions, including the efforts of managers to influence certain aspects. For instance, Schein (1985) and Hofstede (1980) claimed that managers have the capacity to control the organization's cultural artifacts, rules (promotion systems, reward systems, forms of recruitment), or practices which, in turn, may facilitate or influence change at the deeper levels of culture such as values, assumptions, and beliefs. Thus, managers must be realistic concerning the nature and extent of change that is possible considering the complex nature of organizations and deep-rooted set of values (Collins, 1998).

As suggested by Ogbonna and Harris (2002a), camps can be classified under three categories identified as '*optimistic*', '*pessimistic*', and '*realistic*'. Overall, whereas the optimistic camp may be too positive in perceiving that organizational culture can be easily changed, the pessimistic camp may not portray a complete explanation of the dynamics of cultural change by supporting the idea that culture cannot be changed or managed. Based on this discussion, it would be fair to say that the realistic view represents a more practical position. The realistic camp proposes that an organization's culture may evolve in response to changing organizational and environmental conditions or it may be influenced by change agents through certain interventions; however, it cannot be controlled or changed in an exact direction. In a number of articles, Ogbonna and Harris (2003) provided evidence for cultural change in the hospital and food industry of the UK through certain interventions.

Taking the assumption that cultural change is possible through certain interventions, numerous studies focused on what kind of cultural interventions are needed. In fact, the most common suggestions can be classified as structural reorganization, which includes changing the promotion and reward systems and decreasing hierarchy and bureaucracy in order to facilitate and promote change in a certain direction (Jermier and Berkes, 1979). Other than this, the implementation of new recruitment criteria (*young, educated, diverse in gender and race*) and hiring new people, assessment through benchmarking or other systems, training of organizational members consistent with the new direction, and introducing new technologies that change the organization's daily practices are considered key to successful cultural change efforts (Chan, 1996). Other than these cultural change tools, scholars also recommended the use of physical artifacts, symbols, heroes, rituals, and stories to reinforce new values and practices in the organization (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005).

Police Culture and Change

Police culture is believed to play a critical role in change efforts. Scholars have consistently pointed out the difficulty of changing police practices and resistance to change (Manning, 1977); the most common and popular explanation is the existence of a police culture (Davies and Thomas, 2003). As suggested by Schein (1984), an organization with a long, intense, and varied history generally has a strong and easily distinguishable culture, and such a culture is correspondingly challenging to reshape. Given its lengthy and dramatic history, the police culture strongly shapes an individual officer's characteristics, and such strong cultural practices and values often undermine change efforts as they lead to ambiguity and anxiety among police officers. Specifically, the control and command structure, discretionary power, and cultural values such as, masculinity, conformance to authority, solidarity, discipline, mistake avoidance, security, order, caution, and systematic rule application can bring about the resistance in police organizations.

The popularity of Compstat comes from the intended success to change police culture. It is common to suggest that after the implementation, NYPD's largely hierarchical, centralized, formalized management that emphasized mistake avoidance, security, order, caution, systematic rule application changed in a way that stressed innovation, creativity, flexibility, information-sharing, accountability, and problem-solving (O'Connell and Straub, 2007). Compstat was presented as a vital component of the NYPD's reorganization process, and regular Compstat meetings in particular were believed to provide a platform to sustain change by constant monitoring, communication, measurement, and accountability to achieve the goals (O'Connell, 2002). It is suggested to contribute system thinking, benchmarking, and continuous measurement, which promoted an outcome, performance-oriented culture.

Most of these claims rely on the case of Compstat in the NYPD. This study will focus on the implementation of Compstat in Newark Police Department and try to determine whether Compstat reached the same results and how. In order to determine the assumptions of cultural change, the main discourse, rituals, rules and norms and speaking about organizational practices, relationships, and policies in the Compstat meetings were analyzed in this study.

Methodology

Research Setting

In this study, a large police department, Newark Police Department (NPD), in the east coast of the USA was selected for an in-depth analysis of cultural change. This police department was selected due to its relevance for this research. First and foremost, the NPD has employed the Compstat since 1997, and the department was receptive to conducting interviews. In addition, its large size, crime-ridden environment, similarities with the NYPD (*geographic closeness, high population, crime problem, organizational dysfunctions*), and reduction in crime rates after the implementation of Compstat made this police department a good and interesting sample of study.

Data Collection

Data regarding on this issue was collected through in-depth interviews of police officers in different ranks and positions and observation of Compstat meeting. The researcher conducted 26 interviews with the members of the NPD. The basic sampling strategy was to reach a sample of individuals from diverse groups and varied functions within the organization. The interviews were arranged by a contact person who was assigned by the police director to assist with the study. There were a representative number of officers from a wide range of ranks and units. This enabled cross-checking of information in an effort to establish different views held concerning the cultural change after the implementation of Compstat.

Observation was another data collection method used for this study. The main setting for observations was the Compstat meetings. The researcher attended nine meetings in 6 months and made observation approximately 18 hours. These meetings, as the most visible component of Compstat, presented a unique context in which to examine certain practices and conversations conducted in the scope of Compstat. They also allowed the researcher to understand the cultural change of the organization manifested in the rules, rituals, relationships, and preferred styles of communication of officers during the meetings. Normal attendance at these meetings ranged from 30 to 40 officers. As will be discussed in details, there were clear rules that defined the critical people in meetings, who would talk, about what, and the expectations of the chief and director.

Data Analysis

The data obtained from the interviews and observation was used for the analysis and interpretation of the cultural change after the implementation of Compstat in this specific organization. The research took an inductive approach to examining the present phenomenon, insofar as the "categories emerge out of the examination of the data … without firm preconceptions dictating relevance in concepts and hypotheses beforehand" (Walker, 1985: 58). The overall data analysis process can be considered in terms of two interrelated concepts: analysis and interpretation.

Specifically, the constant comparative method was used for analysis and interpretation. In fact, this method appears to be particularly useful in coding a large amount of texts, forming categories, establishing the conceptual boundaries of the categories, assigning the segments to categories, and summarizing (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). All interview statements and field notes were logged into the computer for the analysis and interpretation of data.

The analysis process involved three stages: '*open coding, axial coding,* and *selective coding'.* Open coding can be considered a form of content analysis where the data are read, coded, and categorized into themes on the basis of '*look-alike*' characteristics rather than predetermined categories. The purpose is to "group similar events, happenings, and objects under a common heading or classification" (Strauss and Corbin, 1998: 103). Within this iterative process, a total of about 141 codes were generated. This process ended by classifying 141 codes under the14 broader categories. The next step, axial coding, is "the process of relating categories to their subcategories and linking categories at the level of properties and dimensions" (Strauss and Corbin, 1998: 142). During axial coding, these categories were reviewed and re-sorted in order to relate them to subcategories, linkages, and relationships that have greater explanatory power to answer research questions. The final step is selective coding, in which core categories were selected and systematically integrated to narrate what is happening, form general explanations, generate a larger theoretical stance, and make knowledge claims about the organization studied.

Findings

The findings are classified in two headings based on research questions. The first heading is about the perception of police officers whether or not Compstat changed the culture of the NPD. The second heading is about the communication practices in the Compstat meetings in terms of understanding culture and change of cultural values in the NPD.

Cultural Change and Compstat

Compstat has been in place for more than twelve years in the NPD. Through these years, not only this change model, but also policing approaches, officers' understanding of police work, society, and the technology that supports policing have changed extensively, all of which have something to do with the culture of police organizations in general. Illustrated in the statements of officers, it would be wrong to assume that the change in the cultural values of officers since the introduction of Compstat can be fully explained by referring to this change initiative. Officers specifically mentioned the role of technology, leadership, generational differences, and years of experience, and environmental change in these years, all of which certainly changed the culture of the NPD. All these factors reciprocally changed the culture of the NPD.

This is not to say that officers were not able to identify the role of Compstat in this process. Among all these issues to be considered, it is clearly and strongly evidenced in the statements of officers, and displayed in their organizational and communication practices that *this initiative changed the culture of the NPD.* In response to the question of whether

Compstat has changed the culture of the NPD over these years, nearly all officers replied in a supportive manner, with statements such as, "Absolutely, yes. I think we would be lost today without it", and; "Overall, I think it was necessary and it has been a success. It became culture. It changed culture. We are doing better than we did. If we did not have Compstat, we wouldn't be as successful as we are today." Another officer implied that it took years to make Compstat part of the culture in the NPD: "When the department adopted Compstat first, it was something very new, it was never experienced. Compstat is part of our culture now. So, now, it is our background." There are many other examples that illustrate that the officers really believe in the positive role of Compstat in changing this organization and its culture. Thus, it is clear that officers accept the cultural change after the implementation of Compstat. The second point is how the assumption of cultural change is manifested in communication practices in the Compstat meetings.

Communication as Manifestation of Culture and Cultural Change

The Compstat meetings are the most visible part of this model where culture is both constructed and manifested. The preferred styles of communication in these meetings (*verbal, nonverbal*), language, jargon, addressing terms, physical arrangement of meeting room, the number and rank of participants, and the sequencing of disclosures, and processes such as greetings and asking questions show the culture of the organization and culture of the gathering that define the rules of meetings. The observable aspects of the interaction (*timing, location*) tell us a great deal about the relationship among the participants. For this reason, these regular gatherings with their certain practices deserve specific attention in this study, which aims to understand the connection of culture and communication in the context of Compstat.

The meetings were held on Thursdays promptly at 9 am. Officers wore either a police uniform or suit depending on their unit, which represents the formality and seriousness of these meetings. Officers mostly came about 15 minutes before the meetings. The time gap between their arrival and the start of the meeting functioned as a ritualistic occasion for sharing informal information and bonding. The meeting started officially after the police director came to this room. When the police director entered, everybody stood up and sat only after he asked them to.

The Compstat meetings were held in a ritualistic manner in terms of greeting, asking, turn-taking, topic, manner, and participants. There were clear rules that define the critical people in meetings, who talk, about what, and the expectations of the deputy police chief and police director. The police director regularly opens the meeting and gives the floor to the deputy chief for questioning. The deputy chief starts mostly "*welcome*" and calls a precinct commander by saying, "*Yes, we start Compstat, the second precinct.*" The related precinct commander and one or two staff from this precinct go to the seats opposite the director for questioning, which is basically known as the '*hot spot*'. In each meeting, usually two different commanders were invited to the podium, where they were expected to answer questions regarding their units or precincts in front of their peers. This room design, specifically the use of the podium, has a symbolic meaning that supports the accountability mechanism. At the same time, these meetings, conducted with the participation of all units, increase information sharing and reinforce commanders to take responsibility for the problems in their district or unit. As stated by an officer "*You put them to a hot seat. Commanding officers say that I am going to address this particular issue in my command, when they come back I bet they do.*"

The central discourse of meetings was devoted to how crime can be reduced either by prevention, deterrence (quality of life summonses, visibility, presence, tickets), or investigating and solving crimes committed and arresting people. The police director and deputy chief had different roles in the meetings. The deputy chief's role was to ask questions in order to check commanders' information about the problems in their precinct, hold them accountable, and check their performance. The deputy chief regularly started questioning with a number of expected questions (what the activities in your region are; what your analysis is; what causes this; what are you doing about it; what your plan is) regarding crime statistics, analysis, deployment of resources, and the response of officers for the problem. The byproduct of this questioning was basically accountability, information sharing, flexibility (quick response to problems) and performance measurement.

The police director came into play if he needed further clarification, or found the answers inadequate, or to finalize the meeting with a general evaluation. In particular, the times when a commander did not provide enough information, or satisfying information about the problems in his/her region, crime analysis and patterns, and possible police tactics for the crime problems, the police director expresses his displeasure by saying, for instance, *"this is not good; this is not a solution to this problem", "this is not enough", "Hey T… listen to me, we have been talking about this for two years. It is not okay……", "It is ok. But, come up with a more comprehensive plan."* After this, he mostly explained the reason for his displeasure and what he has in his mind. For instance, it is not uncommon to hear comments such as:

Presence is great, but not a solution to this problem. You should put handcuffs on these people. Early

morning operations with the narcotics division are needed to solve this problem. Hi guys, you should make analysis of crime time and place carefully in order to make a good decision for the police response. You should have pictures of the suspects. You guys listen! Quality of lives, quality of lives, quality of lives; they have to feel uncomfortable carrying a gun.

The closure of the meetings was conducted by the police director by focusing on general problems, followed by a visionary and motivational speech. The police director frequently focused on the issues of leadership, personal expectations and priorities of the department, policies of the organization, new procedures initiated by his upper echelon, cultural and organizational change, motivation, and the success or failure of the organization. The following excerpt from the end of a meeting illustrates a typical closure speech of the police director:

Listen folks; ….. You did a phenomenal job. You can do better. You can do better by listening to what you are told to do. Listen, I am going to screw up. Management is about numbers, leadership is about vision, letting people see themselves in this agency. Caroline you did a great job. That is the type of thing we are waiting for. Today, she went to the podium to represent her precinct and she did a great job. Listen, great job, keep up the good work. Take care you folks and stay safe. Thank you everybody.

The speeches of the police director in these meetings show that managerial discourse on leadership, organizational and cultural change, and motivation served as a powerful rhetorical resource for the police director in communicating certain ideas. He referred to these concepts frequently and tried to adopt the popular ideas of management in this organization. In short, the police director used these meetings both for motivation and critiques of some commanders. There were some questions unanswered throughout the questioning process, which was criticized, but at the same time there were moments of motivation, support, and reward.

The discourse of the meetings shows that officers consider crime patterns, statistics, digital maps, and talk about these things more than before. There were a range of concepts that manifest the new ways of doing the job and the new world of policing. In particular, the common use of concepts such as, "crime analysis and patterns, computers, crime maps, daily information, effective tactics, and accountability" show the new face of policing. It is understood that the way this police organization discusses crime changed with the contribution of Compstat. The change of discourse indicates '*can do mentality*' in this organization as they regularly talk about reducing crime by analysis and effective police tactics.

Another presenting property of these meetings was the way communication was organized; it both influences and is influenced by the relationships among participants (*social status, power of participants*) as well as the culture of the police (*hierarchy, rank*). It was clear that there were some conventional rules that defined the preferred communication practices. Officers, institutionally, seemed to be aware of the range of choices open to them. In particular, the deputy chief and police director had the primary role of starting the conversation, changing the subject, selecting the speaker, defining the tone of meeting, and finishing the conversation. In addition, the communication patterns in these meetings, addressing terms confirmed the formality of the discourse and the power distance among participants. While ranked officers started answering the questions of the upper echelon with "Sir", the police director addressed officers in the room by saying "Listen, folks, guys", hey guys" or with the names of officers. These addressing terms clearly show the power difference and chain of command among participants.

All communication practices, the way turn-taking was organized and timing, and the lack of overlap clearly showed that the current form of these meetings was very structured. In fact, this strictly enforced question-answer form seemed to limit the extent of information sharing, organizational learning, and innovation as most of the officers in the room remain as passive listeners rather than active listeners or contributors. In addition, the culture of the police organization characterized by hierarchy, bureaucracy, and power distance seemed to discourage taking responsibility and risk-taking. The culture of the police organization, early forms of the meetings, peer pressure, and fear of embarrassment seemed to play a significant role in this structured communication practice. A ranked officer clarifies this limitation as follows:

I don't know because director GB says all the time, what do you guys think. However, most of the time, he does not get any responses. I don't think that everybody has an opinion. Some people might have a comment. It is just police culture. Again, it is probably a reflection of how Compstat is used to being done over the years. People did not speak up pretty much. There is also a lot of pressure in that room, fear of embarrassment, fear of being ridiculed, and fear of giving me more work, fear of transfer.

The observation of meetings confirmed that the meetings were organized with well-defined and predictable questions and predictable answers that lack creativity and innovation. There were a few moments that surprised the participants in the room. As such, it is plausible to say that the communication in these meetings was a way from being in the form of brainstorming. This is not to say all these discussions were useless, but to point out the possibility of improving the meeting design, communication, and creating a feeling of relaxation in terms of the topic of discussion and range of answers. The following interview excerpt from one officer illustrates the problems on these issues and possible solutions:

In order to overcome this problem, you can organize the meeting differently. Instead of saying, second precinct what are you doing about your robberies, it can be something like, let's talk about robberies now. Instead of being personnel driven, it can be problem driven. That might be helpful for people to talk more freely.

To summarize, the basic character of communication was question-answer and feedback. The most common forms of transactions were information giving, greeting, criticizing, questioning, complaining, threatening, warning, requesting, and making announcements. Communication practices in these meetings were clearly restricted by the organizational culture. Within this cultural knowledge, participants know who will talk, when, when to stop talking, addressing terms, what is appropriate and inappropriate, the arrangement of turn-taking, and also questioning, how to question, and how to warning.

Thus, these regular gatherings with their well-defined norms and communication patterns show high power distance, paramilitary structure as well as a focus on the ranked system, status, and avoiding risk-taking. In addition to these traditional values, accountability, information sharing, '*can do mentality*' and flexibility seems to be emerging values in this organization. However, the claims of Compstat to bring creativity, innovation, risk-taking and organizational learning were not observed at the desired level in this specific organization due to the structure of meetings and organizational culture. The issues discussed in this part are illustrated in the Table 1. This table shows the main activities in the meetings and their cultural meanings.

Table 1: Culture, Communication and Compstat Meetings

Culture, Communication and Compstat Meetings		
	Activity	**Cultural Value**
Rules of the Meeting	Regularity in day and time	Promptness
	Dress code: Uniforms/ Suits	Formality
	Standing up when the police director comes to the meeting room	Paramilitary Structure
		Chain of command
	Ritualistic manner of meetings in terms of time, duration, topics of discussion, greeting, turn- taking.	Power distance
	Regular participants	Norms and Habits

Central Discourse of the Meetings	Reducing crime / Prevention	Proactive policing style
	Investigating and solving crimes	Can do mentality
	Crime statistics, Analysis of crime, Crime patterns	Accountability
		Information sharing
	Plans and tactics for responding to crime	Performance evaluation
Communication Design / Practices	Question-Answer Form	Social Status
	Regularity in turn-taking rules	Power of participants
	Tone of voice	Hierarchy and Rank System
	Body language	Power distance
	The primary role of upper echelon to start, finish conversation and change of topic of discussion	Masculinity
		Structured form of communication
	Addressing terms	
	Lack of overlap	
Word Choices	Use of occupational codes: Positive, negative, sector	Formality
	Relational Codes	Regularity
	Jargon	
	Use of numbers	

Discussion

As suggested by Thayer (1988), the real change of values can be found in what and how people communicate with one another given that cultural distinctions are created and the potential for cultural change occurs through the alteration of communication processes and mindsets. The tacit knowledge regarding communication patterns and practices illustrate values that changed in this process. It was evident in the NPD that there was a change in the discourse of officers, in the way of using language and speaking about organizational practices, policies, and relationships. Crime analysis, crime maps, hot spots, patterns, proactive policing, accountability, and smart tactics certainly became part of policing discourse. The use of these terms shows the new face of policing and new values in practice *(information sharing, accountability, taking responsibility, flexibility, can do mentality)*.

It has been suggested in the case of the NYPD that there are some values such as innovation, creativity, risk-taking, and empowerment that became part of culture after Compstat implementation. In the case of the NPD, although a degree of innovation and creativity was seen, it was limited by the need for commanders to respond to crimes quickly, pressure to follow traditional tactics and strategies, defensive culture, and the structural design of communication in the meetings. Similarly, delegation of authority to precincts and different units was limited as the police directors were willing to keep power centralized. In short, these values were not in practice as much as others. For this reason, it is hard to call them part of culture in the NPD.

The change of cultural values can be explained at two levels. At the first level, the assumptions of Chan (1996) have an explanatory power for this change. As suggested by Chan (1996), due to the strong culture, habitual nature of work, and preferences for clarity, if the existing processes and practices are not challenged relentlessly, police officers will tend to follow existing ways of accomplishing organizational tasks. Chan (1996) found that successful change efforts in police organizations require the external pressure and longtime efforts of stakeholders. The case of the NPD illustrates the relentless efforts and struggles of the upper echelon to change the mindsets of police officers. The tough strategies to gain compliance, the persistence of Compstat, follow up strategies in regular Compstat meetings, and the focus on performance measurement in transfers and promotion created a sense of obligation among officers in this organization. All these practices affected the mindsets of police officers (*inefficient practices will not be tolerated*) and created a sense of the new ways things should be done.

The other way to understand and explain all these changes is to look at external pressures, in particular, the interplay between the macro and micro conditions. Change in outside conditions, public administration trends, new technology, competition among police organizations, and new trends in policing (*broken windows policing, community policing, problem-oriented policing*), interact with the needs of organization and the vision of the change agents and reinforce to create new policing approaches and management practices. In this process, Compstat functions as a carrier of environmental changes (*technology, performance-based management, competition*), a number of cultural identifications (*national, organizational, occupational*), and characteristics of the organization (*hierarchy, authority, chain of command*). The change agents who follow and interpret larger social, political, and occupational networks, and the characteristics of the organization used this initiative to make new practices and strategies work in the organization in order to adopt these trends and to be seen progressive.

Conclusion

As specified by Mansell (1996), design of communication is particularly important in developing procedures or formats to alter forms of interactivity and communication. Firstly, this design, -structure and setting- of communication in the Compstat meetings often influence the contribution of other participants to the process, climate of real participation, innovation, and organizational learning. It was observed in the Compstat meetings that the same group of people participates actively to the meetings. The number of participants, their seating position and the room design, and the manner of questions could be redesigned to increase the contribution of all officers. In this sense, the number of participants and their role in these kinds of gatherings need to be redefined; and their active contributions also need to be encouraged to spur brainstorming and promote a learning environment.

In addition, asking questions using interrogation-like style should be reconsidered. This mechanism brings a defensive response, in which officers tend to justify any increase in crime rates or other problems. For this reason, instead of putting a commander in the '*hot spot'* and asking about the robbery problem in his/her district, more may be gained by approaching the robbery problem as a general topic and encouraging open discussion of that problem by all participants at a meeting. At this point, the upper echelon's role is also critical in making organizational members feel comfortable expressing their opinion freely without any kind of retribution. If fear of wrongdoing and humiliation, mistrust, and hierarchical control can be kept at a reasonable level, the trust and comfort levels will certainly increase which is key for building a genuine dialogue instead of talking considering the expectations of upper echelon. A meaningful dialogue permits individuals to change the way they see something and allows for the development required for organizational learning, risk-taking, creativity, and innovation.

References

Bratton, W. and Knobler, P. (1998). *Turnaround: How America's top cop reversed the crime epidemic.* New York: Random House.

Brown, A. D. and Starkey, K. (1994). The effects of organizational culture on communication and information. *Journal of Management Studies, 31,* 808-827.

Cameron, K. S. & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture.* NJ: Upper Saddle River.

Chan, J. (1996). Changing police culture. *British Journal of Criminology, 36,* 109-134.

Davies, A. and Thomas, R. (2003). Talking cop: Discourses of change and policing identities. *Public Administration, 81,* 681-699.

Dawson, P. (1994). *Organizational change: A processual approach*. London: PCP.

Eilam, G. and Shamir, B. (2005). Organizational change and self-concept threats: A theoretical perspective and a case study. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 41*, 399-421.

Eisenberg, E. M., Goodall, H. L. and Trethewey, A. (2006). *Organizational communication: Balancing creativity and constraint.5th ed.* New York: St Martin's Press.

Hofstede, G. and Hofstede G. J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations. Software of the mind.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics, Summer,* 14-42.

Jermier, J. M. and Berkes, L.J. (1979). Leadership behavior in a police command bureaucracy: A closer look at the quasi-military model. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24,* 1-23.

Manning, P. K. (1977). *Police work: The social organization of policing* (2nd ed*.).* Prospects Heights, IL; Waveland Press, Inc.

Mansell, R. (1996). Communication by design. In R. Mansell & R. Silverstone (Eds.), *Communication by design: The politics of information and communication technologies* (p. 15-43). New York: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in organization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ogbonna, E. and Harris, L.C. (2002a). Managing organizational culture: Insights from the hospitality industry. *Human Resource Management Journal, 12,* 33-53.

Ogbonna, E. and Harris, L.C. (2002b). Organizational culture: A ten year, two-phase study of change in the UK food retailing sector. *Journal of Management Studies, 39,* 673-706.

Ogbonna, E. and Wilkinson, B. (2003). The false promise of organizational culture change: A case study of middle managers in grocery retailing. *Journal of Management Studies, 40, 1151-1178.*

O'Connell P. E. and Straub F. (2007). *Performance-Based management for police organizations.* Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.

Pacanowsky, M. and O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1983). Organizational communication as cultural performance. *Communication Monographs*, 50, 127-147.

Peters, T. J. and Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In Search of Excellence.* New York: Harper and Row.

Raymond, W. (1976). Culture in keywords. London: Fontana.

Ruben, B. D. and Stewart, L. P. (2005). *Communication and human behavior* (5th edition). Allyn & Bacon.

Ruben, B. D. (2009). *Understanding, planning and leading organizational change: Core concepts and strategies.* Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership.* Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Scott, W.R. (1998). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28*, 339-358.

Strauss, A. L. and Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tayep, M. (1994). Organizations and national culture: Methodology considered. *Organization Studies, 15,* 429-445.

Thayer, L. (1988). *On communication: Essays in understanding.* New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Vito, G. F., Walsh, W. F. and Kunselman, J. (2005). Compstat: The manager's perspective. *International Journal of Police Science and Management, 7,* 187-196.

Walker, R. (Ed). (1985). *Applied qualitative research.* Aldershot, UK: Gower.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Witherspoon, P. D. (1997). *Communicating leadership: An organizational perspective.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.