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Abstract

Random breath testing (RBT) is one of the most successful drink driving countermeasures employed by police in Australia. Its success over the years has been evidenced by reductions in drink driving behaviour, reductions in alcohol-related crashes and fatal crashes and a corresponding community-wide increase in the disapproval of drink driving. Although a great deal of research has been able to highlight the relationship between increased police enforcement and road safety benefits, little is known about the organisational factors that assist or hinder the management and operation of RBT. The purpose of this thesis is to explore the perceived barriers and facilitators to the effective operation of RBT in the Queensland Police Service (QPS). Findings will have human resource implications for the QPS and will highlight areas that are currently functioning effectively.

Study One involved 22 semi-structured interviews with 36 QPS managers involved in the day-to-day organisation and delivery of RBT operations. Managers were recruited with assistance from members of the QPS’s State Traffic Support Branch. The interviews were approximately one hour long and involved exploration of the perceptions of managers involved in the planning and delivery of RBT operations using the concept of organisational alignment to structure the interviews. The results revealed that RBT management activity is facilitated by a range of factors, including: the belief in the importance of RBT; belief that the purpose of RBT has both a deterrent function and a detection function; the increasing use of intelligence to guide RBT strategies; the increasing use of RBT to support other crime reduction strategies; and a genuine desire to improve the current state of affairs. However, a number of apparent barriers to the effective operation of RBT were identified. These included concern about the strategy of the 1.1 testing strategy (i.e. conducting the equivalent of one test per licensed driver per annum), a misunderstanding of the role of general and specific deterrence and a lack of feedback in relation to the success of RBT.

The second study involved a questionnaire that was distributed to a random sample of 950 operational police stratified across the regions who are responsible for undertaking RBT on a regular basis. There were 421 questionnaires returned representing a response rate of 44%. Questionnaires were also based on the concepts and constructs of organisational alignment and explored perceptions, beliefs and self-
reported behaviour of officers. The results revealed that facilitating factors included a belief in QPS ownership of the RBT program, the agreement that the RBT vision includes road safety goals and apprehension goals, and overall motivation, support and belief in their capability to carry out RBT duties. Barriers included perceived strain related to the 1:1 testing strategy, the lack of feedback in relation to the success of RBT, misunderstanding about the role of deterrence and lack of rewards for participating in RBT duties.

The results of both studies have implications for the planning and operation of RBT in the QPS. While the findings revealed that there were many aspects of the RBT program that were currently aligned with best practice guidelines, there are areas of misalignment. In particular, the main areas of misalignment included concern about the strain caused by the current 1:1 testing strategy, a lack of feedback about the success of RBT and a lack of education of the nature and role of deterrence in road safety and RBT operations in particular.
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Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

BAC
Blood alcohol concentration. A measurement of the proportion of alcohol in a person’s blood, typically obtained using a breathalyser or by conducting a blood test. In Australia, it is generally expressed as grams per 100ml of blood.

CARRS-Q
Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety - Queensland.

Crash
A crash reported to the police that resulted from the movement of at least one road vehicle (motorised or non-motorised) on a road and involving death or injury to any person, or property damage.
- Fatal crash
  A road crash resulting in the death of a person within 30 days of injuries sustained in the crash.
- Serious injury crash (sometimes referred to as a hospitalisation crash)
  A road crash resulting in the hospitalisation of a person due to injuries sustained in the crash.

Driver
The operator of a motorised vehicle including a car, truck, bus or motorcycle.

DUI
Driving under the influence of alcohol.

GD
General duties police officers.

QLD
Australian state of Queensland.

RBT
Random Breath Testing.

OIC
Officer in Charge

Operational
QPS officers who are engaged in active duty, i.e. not working in administrative duties
OPR
Operational Performance Review

QPS
Queensland Police Service

QT
Queensland Transport

RTC
Regional Traffic Coordinator, Queensland Police Service

SGT & S/SGT
Sergeant and Senior Sergeant

STSB
State Traffic Support Branch, Queensland Police Service
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1.1 Introduction

While a number of factors have contributed to the reduction in alcohol-related crashes in Australia, RBT appears to be the most successful countermeasure, evidenced primarily by reductions in alcohol-related crashes and decreases in the number of drivers killed with high blood alcohol levels (see Harrison et al., 2003 for a review). In Queensland, the introduction of RBT was associated with an 18% decrease in alcohol-related driver fatalities (Watson, Fraine & Mitchell, 1994). Since this time, the QPS has continued to devote considerably more resources to RBT. For example, in recent years, the QPS have been conducting the equivalent of one breath test for every licensed driver per year. In the financial years 2001-2002, and 2002-2003 the QPS conducted over 2.6 million breath tests, which is the equivalent of 1.1 tests per licensed driver (QPS, 2002; 2003a). This currently represents the highest rate of breath testing by any police jurisdiction in Australia (Kolesnik, 2002) and demonstrates a high level of commitment by the QPS to the RBT program.

In addition to an increase in testing levels over the years, the QPS have also implemented a number of changes and innovations with regard to the operation and management of RBT. For example, from 1999 to 2003, the QPS has undertaken the following: updated the breath testing equipment enabling data to be stored and utilised to support intelligence driven activity; acquired mini booze buses to ensure regional coverage and increase deployment flexibility; established the traffic intelligence unit, State Traffic Support Branch (STSB) to provide maps and other resources for regional officers to enable strategic planning and placement of RBT operations; and utilised RBT as a ‘one stop checkpoint’ for other offences including those related to vehicles and people (QPS, 2000;2002;2003a). While many of these changes were in response to findings related to an earlier joint review by the QPS and Queensland Transport (QT) (Watson et al., 1994), a follow up review investigating the impact of these changes and innovations has not been undertaken. Hence, it is timely to revisit this issue.
1.2 Rationale for the research

This research endeavour was motivated by several factors. Firstly, as previously mentioned, the QPS have implemented several changes and innovative strategies regarding the management and operation of RBT over the last 10 years. As already noted, the QPS is currently conducting the highest rate of breath testing nationwide (Kolesnik, 2002). This commitment to high testing levels has required high levels of resources to maintain, such as an increase in the number of officers to conduct RBT duties and longer hours spent on RBT. The QPS has also implemented improvements to RBT operations through the acquisition of state of the art breath testing equipment, booze buses and the implementation of coordinated intelligence efforts in relation to crash and offender hot spots (QPS, 2000a; 2001; 2002; 2003a). Despite these innovations and changes, little is known about the impact these changes have upon the management and operation of RBT within the QPS. It is not known, for example, whether the increased resource demands required for RBT have led to strain in other areas of policing.

Secondly, although research has been able to demonstrate the relationship between RBT and reductions in alcohol-related crashes (Henstridge, Homel & Mackay, 1997; Watson et al, 1994), there has been limited research investigating the organisational factors that are involved in RBT enforcement by police. It is, therefore, not clear what types of organisational features are influential in the successful implementation of RBT or what types of organisational barriers exist. Are there organisational structures and systems in place within the QPS to support the delivery of RBT? How is RBT accepted among police officers? Does the policing culture support the philosophy that underpins RBT? Does the espoused QPS vision regarding the RBT program align with operational practices? All of these issues have not been previously explored as the general focus of RBT research in the past has been on tangible outputs, including numbers of drink driving offenders detected, crash reduction levels and the attitudes and self-reported drink driving behaviour of the community. This body of research, therefore, seeks to redress this lack of focus on the organisational factors involved in the enforcement of RBT.
1.3 Theoretical framework for the research

The theoretical framework for this thesis will be comprised of two theoretical perspectives, namely alignment theory from the organisational psychology literature and deterrence theory from the criminology literature. Both perspectives are designed to complement each other in the research process. For example, deterrence theory provides a basis for understanding the way RBT is currently conducted and provides a rationale for the best practice template utilised in this thesis. Alignment theory provides a conceptual framework and conceptual tools to assist in the investigation of the organisation in question, namely the QPS.

Deterrence theory has, for many years, been the cornerstone of many road safety countermeasures and policies throughout Australia and other motorised countries (Watson, 2004). Deterrence theory is a criminological theory that suggests that potential offenders are deterred from committing offences due to the perceived certainty, severity and swiftness of punishment (Gibbs, 1975). In Australia, road safety enforcement efforts that are directly modelled on the principles of deterrence theory include speed camera policies (Cameron, Cavallo & Gilbert, 1992) and RBT (Homel, 1986; 1988). Over the years, there has been increasing evidence for both the short-term and long-term effectiveness in reducing crashes, especially alcohol-related crashes (Henstridge et al., 1997). From an operational perspective, deterrence theory has underpinned RBT strategy and operation from its inception and ongoing refinement. Deterrence theory as applied to RBT is, therefore, perceived as an appropriate theoretical basis for the best practice guidelines utilised in this research endeavour (see section 2.2 for a more comprehensive discussion of deterrence theory and its role in RBT).

Alignment is derived from general systems theory, specifically the open systems theoretical perspective. Over the years, open systems frameworks have featured in the organisational diagnostics literature for their ability to explain relationships between organisational features and deal with the complexity inherent in organisations (Harrison & Shirom, 1995). It is suggested that the relationships between organisational elements, if mutually reinforcing and cooperating to achieve the same goals, tend to lead to higher quality operations within the organisation (Schneider et al., 2003). Not surprisingly, alignment theory suggests that congruence
or alignment between the various elements of an organisation leads to optimum performance (Semler, 1997). The premise of alignment applied to RBT and the QPS, therefore, is that an efficient RBT program is one where there is strong alignment between the organisational features in the QPS that facilitate and support the management and operation of RBT and what is considered best practice.

Alignment theory was utilised for this research for two main reasons. Firstly, being based on an open systems framework it was considered an appropriate theory for the study of a public sector organisation. The literature suggests that systems thinking is being increasingly used in various areas of public sector life including: management (Rodgers & Hunter, 1992; Rosenberg, 1998), training (LaLopa & Holecek, 1996), change management (White, 2000), performance management (Boland & Fowler, 2000) and information systems and information technology (Khalfan & Alshawaf, 2003). Secondly, the theoretical constructs of alignment theory, namely: environment; vision, values and purpose; strategy; culture; structure and systems; rewards; practices; behaviour; and performance capability, adequately cover the types of organisational issues of interest in the management and operation of RBT within the QPS.

1.4 Research aim and tasks

The major aim of this research is to investigate the management and operation of RBT in Queensland by the QPS and to identify facilitators and potential barriers to best practice. The tasks involved to achieve this aim are to:

1. examine current QPS strategies, policies and procedures related to RBT;
2. review the perceptions of officers in the QPS who are responsible for the management and operation of RBT to assess facilitating and obstructive organisational systems and processes;
3. assess the degree of alignment between the current management and operation of RBT with best practice guidelines identified in the literature; and
4. identify improvements to the current management and operation of RBT to ensure that best practice RBT is being conducted.
The specific research questions examined in this thesis are outlined in section 2.6, following a review of the literature.

1.5 Parameters of research

The primary focus of this study was the examination of enabling and obstructive organisational factors related to the management and operation of RBT in the QPS. As a result, the majority of participants in the study were non-commissioned police officers who are either involved in the management of RBT operations and/or who undertake RBT enforcement on a daily or regular basis. The commissioned officers involved in the study were the Regional Traffic Coordinators (RTCs) and some members of the Strategic Planning Branch. While the RTCs are primarily responsible for the planning and management of RBT, they are operational and often take part in RBT duties. Although the commissioned officers interviewed from the Strategic Planning Branch do not conduct RBT operations, they are responsible for internal review processes and procedures related to RBT enforcement. Overall, the main aim was to ensure that this investigation involved those people who are involved in the management and/or the day-to-day delivery of RBT.

With regard to the explanatory scope of the research endeavour, this study does not attempt to qualify what constitutes an optimum level of breath testing enforcement activity. It is recognised, however, that this information would be especially useful to both the QPS and other police jurisdictions around the country. In particular, this thesis is not able to qualify or comment on the current QPS RBT enforcement strategy of one breath test per licensed driver. By identifying areas of organisational alignment and misalignment, however, the research aims to identify areas of harmony and strain as perceived by officers of the QPS involved in the management and delivery of RBT. Ultimately, this information may help improve RBT delivery in the QPS via human resource management improvements.

It should also be pointed out the best practice guidelines that are identified in the literature review are guidelines. In the absence of research evidence to the contrary, the current accepted evidence as to what constitutes an effective RBT operation is accepted as best practice. It is anticipated that future research may be
able to specify operational guidelines to suit specific drink driving problems for specific areas. In other words, there may be different enforcement strategies that work best for rural locations, popular tourist destinations and major traffic thoroughfares for example. The possibilities for future research directions are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

In relation to the theoretical scope, the thesis is not concerned with directly testing the alignment model although it is expected that the results will be able to provide some insight into the utility of the model. Instead, the constructs of alignment model are utilised as a framework to guide the investigation of the various organisational aspects of the QPS impacting on the operation of RBT. This is because the development of the model is relatively recent and tests for validity and reliability are limited. The basic premise of alignment, however, is embraced as the central concept guiding the investigation. Theoretically, alignment theory is well grounded being derived from systems theory, originally proposed in the 1940s by von Bertalanffy (1971) who described the value of analysis of the interaction between parts of an organisation.

Finally, despite developments in the theoretical explanatory power of deterrence theory recently proposed by Stafford and Warr (1993), traditional definitions and interpretations of deterrence theory are used in the thesis. This is mainly because the majority of RBT operations are currently based upon the principles of general deterrence as detailed in Section 2.2.

1.6 Structure of thesis

The outline of the thesis encompasses the tasks undertaken as part of the program of research. Chapter Two examines the literature dealing with the best practice features of RBT and the theoretical basis that underpins the current RBT strategy. A review of the organisational management and performance literature is also examined in order to discover a suitable approach for evaluating RBT strategy and practices in the QPS. More importantly, the review provides a rationale for the choice of theoretical model that is utilised in the research. Chapter Two also

---

1 Semler (2000) tested the construct validity of alignment theory and content validity of the Semler Alignment Questionnaire. Despite promising results, it was stated that further research was required.
describes the organisational setting of the QPS and outlines the research questions and provides a conceptual map of the research process.

Chapter Three provides the details of Study One, an exploratory study involving 39 semi-structured interviews with QPS managers involved in the planning and delivery of RBT operations. The information gleaned from these interviews is then examined using an alignment model from the organisational literature and the implications of this study are discussed. An earlier version of this chapter was published in the peer-reviewed proceedings of the *2003 Road Safety Research, Policing and Education Conference* (Sydney: Roads and Traffic Authority, NSW).

Chapter Four details the results of the second study involving a questionnaire that was distributed to 950 non-commissioned operational police who are responsible for undertaking RBT duties on a daily or regular basis. The questionnaire was also modelled upon the constructs of the alignment theoretical model and the 421 responses received are used to assess the degree of alignment between the current management and operation of RBT in the QPS and the best practice RBT guidelines.

Chapter Five summarises the main findings of both studies and compares the differences and similarities between officers involved in the management of RBT and those officers who are mainly concerned with RBT delivery. Major implications for QPS policy and procedure are highlighted. Finally, the limitations of the research are discussed, along with suggestions for future research.
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2.1 Introduction

In order to identify the organisational barriers and facilitators to the effective operation of RBT in Queensland, it is important to firstly determine what constitutes an effective RBT operation. In addition, it is also important to identify what organisational features of the QPS would be useful for this examination. A comprehensive literature review of both the best practice and organisational performance literature is, therefore, essential to achieve these tasks.

As a result, the aim of Chapter Two is to explore the literature relating to both the best practice features of RBT and organisational performance in order to develop a best practice framework or model that can be used to examine the way RBT is currently conducted in the QPS.

To achieve this aim, Chapter Two covers the following areas. The first section initially details the history of RBT in Queensland, providing an outline of the evolution of the current RBT strategy. The best practice literature regarding RBT is then explored which provides an overview of the theoretical basis of RBT and some of the operational and organisational issues that impact upon enforcement. The second section deals with the organisational psychology literature, specifically research that deals with private sector performance principles and practices and their application in the public service. This organisational literature review also includes examination of the theoretical model used in the study and its conceptual underpinnings. The third section provides background information relating to the organisational structure of the QPS, particularly the function and nature of traffic policing and the specialised units that exist to support and facilitate RBT operations in Queensland. The final section outlines the research questions to be addressed by the thesis, the broad methodological approach that will be utilised and provides a conceptual map of the research process.

2.2 Best practice features of RBT

2.2.1 Background and evolution of the current RBT strategy

Over the years, the various Australian states and territories have adopted RBT as part of their drink driving enforcement strategy. RBT was formally introduced in Queensland in December 1988. Prior to this, a modified form of RBT known as
Reduced Impaired Driving (RID) was the primary drink driving enforcement tool. RID involved random stopping of motorists who were breath tested only when police had formed the suspicion that the driver had been drinking. As a result, RID did not result in a large number of drivers being tested. Nonetheless, RID did initially have a positive effect upon the road toll, particularly alcohol-related crashes (Watson et al., 1994). Unfortunately, analysis of the effects of RID showed that reductions in crashes began to level off after one year. As a result, and in response to the greater success of RBT in other states, RBT was eventually introduced in Queensland.

A few years after introduction, a review was conducted to evaluate the impact of RBT on alcohol-related crashes in Queensland and to identify best practice strategies to enhance operational effectiveness (Watson et al., 1994). The results of this review produced a range of recommendations for RBT program management and coordination. Several aspects identified were taken up by the Queensland Parliamentary Travelsafe Committee who made official recommendations for the operation of RBT based on this review and other research (Travelsafe, 1996). After consideration of the evidence, the committee concluded that New South Wales “with its ‘boots and all’ approach, had implemented the most successful RBT program” (Travelsafe, 1996, p.25). The characteristics of the New South Wales program involved intensive RBT enforcement achieved through high profile operations, the incorporation of RBT into routine police duties and testing targets. As a result, the committee recommended that “While ensuring that RBT best practice...is adhered to, the intensity of the RBT program should be increased in all police regions so that a ratio of tests to licensed drivers of 0.7:1 is achieved by 1998; and a ratio of 1:1 is achieved by the year 2000” (Travelsafe, 1996, p.25).

In addition, several other best practice recommendations were made including:

- maximum exposure to RBT through sustained, high levels of enforcement as indicated by the number, timing, location and duration of testing;
- Ensure RBT operations are:
  - Highly visible and threatening,
  - Unpredictable in their timing and location, and
  - Deployed throughout the road network;
testing of all drivers who are pulled over;
stationary operations as the primary mode of delivery, with mobile operations playing a supporting role targeting persistent offenders and motorists who attempt to evade stationary operations;
continuous feedback to police on the goals and effectiveness of RBT;
sustained publicity with a focus on RBT enforcement activities and the high risk of detection; and
penalties that reflect the severity of the crime committed, applied with close to 100 percent certainty to convicted offenders (Travelsafe, 1996, p22).

As previously mentioned, these recommendations were based on the research evidence that was available at the time, particularly the work of Homel (1986; 1988; 1990) and others who undertook evaluations of the various RBT programs in different states across Australia (Cavallo & Cameron, 1992; Hendrie & Ryan, 1995; Watson et al, 1994; Zaal, 1994;) Overall, the evidence suggested that those states with intensive RBT programs, characterised by highly visible, sustained police operations supported with publicity were the most successful (Homel, 1988).

In other words, RBT operations that were geared primarily toward general deterrence, where the motoring public experienced maximum exposure to enforcement, brought about the most significant road safety improvements. In particular, these improvements included decreases in the level of alcohol-related and fatal crashes, reduced levels of self-reported drink driving and a decline in the community acceptability of drink driving in general (Homel, 1990). According to Homel, these intense, focused operations provided a “pure and single-minded operationalization of the key concepts of general deterrence” (Homel, 1990, p169).

As such, deterrence theory has underpinned RBT strategy from its inception especially from an operational perspective. The following section, therefore, is dedicated to a brief outline of the conceptual basis of deterrence theory and its role and function in road safety and RBT operations.
2.2.2 The role of deterrence

2.2.2.1 Historical and theoretical overview

Deterrence theory is a criminological theory that originated from the ideas of early classical theorists such as Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham (Siegel, 1992). Both Beccaria and Bentham were classical utilitarian philosophers who put forward moral reform arguments related to punishment. The purpose of punishment, according to these theorists, is to deter people from committing crime or to prevent criminals from repeating a criminal act. The presumption of deterrence theory is that individuals consciously weigh the potential benefits and costs of certain behaviours before carrying out those behaviours. It is suggested that individuals are rational agents who are likely to choose criminal behaviour if it serves their interests but that these choices can be mediated by fear of punishment as long as the corresponding punishment is swift, severe and certain (Siegel, 1992). In other words, compliance with the law is greater where there is a greater perceived likelihood of detection and where it is expected that a severe penalty will be quickly imposed (Vingilis, 1990).

The deterrence literature defines two types of deterrence: specific and general deterrence. Traditionally, specific deterrence relates to situations where individuals who commit offences are apprehended and punished and, therefore, deterred from committing further offences due to the unpleasant experience of punishment. General deterrence is the process whereby members of the general public are deterred from committing offences due to exposure to threatened punishment that is communicated through enforcement efforts by police and the punishment of others (Gibbs, 1975; Homel, 1986, 1988; Zaal, 1994).

In recent years, a reconceptualisation of deterrence theory has been proposed that incorporates both personal and vicarious experiences with punishment, as well as the concept of punishment avoidance (Stafford & Warr, 1993). This reconceptualisation has been applied to the drink driving arena, particularly intentions to drink and drive (Piquero & Paternoster, 1998) and intentions to drive unlicensed (Watson, 2004). Paradoxically, results have shown that personal and vicarious punishment experiences appear to encourage intentions to drink and drive (Piquero & Pogarsky, 2002). Similarly, the experience of punishment avoidance has been found to have a stronger influence on the frequency of unlicensed driving than
exposure to punishment (Watson, 2002; 2004). Although this appears to be in direct contrast to the propositions provided by classical deterrence theory, it does suggest that drink driving behaviour is more complex than traditional deterrence theory allows for. Indeed, there are strong arguments in the road safety arena outlining the failure of classical deterrence theory to capture factors such as the impact of informal sanctions on road user behaviour and behaviour that is compulsive and impulsive (Vingilis, 1990; Watson, 2004). Nonetheless, deterrence theory has been the foundation of many road safety countermeasures in Australia and in motorised countries around the world. The relative success of the various initiatives, however, has been largely dependent upon which of the three principles of deterrence theory (certainty, severity and celerity) have been emphasised. The following section is dedicated to a brief outline of the operationalisation of the principles of deterrence in road safety countermeasures.

2.2.2.2 Deterrence and road safety

The success of many road safety countermeasures in Australia can be mainly credited to their emphasis on increasing the perceived risk of apprehension through enforcement. For example, during the progressive introduction of speed cameras in Victoria from 1990-1992, the number of vehicles exceeding the speed limit in speed camera enforced areas decreased from 20% to fewer than 2% (Cameron, Cavallo & Gilbert, 1992). With regard to RBT, studies have shown that where enforcement programs have been intensified, significant long lasting reductions in crash rates, alcohol-related crashes and single-vehicle evening crashes have followed (Homel, 1986; Watson et al., 1994).

Even in the United States, where police can only breath test drivers on suspicion of alcohol consumption, the evidence suggests that the use of sobriety checkpoints are effective in reducing the levels of alcohol-related crashes and impaired driving (Lacey, Jones & Smith, 1999; Peek-Asa, 1999). This is especially true when checkpoints are conducted frequently and are well publicised (Wells, Preusser & Williams, 1991). Although some research has suggested that over 60% of drink drivers are missed at these checkpoints due to the reliance on police observation of impairment (Wells, Greene, Foss, Ferguson & Williams, 1997), meta-
analytic studies examining the effectiveness of both RBT and sobriety checkpoints reveal that both are effective in bringing about significant reductions in alcohol-related crashes (Peek-Asa, 1999; Schults et al, 2001). This suggests that even though RBT may be more sensitive in detecting drinking drivers, that the most important deterrent element in both programs is increasing the perceived probability of detection.

Road safety countermeasures based upon increasing the severity of punishment typically include harsher sentences, such as mandatory gaol for first offenders, increased gaol terms for repeat offenders and minimum fines. The evidence to support the effectiveness of this approach, however, is mixed (Vingilis, 1990; Zaal, 1994; Ross & Klette, 1995). For instance, Zaal’s (1994) examination of Scandinavian and Swedish research revealed that increased fine severity for speeding in those countries did not result in significant changes in speeding. Similarly, Vingilis, Mann, Gavin, Adlaf and Anglin (1990) found that increased fines and incarceration periods for drink driving were not linked to decreases in alcohol-related crashes. In Australia, a recent study investigating the impact of harsher penalties for drink driving in New South Wales showed only a slight reduction in recidivism rates and only for offenders living outside the metropolitan area (Briscoe, 2004).

Other studies appear to indicate that there is a threshold of penalty severity required in order to change road user behaviour and that fine increases need to be introduced in conjunction with a proportional increase in enforcement activity to be effective (Fildes & Lee, 1993; Nagin, 1998). In other words, severity of punishment appears to only be effective when the perception of certainty of punishment is relatively high (Homel, 1986).

The literature dealing with the final aspect of deterrence, the swiftness of punishment is relatively limited. It is proposed that the reason for this is that not many policies are designed with punishment celerity as a sole focus (Simon, Cleary & Storkamp, 2000). Nonetheless, the research that does exist is positive, especially in the United States and Canada where recent changes to laws allow police to impose impaired driving sanctions administratively rather than through the courts (Sweedler & Stewart, 2000). Measures such as administrative licence revocation, administrative licence suspension, vehicle impoundment and confiscation and licence plate
confiscation have enabled police in these jurisdictions to revoke driver privileges more swiftly than is the case for court-imposed penalties. Evaluations of the effectiveness of these sanctions reveal reductions in drink driving recidivism and alcohol-related crashes (Ross & Gilliland, 1991; Rodgers, 1994; Stewart, 1995; Beirness, Simpson, Mayhew & Jonah, 1997). However, it is likely that many of these policies serve to increase the perceived certainty of punishment as well as its swiftness.

In sum, anti-drink driving strategies that emphasise increasing the certainty of detection and punishment appear to be the most successful. This highlights the importance of police enforcement in achieving and maintaining the deterrent effect. In RBT operations, there are various ways that police can maximise motorists’ probability of detection.

2.2.2.3 RBT and police enforcement

There are several ways that a driver’s perceived risk of apprehension can be influenced. Firstly, from a general deterrence perspective, a driver can be directly exposed to enforcement by actually driving through or past a RBT station. Indirectly, individuals may hear about the enforcement experiences of others or learn about RBT operations through the media. Specific deterrence occurs when an individual is actually apprehended and punished for drink driving (Homel, 1988).

In relation to enforcement practices, there are two primary modes of RBT enforcement: stationary RBT and mobile RBT. Stationary RBT is, as the name suggests, characterised by police conducting operations at static roadside locations that are highly visible to the driving public. Stationary operations may involve ‘booze buses’ and be undertaken by many officers (Homel, 1990). Stationary operations are geared primarily towards general deterrence that results in high numbers of drivers tested and a relatively low number of drink driving detections.

Mobile operations are characterised by police travelling around in patrol cars (either marked or unmarked) and pulling over drivers at their discretion, usually in response to erratic driving behaviour (Homel, 1993). Mobile RBT was introduced to counter impaired drivers who attempted to use back streets as an escape route to avoid stationary sites. The consequences of this evasive tactic initially led to an
increase in alcohol-related crashes on back streets between late evening and early morning hours (McLean, Clark, Dorsch, Hulobowycz & McCaul, 1984). Not surprisingly, mobile RBT soon became an important adjunct to stationary RBT by reducing drinking drivers’ perceptions of their ability to escape detection (Homel, 1990).

In addition to countering impaired driver’s avoidance strategies, studies have found that a mobile RBT is useful in the detection of drivers with very high BAC levels (Carseldine, 1988). There is, however, scant research investigating the relative effectiveness of mobile RBT compared to stationary RBT (Watson et al, 1994; Harrison et al, 2003). At this stage it appears that mobile RBT is useful in the policing of back streets around stationary sites and for the detection of impaired drivers in rural areas where covert operations appear to counter the ‘bush telegraph’ to a certain extent (Healy & Wylie, 1998). Nonetheless, researchers have cautioned that mobile RBT should remain an adjunct to stationary RBT due to concerns about the unstable nature of deterrence (Homel, 1990; Watson et al, 1994).

2.2.3 The instability of deterrence

In order to create and maintain the deterrent effect of RBT originally advocated by Homel (1986), it is suggested that RBT operations should be highly visible, sustained and widespread (Homel, 1986, 1988; Watson et al, 1994). This ensures that all drivers, whether newly licensed or experienced, perceive a constant high risk of apprehension. If drivers do not see, encounter or hear about RBT operations they may become undeterred which may be then reinforced by successful drink driving episodes. As a result, Homel suggests that deterrence is an unstable process: “... whether a deterrent effect is maintained or not is essentially an outcome of a delicate balance, over time, between the forces maintaining and those tending to erode perceptions of arrest for drinking and driving as a likely event” (Homel, 1986, p.136). An example of the unstable nature of deterrence was evidenced in Moore, Barker, Kloeden, McLean & Ryan’s (1993) roadside surveys in South Australia. They found that drivers’ perceptions of the likelihood of being apprehended for drink driving were only influenced by the amount of enforcement encountered in the previous three months.
Figure 3 provides a pictorial representation of the unstable nature of deterrence as originally described by Homel (1986). It demonstrates the dynamic nature of deterrence where, like a leaky bucket of water, the pool of deterred drivers is undermined by various factors and requires constant ‘topping up’ through sustained, visible enforcement.

![Hole in the bucket model of RBT](image)

*Figure 2.1: Homel’s (1986) “Hole in the bucket model of RBT”*

Achieving and maintaining an optimal level of deterrence requires a substantial commitment by police to ensure that RBT operations are adequately organised, staffed, conducted, recorded and supervised. Not surprisingly, senior police in Australia have revealed a growing concern about the cost effectiveness of highly visible, general deterrence-based operations. As a result, they have expressed an increasing interest in engaging in more targeted and intelligence-led drink driving operations to minimise resources and maximise detection rates (Harrison *et al*, 2003). Like any strategy, however, targeted operations have benefits and limitations.
2.2.4. The role of targeted operations

When police refer to ‘targeted’ or ‘intelligence-led’ operations they are describing a strategy that is output focused. Intelligence is gathered in relation to a specific problem and resources are then strategically deployed to tackle the problem. In the case of drink driving, this involves the deployment of patrols at times and to areas where greater numbers of drink drivers are more likely to be encountered. In other words, drink driving enforcement is conducted in high risk areas and at high risk times based on the evidence provided by crash data, apprehension data, alcohol sales and local knowledge (Harrison et al, 2003).

In the last few years, most of the police jurisdictions in Australia have focused upon increasing targeted operations. As a result, this has lead to an increase in the number of drivers apprehended over the limit coupled with a decrease in the number of drivers tested overall (Ryan, Cooper & Kirov, 1999). Although senior Australian police are aware of the importance of general deterrence-based drink driving enforcement, the desire to adopt more targeted and intelligence-led drink driving operations has been gaining momentum (Harrison et al, 2003). For example, the recent development of a licensed premises identification system in Victoria is currently able to provide the police data on the drinking locations of recidivist drink drivers (Cairns, 2000; Cairns, Thiele & van Neil, 2000). The data is then made available to local police who are then able to target specific hotels or other establishments according to specific local problems (Cairns, 2000).

The current available evidence suggests that targeted operations are useful for high-risk drink drivers such as recidivist offenders (Cairns, 2000) or rural drivers (Healy & Wylie, 1998). Unfortunately, there is little research evidence that comprehensively investigates the effectiveness of these strategies. There are also problems with the use of crash and apprehension data to guide future enforcement initiatives as changes in crash and apprehension levels are often confounded with current enforcement efforts, along with the effects of other road safety initiatives or other economic, social and environmental variables (Harrison et al, 2003). Generally, the evidence suggests that targeted, intelligence-led operations appear to play a role in drink driving enforcement. At this stage, however, their effectiveness is unclear and there is a danger that stationary, highly visible, general deterrence-based
RBT may be compromised if targeted operations take precedence (Homel, 1988). Targeted operations are, however, more likely to increase in the years ahead due to perceived problems with traditional RBT.

2.2.5 The perceived problem with RBT

Characteristically, RBT does not have a high offender detection rate which makes RBT duties quite uninteresting and unrewarding for the officers who conduct them (Moloney, 1994). In addition, recent research involving interviews with operational police revealed a general desire to focus upon the detection of drink driving offenders as a result of the belief that apprehension is the main element of deterrence (Harrison et al., 2003). This suggests that the police who are directly involved in the day-to-day operation of RBT are unaware of the underlying concepts of deterrence and the subsequent value of deterrence-based RBT. Faced with competing tasks and consuming workloads, this could create negative or ambivalent attitudes toward RBT leading to ineffective RBT operations. At the extreme end, it could lead to corrupt practices such as the falsification of RBT statistics as was recently evidenced in Western Australia (Western Australia Ombudsman, 2001).

One of the major factors behind the view that apprehension is the most important aspect of deterrence relates to police culture. Although it is beyond the scope of this research to fully investigate the implications of police culture on the operation of RBT, it is important to outline some of the main cultural aspects implicit in police work. In a review of the nature of general police work in Queensland, the Criminal Justice Commission (1996) concluded that “there is still a tendency – both within and outside of police organisations - to see the ‘real business’ of policing as responding to and investigating crime”(CJC, 1996, p.5). This was despite the finding that the majority of police duties the CJC examined were related to disturbances, traffic enforcement, attending to crashes, alarms and the provision of general assistance to the public. Similar research conducted in the United States has over the years consistently found that only a small proportion of police time is spent on active crime control as opposed to general patrols, administrative duties and traffic matters (Greene & Klockars, 1993, Kessler, 1993, Reiss, 1971, Skolnick & Bayley, 1986). More recently, Smith, Novak and Frank (2001) reported that the majority of
Cincinnati police time was spent patrolling (29%) rather than dealing with crime related activity (12%).

One of the major reasons for this perception of policing as a predominately crime fighting activity is rooted in police culture. In the growing literature on the subject, some of the major cultural themes identified within policing institutions include practicality, rationality and instrumentality (Vickers, 2000). As a result, definitions of success for police organisations traditionally include arrest numbers and clear-up rates (Skolnick, cited in Prenzler, 1997) despite evidence that suggests that these performance indicators are outdated and ineffective (Prenzler, 1997).

Although many police organisations have embraced the community policing philosophy in recent years, the research shows that community policing strategies often lack the organisational change processes to support their effective implementation (Zhao, Thurman & Lovrich, 1995). Consequently, it appears that the majority of police departments are still focused upon quantifiable and measurable objectives. For example, recent longitudinal surveys with police in the United States have shown that the core priorities of police have remained largely unchanged and the crime control model, with its focus on rapid response police times and reactive investigation strategies is still dominant (Zhao, Lovrich & Robinson, 2001).

Police themselves also report crime-related policing activities to be more rewarding than other activities, and while admitting that crime-related encounters are rare, perceive crime fighting to be highly supported by superiors, peers and the general public (Perrott & Taylor, 1995). Yet it is not difficult to understand why the police prefer to see themselves are crime fighters rather than crime preventers. The policing literature provides many examples of the pressure to be productive among operational police (Reiner, 1992; Skolnick cited in Chan, 1996). Alternative approaches to crime such as community policing and problem-oriented policing are not viewed as practical, serious endeavours (Prenzler, 1997). Even if democratic departmental mission statements and goals are accepted at the recruit level, it is pointed out that trainees are subjected to powerful enculturation of dominant cultural policing values during academy training and especially after graduation (Vickers, 2000; Ellis, 1991).
The critical issue that emerges from the police culture research is that the crime control model, with its focus on the apprehension of offenders, appears to be a major organisational aim of policing (Prenzler, 1997). This presents a potential barrier to best practice RBT because it requires police to operate RBT in a highly visible manner that results in low apprehension rates. If the police are more likely to both formally and informally, encourage and reward apprehension-based activities, it appears that RBT with its low ‘hit rate’ is at least within the police, culturally threatened.

2.2.6 Conclusions of the best-practice literature

This section has outlined the best practice features of RBT according to the literature and in doing so, has highlighted some operational and organisational issues that may present a barrier to best practice RBT. What is now known is what constitutes an effective RBT operation. The next step is to determine the status quo of the operation of RBT in the QPS. Prior to this investigation, however, an examination of the organisational management and performance literature is undertaken. This examination will provide an understanding of the rationale behind the use of traditionally private sector principles in the study of police and will also assist to identify a suitable organisational framework to guide the investigation.

2.3 Organisational management and performance

2.3.1 The application of private sector principles in the public sector

In recent years, both private and public sector organisations have been increasingly faced with similar challenges. For the public service, these challenges are mostly due to political, economic and technological change (White, 2000). For example, much of the organisational change literature describes the parallels between private and public sectors as a result of government spending cuts that have lead to increasing demands for improved efficiency and effectiveness (Hood, 1995). As a result, public service organisations have found themselves increasingly closer to market orientation, having to deal with new opportunities while being required to revise and reorganise operating methods (Stewart & Kimber, 1996).
Accompanying these changes has been the adoption of many private sector management practices, including performance management. This process has been referred to as the “private sector solution to the public sector problem” (Dixon, Kouzmin & Korac-Kakabadse, 1998, p.1). Initially, performance indicators for the public service centred on the use of resources but were eventually expanded to include conformance and compliance with systems, standards (Boland & Fowler, 2000) and more recently, customer satisfaction (Kouzmin, Loffler, Klages & Korac-Kakabadse, 1999). The literature suggests that there are many private sector performance tools that are now applied in a public setting. For example, the private sector management paradigm Total Quality Management (TQM), otherwise known as benchmarking or best practice, has found its way into many public sector organisations including university administrative management (Melan, 1998). Other private sector tools that have been transferred to the public sector include citizens’ charters, quality awards and learning strategies.

2.3.2 Market orientation in the police services

Internationally, government demands for accountability have also brought about major administrative and managerial reform to the police. It has been suggested that police organisations are not that much different from other organisations and as a result, the principles and theories of organisational management are equally applicable to the police (Marks, 2000; Alsabrook, Aryani & Garrett, 2001). Like other public service bodies, the police have been subjected to changing economic and social circumstances. Consequently, many police jurisdictions have been required to initiate new management initiatives to keep up with demands for accountability and perceived problems with internal management (Bryett, 1999).

In Queensland, allegations of police corruption (Fitzgerald, 1989) added momentum to the reform process resulting in the introduction of many private sector management practices such as strategic planning and performance-based contracts for senior staff (Fleming & Lafferty, 2000). In other jurisdictions, private sector principles are taken to the extreme. For example, the Brighton Police Department in Colorado USA are so committed to total quality service they provide a guarantee to
their customers—the public—that their officers will provide prompt, courteous service, will act respectfully and compassionately and that they will do “whatever it takes” to remedy any digressions (Galloway, 1994). In Sweden, a comprehensive TQM project has been underway since 1998 and is designed to improve many aspects of police work including planning, management and feedback evaluation (Elefalk, 2001). This project, however, is still being evaluated so it is not known what aspects of the TQM paradigm are especially beneficial to police management.

In the United States, several police departments including the New York City Police have introduced a new organisational management program known as Compstat. Compstat or ‘computer statistics’ is a goal-focused process used to strategically manage crime-control services (Walsh, 2001). Besides crime statistics, data generated by Compstat also functions as an accountability measure for managers, outlining a variety of resource management variables such as levels of overtime, sick leave, injuries and complaints against police. The philosophy behind Compstat is based on information technology and its application is more frequently referred to in the business sector as baseline management.

Closer to home, the New Zealand Police have recently embraced TQM principles in a change strategy called Policing 2000 or P2. P2 embraces strategic management practices adopted from the private sector and is designed to improve efficiency and effectiveness by focusing on customer service (Duncan, Mouly & Nilakant, 2001).

Despite evidence for the popularity and success of management techniques in the public arena, there are some who do not believe their application is either useful or worthwhile. The main problem according to these critics is that private sector principles are inappropriate for the public sector for various reasons (Vickers & Kouzmin, 2001). In the case of the police, it is suggested that attempts to turn policing into a ‘business’ results in the undermining of police processes and police work (Vickers & Kouzmin, 2001). It is conceded that the measurement of performance in the police is arguably more complex. For one thing, performance is a broad term that implies various meanings (Kouzmin et al, 1999). Police organisations also do not have a profit focus and so ultimately, there is no ‘bottom line’ for performance to be measured against (Boland & Fowler, 2000). As
previously highlighted, output indicators of performance in the police typically include crime clear up rates and arrest rates but these do not necessarily demonstrate relative success. Boland and Fowler (2000) point out, “an increase in the number of outputs, for a given input, simply demonstrates how efficient an organisation is converting its inputs into outputs but provides very little information about the effectiveness or value of these outputs” (p.420).

Proponents of the market orientation for the public service are, however, aware of these limitations and suggest that private sector models should be modified to suit the specific requirements of the organisation (Elefalk, 2000). It has been suggested that one way of dealing with the intangible outcomes and the organisational complexity that is characteristic of the public service is to utilise an open systems approach (White, 2000).

2.3.3 Using a systems theory approach

The systems paradigm was founded by the biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy who proposed that there were commonalities that linked seemingly diverse and unrelated scientific disciplines (von Bertalanffy, 1971). In particular, he argued that many objects of scientific study whether living (cells, organs, groups of people) or non-living (atoms, weather, and solar system) share universal principles of organisation. Systems theory is both holistic and reductionist as it focuses on the arrangement of and the relationship between the parts of an object in addition to the properties of the object (Weinberg, 2001). There are open and closed systems. Closed systems by definition are not influenced by the external environment and are self sufficient. Examples of closed systems include mechanical systems. Open systems, however, do interact and respond to the environment and such systems naturally include societies and organisations (Jacobs, 1989). There are several main principles of open systems theory when applied to the organisation, these include:

- the parts of a system are interrelated;
- there are permeable boundaries;
- organisations are not separate from their environments;
- subsystems do not operate in isolation which implies interrelationships between parts;
• recursiveness as opposed to linearity; and
• discontinuous change (Scott, 1992).

Systems approaches have many applications in organisational areas. They can be found in educational settings as an aid to solving problems such as methods for dealing with pupil misconduct or processes for rewarding good behaviour (Richardson, 1999). The open systems framework is also useful in organisational diagnostics where the use of a holistic approach can help identify organisational problems and highlight the relationships between various organisational features that can assist organisational change (Harrison & Shirom, 1995).

There are several reasons why the systems approach is fundamental in organisational theory and practice. For one thing, in an organisation, the relationships between the various systems of the organisation are crucial. For instance, interdependent relationships between systems that are mutually reinforcing rather than disrupting tend to lead to operations that are more efficient and of higher quality (Schneider et al, 2003). In organisational research, this relationship between internal systems and the environment have often been expressed in terms of congruence, fit or alignment (Schneider et al, 2003). The literature suggests that the degree of congruence between the various elements of an organisation leads to optimum performance and that aligned organisations are less subject to resource and energy losses (Nadler & Tushman, 1989). More recent research has attempted to refine the concept of organisational alignment to improve strategic human resource management and assist organisational change.

2.3.4 Organisational alignment

Organisational alignment is the “degree to which an organisation’s strategy, design, and culture are cooperating to achieve the same desired goals” (Semler, 1997, p.23). It is suggested that strongly aligned organisations have structures and systems in place that are closely tied to the organisation’s vision, strategy and culture. In other words, it is expected that organisations that are well aligned are more efficient (Semler, 2000). Despite much rhetoric in the early organisational literature about the benefits of alignment, it was only recently that an attempt was
made to explain the relationships between organisational constructs and develop a method to measure the degree of alignment in an organisation. Through the work of Semler (1997; 1999; 2000), a theoretical and diagnostic model of organisational alignment has been developed for this purpose.

According to Semler, organisational alignment improves performance by focusing the efforts of the members of an organisation on the achievement of strategic goals (Semler, 1999). Semler proposes that there are nine organisational variables of interest in the investigation of alignment comprising environment; vision and values; strategy; culture; rewards; structure and systems; practices; behaviour; and performance. These variables comprise the alignment model that is detailed in Figure 2.2.
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The degree of alignment is measured by the correlation between the pairs of variables. The details of the nine elements are described as follows.

**Environment**: The environment is the context in which the organisation operates. In general, it includes the economic, political, governmental, cultural, technological and social environment. The environment provides the opportunities or constraints that impact on an organisation’s actions. The environment also provides information about what constitutes success for the organisation and provides information about consumer wants or expectations.

**Vision, values and purpose**: This construct deals with the goal of alignment. In every organisation, this defines the purpose of the organisation. Although linked to strategy, this element refers to the wider aspirations.

**Strategy**: Strategy is defined as a process of constructing and communicating the goals of the organisation. It includes plans and all forms of communication throughout the organisation.

**Culture**: This element relates to the assumptions of success among people within an organisation. It deals with the transmission of these values from individuals to new members of the organisation.

**Structure and systems**: These elements represent the organisational structure, the design of processes, information and learning.

**Rewards**: Is comprised of both formal and informal rewards and deals with the ways in which the organisation deals with organisational behaviour. Examples of formal rewards include disciplinary procedures, promotional systems and formal feedback. Informal rewards may include interpersonal attention and feedback at a local level.

**Practices**: Practices represent cultural assumptions in action and relate to the way in which culture is carried out on a daily basis.
Behaviour: Behaviour is the actual individual activity of the people in the organisation. Behaviour may or may not necessarily contribute, either intentionally or not, to the overall goals of the organisation.

Performance: Performance relates to the overall output of individuals and group behaviour that can be represented by the formula: \( \text{knowledge} \times \text{individual capability} \times \text{motivation} \times \text{system capability} \). Semler advises that specific performance indictors are determined by each organisation and consequently, define performance for that particular organisation (Semler, 1999; 2000).

2.3.5 The value of the alignment model

Semler designed the alignment model to facilitate three main organisational tasks: organisational design, future planning and performance diagnosis (Semler, 2000). According to Semler, the development of the model has expanded upon previous work in the area, increasing the power of the theory and broadening the coverage of associated issues (Semler, 1999). In particular, it is proposed that the model provides a better method of demonstrating how alignment affects performance and provides suggestions of how it may be operationalised (Semler, 1999). It is also believed that the alignment model allows for a relatively simple comparison of idealised organisational states with existing conditions without the intensive man hours required by some quality management systems such as the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award framework (NIST, 1994, cited in Semler, 2000).

While relatively new, Semler’s ideas have been successfully utilised in the study of organizations, either as a framework to guide the overall investigation (Quiros, 2004), as specific hypotheses to test the utility of organisational interventions (Montesino, 2002), or more recently, in an examination of the impact of alignment of organisational structures on job satisfaction (Workman & Bommer, 2004). It is claimed that the major strength of the model includes its ability to deal with the “multilevel integration of systemic phenomena in HRD” (Torraco, 2005).
2.4 The organisational setting

The Queensland Police Service (QPS) was established in 1864 and in 2003 consisted of 8,434 police officers, 270 police recruits and 3257 staff members (Queensland Police, 2003a). The service is divided into eight operational areas comprising: Metro North Region; Metro South Region; Southern Region; South Eastern Region; North Coast Region; Central Region; Northern Region; and Far Northern Region. The geographical locations of these regions are detailed in Figure 2.3 and the organisational structure of the QPS is detailed in Figure 2.4.

Figure 2.3: Regional map of the QPS
Figure 2.4: Organisational structure of the QPS (Queensland Police, 2003a)
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2.4.1 Traffic policing strategy in the QPS

The QPS Strategic Plan 2001-2005 outlines traffic policing as a major service output which includes the “provision of proactive and reactive traffic policing operations or those activities intended to prevent or detect motorists committing traffic offences” (Queensland Police, 2000, p.2). The goal of the traffic service is to “promote safe and responsible road use in Queensland” (Queensland Police, 2000, p.2) and one of the three strategies listed to achieve this goal is to “provide targeted traffic enforcement supported by research, intelligence and technological developments” (Queensland Police, 2000, p2). In relation to the monitoring of traffic policing performance, the performance indicators listed in the strategic plan related to drink driving include those that are enforcement-oriented, “the number of hours officers spent on breath testing; the number and rate per licensed driver of breath tests conducted; the number of drink driving charges; the number of Traffic Infringement Notices; and the ratio of breath tests to charges”. There are also performance indicators related to the percentage of time and officer hours spent on traffic policing and those related to numbers, rates and causes of crash fatalities (Queensland Police, 2001).

While these performance indicators may be useful to the QPS in terms of planning, resources and budgetary issues and while they are more inclusive than those utilised by other police (Gelau, Gitelamn & Pfeiffer, 2001), there are some limitations. For one thing, the data does not explain to what extent were outcomes the result of factors unknown or not under police control, such as levels of alcohol consumption, distances travelled, road and weather conditions to name a few. Despite this, it is acknowledged that the QPS is currently making a considerable effort to try and tackle the drink driving problem with a more systematic and meaningful approach to the collection and evaluation of data.

For example, the QPS has also recently introduced the Operational Performance Review (OPR) process. The purpose of the OPR is to collect and systematically analyse data to identify local policing problems to enable the various regions to prioritise organisational and operational problems. The OPR is based on the principles of intelligence-led policing and attempts not only to identify policing
problems, but also to discover the causal factors that underpin these issues. The Statistical Services Branch of the QPS generates statistics, graphs and tables and provides them to the various regions and districts prior to OPR meetings. A major priority of the OPR is a focus on personal safety, including road trauma (Atkinson, 2000). The OPR process, therefore, is designed to evaluate regional and district traffic policing problems, identify the current state of enforcement activity and highlight areas for improvement and suggestions for future enforcement strategies and initiatives.

Facilitating strategic goals and OPRs is the State Traffic Support Branch who play an integral role in the development and management of programs, policies and operations relating to road safety.

2.4.2 The role of the State Traffic Support Branch and RBT

The State Traffic Support Branch (STSB) is organisationally situated under the Operations Support Command (see Figure 2.4). The major responsibilities of the STSB include: the development and management of enforcement related road safety initiatives for Queensland either solely or in conjunction with other road safety agencies such as Queensland Transport; the provision of support services to operational members of the QPS; the collation, evaluation and monitoring of statistics related to traffic-related enforcement and activity; and the development of road safety policy for the service. The Accident Investigation Squad, Traffic Camera Office, State Traffic Task Force and Breath Analysis State Support are all housed under the STSB. With regard to RBT, the STSB collate regional breath testing targets and relay performance to the Senior Executive and this information is then formally presented and discussed at OPR meetings. The STSB provide regions with crash intelligence information including maps (MapInfo) where alcohol-related crash ‘hot spots’ are identified along with peak times of the day, days of the week and high risk months. The STSB have also been involved in the development of WebCrash 2, a database managed by Queensland Transport that enables district and regional traffic managers to utilise road safety intelligence to highlight local problems and develop specific strategies in response.
At present, the STSB is in the process of improving the strategic use of RBT data in order to maximise police resources. For example, the STSB is currently attempting to develop a database to collate information related to ‘last known place of drinking’ to complement the information normally collected during RBT operations. The main impetus for improved data collection and intelligence systems is related to a general concern about the current ‘quality’ of RBT operations. In other words, there appears to be uncertainty regarding the value of high testing levels due to the possibility that a saturation point has been reached leading to diminishing returns. As a result, the STSB are currently attempting to define what constitutes the ‘optimal’ level of breath testing enforcement activity.

2.5 Aim of research program

As noted in the introduction, the major aim of the research is to investigate the management and operation of RBT in Queensland by the QPS. Apart from Watson et al’s investigation in 1993, little has been done since to ensure that RBT is being conducted in a way that maximises its impact on the road toll. The literature review covered in this chapter identifies several key indicators of best practice RBT. Specifically, the major best practice issues from an operational perspective are to ensure that the majority of RBT operations are conducted in a highly visible manner and to ensure that these operations should be sustained and widespread throughout the road network (Homel, 1990; 1993, Watson et al, 1994).

The literature review also noted that the QPS have expressed a desire to increase the number of targeted breath testing operations to maximise resources. This desire, coupled with the problem that RBT operations are characteristically unrewarding and unchallenging for many officers involved, presents a potential barrier to best practice RBT. Hence, the present program of research is designed to investigate the current state of affairs regarding the management and operation of RBT through the examination of various organisational elements of the QPS.
2.5.1 Research questions

Based on the review of the literature, the two research questions underpinning this study are:

1. What types of organisational systems and processes in the QPS either facilitate or hinder RBT operations according to the perceptions of managers and operational police officers?

2. In terms of the key organisational elements identified by Semler (1997; 1999; 2000), how well aligned is the management and delivery of RBT in Queensland with best practice guidelines?

It was expected that for the purposes of this research, the analysis of alignment within the QPS would take two forms, one qualitative and one quantitative. The main reason for this approach is to enhance the explanatory scope of the information gathered. The qualitative aspect of the research forms the basis of Study One in order to explore the perceptions of managerial staff toward the RBT program. Specifically, Study One was designed to identify potential barriers and facilitators to the planning and delivery of RBT operations experienced at the middle management level. Study Two deals with the quantitative evaluation of operational police officers’ perceptions, beliefs, practices and self-reported behaviour related to RBT delivery. A conceptual map of the research design and process is depicted in Figure 2.5.
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Figure 2.5: Overview of the research process
Adapting the alignment model for the examination of RBT in the QPS

Although Semler developed the Semler Alignment Questionnaire (SAQ) to operationalise alignment theory, preliminary testing revealed some areas of confusion among respondents related to SAQ wording (Semler, 2000). In addition, despite high face and content validity ratings during instrument development and satisfactory inter-method reliability, it was conceded that further testing was required to refine the questionnaire (Semler, 2000). To avoid similar problems with this research program, it was decided not to use the SAQ. Instead, it was decided to utilise the alignment model primarily as an organising framework, with slightly different applications for the two studies. These applications are detailed as follows.

Firstly, for Study One, it was expected that the constructs would be used as guiding topics for the interviews with the managers. In other words, each construct would be used as a discussion point to explore the various organisational aspects relevant to the management of RBT. As Study One was intended to be an exploratory process, it was expected that any problems with the application of alignment constructs would be identified at this stage. In Study Two, it was expected that the constructs would be used to structure a questionnaire specifically developed for the QPS to be administered to operational police.\(^1\) For both studies, the only modification made to the alignment model was in relation to the construct Performance. Although the QPS has various performance indicators for the operation of RBT (refer section 2.4.1), it was believed that it would be more meaningful to rename this construct Performance capability while still retaining the formula \((\text{knowledge} \times \text{individual capability} \times \text{motivation} \times \text{system capability})\) proposed by Semler (1999; 2000). Specifically, this was because the focus of the investigation was on human resource issues and not on how many breath tests were conducted, the number of drink drivers detected or the number of alcohol-related crashes, for example.

Finally, in order to calibrate alignment for the constructs, the best practice guidelines previously identified were applied to each organisational construct. This enabled the state of alignment to be determined in each case. In addition, specific

\(^1\) For the purposes of the thesis, non-managerial officers are referred to as ‘operational’ to distinguish the two groups but it is noted that managers can also be operational in reality.
goals were developed for each construct in order to guide the interviews and assist with the questionnaire development. Generally, the goals of both studies were similar but there were some differences mainly as a result of an attempt to draw out the two different perspectives of management and operational police for later comparison. To clarify this process, Table 2.1 provides an outline of the goals for both studies and states what was considered to constitute alignment for the model constructs.

Table 2.1
Goals of investigation and the nature of alignment for both studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Goals of investigation and nature of alignment for Study One and Study Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>S1: To explore managers’ perceptions of external opportunities and constraints that influence the RBT program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2: To determine to what extent members believe that certain groups, including the QPS currently play a major role in setting the overall RBT strategy, including the number of breath tests conducted each year and the way in which RBT is conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment: Agreement that the QPS is the primary stakeholder regarding the management and operation of the RBT program and that there are no external constraints to RBT activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision, values and purpose</td>
<td>S1/S2: To explore and determine what members perceive are the overall goals of the QPS’s RBT program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment: Agreement that QPS’s RBT vision is not only about deterring drink drivers and catching drink drivers but also includes the broader road safety aims of promoting safe road use, educating the community and overall, attempting to reduce the road toll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Goals of investigation and nature of alignment for Study One and Study Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Strategy**    | **S1:** To explore managers’ perceptions and understanding of the RBT strategy.  
|                 | **S2:** To determine the level of understanding of what are the main RBT strategies employed by the QPS; to assess the perception of clarity of rationale for number of tests to be performed and where and how these tests are to be conducted; and the achievability of the 1:1 ratio. 
|                 | **Alignment:** Agreement that QPS RBT strategies are congruent with best practice strategies eg. RBT highly visible, unpredictable, unavoidable, and the majority of operations conducted by stationary units. |
| **Culture**     | **S1:** To explore managers’ perceptions regarding the core business of policing and how RBT fits into cultural assumptions about policing.  
|                 | **S2:** To determine whether operational members see RBT as primarily a traffic branch problem or a policing problem in general and to what degree are stationary or mobile operations viewed as core policing objectives. 
|                 | **Alignment:** Agreement that RBT is the responsibility of all operational police and that deterring drink drivers is as equally important as catching drink drivers. |
| **Structures and systems** | **S1/S2:** To explore and determine what organisational structures and systems in place within the QPS in order to facilitate RBT operations. 
<p>|                 | <strong>Alignment:</strong> Agreement that there are necessary structures and systems in place to ensure RBT operations are conducted effectively and efficiently. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Goals of investigation and nature of alignment for Study One and Study Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Rewards** | S1: To explore managers’ perceptions of the formal and informal rewards related to RBT activity.  
S2: To discover the types of formal and informal rewards that are available for participating in RBT duties and what types of enforcement activities are more likely to be rewarded by both peers and supervisors.  
**Alignment**: Agreement that both supervisors and peers praise members for catching drink drivers as well as carrying out RBT in general, that RBT participation is formally acknowledged by the QPS and that there are incentives (shift penalties) for extra participation. |
| **Practices** | S1/2: To explore officers’ perceptions regarding the daily operational practices in relation to RBT with the goal of determining whether assumed practices are based on best practice features or other facilitating features.  
**Alignment**: Agreement that RBT operations are carried out in line with best practice recommendations and other facilitating practices. |
| **Behaviour** | S1: Behaviour not specifically covered but detailed in responses to other constructs (see Section 3.1 for more detail).  
S2: To determine whether officers conducting RBT duties report doing so in a highly visible way, are deploying RBT operations throughout the road network, testing every driver stopped and are complying with the occupational health and safety guideline of constructing a site plan for each operation.  
**Alignment**: Agreement that members’ behaviour is congruent with best practice. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Goals of investigation and nature of alignment for Study One and Study Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance capability</td>
<td>S1/2: To determine to what extent officers believe they possess the necessary knowledge, individual capability and motivation to manage/carry out RBT duties and to what extent they believe the system has the capability to support RBT duties. <strong>Alignment</strong>: Agreement that officers possess knowledge of RBT policy and procedure, are adequately trained to conduct RBT duties, are motivated and agree that the various organisational system components support their efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to detail the first study undertaken as part of this research project. This study involved semi-structured interviews with QPS managers who are responsible or play a role in the management and deployment of RBT. The overall aim of Study One was to explore the perceptions of managers involved in the planning and delivery of RBT operations. As such, it was expected that findings would enable the identification of potential barriers and facilitators to the successful implementation of RBT operations experienced at the management level. The results of these interviews were also expected to provide information that would assist the development of the questionnaire to be administered to operational members, undertaken in Study Two.

The rationale for choosing managerial staff for this study was to explore the decision-making processes relating to the management of RBT. It was also expected that results from this study could be compared and contrasted with the results from Study Two involving operational members to provide greater explanatory scope to the thesis overall. As stated in 2.5.1, this study addresses both research questions from the managers’ perspective.

3.2 Method

3.2.1 Background

After initial approval for the program of research was obtained from the Queensland University of Technology ethics committee, a separate application was undertaken through the QPS Research Committee. Following QPS approval to proceed, the recruitment of participants was undertaken with the assistance of members from the State Traffic Support Branch (STSB). As highlighted in section 2.4.2, the STSB provide support services to operational members of the QPS and are responsible for road safety policy in the QPS and the collation and evaluation of traffic statistics such as those related to RBT enforcement. From this point on, the STSB provided a coordinating role for both Study One and Study Two, assisting with contact names and details for those involved in the interviews for Study One. The STSB provided details of all the Regional Traffic Coordinators (RTC) across the state who were the initial contact for all future interview sessions. RTCs are
responsible for the coordination of traffic operations in the various regions. The position carries the rank of Inspector and some major responsibilities include:

- assist with setting regional goals and objectives and ensure implementation in line with service goals and policies;
- plan, oversee/coordinate/command major traffic enforcement and operations as required;
- identify and monitor traffic trends and implement purposeful remedial action;
- ensure regular evaluation and review processes are undertaken to monitor the efficiency, effectiveness and equity of service policy and practices and policing activities with in the Region; and
- monitor and co-ordinate the development of traffic related policies and procedures aimed at providing a high level of traffic policing efficiently within the region (Queensland Police, 2003b).

There are eight RTCs, one for each of the eight police regions in Queensland. These regions, their locations and the major towns in each are listed on the QPS Regional Map in Chapter 2, Figure 2.3. As one of the RTC’s major responsibilities is the oversight of RBT operations, it was expected that they would be able to outline the broader issues related to RBT enforcement in their respective jurisdictions. The RTC’s provided contacts of other managers in their areas who could be approached for interviews. As far as was reasonably practicable, it was endeavoured to ensure that these contacts provided a balanced mix of general duties (GD) and traffic staff and would also include smaller and/or rural stations. The RTCs were asked to informally advise these managers about the research and flag the possibility that some of them may be approached for interviews.

It should also be pointed out that four officers from the Strategic Planning Unit were also involved in interviews. These officers are responsible for the formal Operational Performance Review (OPR) process that includes the monitoring of road safety enforcement efforts, detailed in section 2.4.1. In addition, two officers from STSB were interviewed to provide a state wide perspective on RBT deployment processes and decision making.
3.2.2 Sample

Overall, 22 interview sessions were conducted involving 36 QPS members. These included: 8 RTC Inspectors, 4 Inspectors from Strategic Planning, 2 officers from STSB, 7 S/Sgts in charge of GD patrols and/or stations, 7 S/Sgts in charge of traffic branches, and 8 Senior Constables from traffic branch and GD patrols. Only one manager interviewed was female and all regions were covered.

3.2.3 Procedure

Interviewees were initially contacted by phone or email. They were advised of the nature of the research, that QPS had approved the research and were invited to take part in an interview to explore their experiences with RBT planning and delivery. Prior to each interview, both an information sheet (Appendix A) and a list of some examples of the questions/issues that could be covered in the interview (Appendix B) were supplied to the interviewees. The example sheet was provided to the interviewees so they would understand the types of issues that may be covered and to allay any fears about the nature of the research.

The interviews were semi-structured and of approximately one hour duration except in those case where there were more people present. This was particularly the case in rural areas where it was more practical for key regional staff from neighbouring towns to meet in a central location. It is noted at this point that it was not possible to cover all stations or towns due to travelling distances, staff availability and time. As a result, the suburban districts were covered in greater detail than the rural regions but it was believed that those participating in the rural/remote sessions were representative of other staff across their regions.

Although notes were taken during the interviews, participants were assured that their anonymity would be preserved and that all comments would remain confidential. Interviews commenced by asking participants about their QPS service history and experience. In addition to the questions and issues detailed in Appendix B, participants were asked to comment on aspects of the current RBT program guided by the various elements of the modified alignment model. For example, in the case of the element Vision/Values, participants were asked to describe their perceptions of goals of the current RBT policy. With the Rewards element, interview
participants were encouraged to discuss the types of informal or formal rewards that exist within the QPS for conducting RBT, meeting testing quotas or apprehending drink drivers. Similar questions were asked for each element of the model but there was no distinct ordering or specific questioning technique for the elements. The closing topic for each interview allowed each participant to make suggestions for the improvement of RBT operations and drink driving enforcement. The research supervisor attended approximately one third of the interview sessions and also made notes of the conversations.

3.2.4 Analysis of data

At the end of the interview sessions where both the researcher and the supervisor were present, notes were compared and cross checked to enhance the validity of the data. All interview notes were, as soon as practicable after the interview session, transcribed onto a computer file. Interviewee comments were grouped under the alignment construct headings and common themes and issues were identified using a basic content analysis technique (Weber, 1990). Frequent consultation with the research supervisor during this aspect of the data analysis was carried out in order to attempt to minimise any subjective bias or inconsistencies in relation to the interpretation of some of the more complex comments made.

3.3 Results

While the alignment model was used to guide Study One, it was not intended to act as a direct test of the model. Rather, the aim was to identify issues that facilitated or acted as barriers to the effective operation of RBT as perceived by QPS managers. The main findings are summarised below in terms of the constructs of the model.

3.3.1 Environment

Nearly all managers reported that the QPS’s RBT policy was strongly influenced by external agencies, particularly politicians and parliamentary committees such as Travelsafe who were responsible for the recommendation of one breath test per licensed driver (see section 2.2.1). For many, the policy was viewed as
a fixed political mandate that served a “government purpose” and did not take into consideration the reality of policing and the geographical and demographic differences between the various regions throughout the state.

For those members who believed that the current policy was determined and driven by senior QPS management (i.e. the Senior Executive), comments were equally critical. Although these managers perceived QPS ownership of the RBT program, they believed that the Senior Executive was under political pressure to conform to an externally derived agenda. Some suggested that this pressure was based upon the program outputs being linked to the QPS budget.

All managers did not believe that the community was a major driver for RBT policy, although most recognised strong community support for the RBT program in general. It was commented that the community did not perceive traffic as seriously as crime and that it was only those individuals who had personally experienced alcohol-related trauma who were interested in RBT policy and procedure. In general, the general public were viewed as passive agents in road safety policy, especially with regard to RBT.

There were some managers who believed that the QPS’s RBT policy was directly influenced by research and policy from interstate. These managers believed that the current policy was copied from other police jurisdictions across the nation. As a result, it was suggested that the current program was “flawed” as it did not take into consideration the geographical and social differences unique to Queensland, which arguably required locally determined drink driving enforcement strategies. It was suggested that instead of a focus on the numbers required, each region should consider its own problems (e.g. remote communities, island communities, tourist hot spots, and mining areas) and conduct RBT accordingly.

3.3.2 Vision, values and purpose

Generally, RBT was viewed as an important police activity, not only as a deterrent to potential drink drivers but also to ensure the detection of drink drivers. All managers believed that the overall purpose of the RBT program was to reduce alcohol-related road trauma but they had different views about how the QPS is currently orienting the RBT program to achieve this goal. For example, some argued
that the current program was primarily aimed at “getting the numbers” which did nothing in their view to deter drink drivers. These managers believed that the apprehension of drink drivers should be the QPS’s primary goal as it was the only method that impacted on reoffending and that apprehension was congruent with the overall goals of policing in general. In other words, police should be concerned with catching people who break the law.

There were some managers, however, who commented that the goals of the RBT program should be both deterrence and apprehension-oriented in order to account for new road users entering the road system as well as targeting drink driving offenders. Traffic managers were more likely to espouse this view than GD managers.

3.3.3 Strategy

It was generally believed that the current QPS RBT strategy was characterised by a “focus on numbers” in an attempt to reach the recommended 1:1 ratio. It was often commented that the targets or quotas for particular regions were “excessive”, “counterproductive” and a “burden to achieve”. For example, it was reported in many instances, that a strong focus on the number of tests has led to the practice of concentrating RBT operations at low alcohol/high volume traffic times, such as during work hours, to maximise the number of drivers tested. This practice was viewed as a “waste of time and money” for both motorists and police. It was also claimed the officers engaged in these operations were bored and demoralised but that such operations were often required to help bolster figures that were unable to be reached due to other policing commitments (see 3.3.5 for more detail regarding practices including issues relating to unpredictability, visibility and unavoidability).

The reported focus on numbers was also believed to lead to poor policing habits, including the reduced ability of officers to identify the indicia of impairment demonstrated by alcohol and drug affected drivers. It was commented that managers had, on several occasions, seen members waving drivers through RBT stations who were demonstrating signs of impairment that suggested that they were under the influence. In other words, despite these drivers having ‘passed’ the breath test, they were under the influence of another substance, which could impair their driving
ability. In addition, the perceived pressure to “blow and go” was also claimed to result in some officers missing or disregarding evidence of other offences such as possible stolen property or car defects.

In some cases managers stated that they were aware that there were officers under their command would sometimes falsify RBT figures by conducting “dummy” tests on themselves and disposing of the required number of mouthpieces to cover discrepancies. This practice was not claimed to be widespread and these managers did not condone it but it was claimed to be another symptom of the pressure to achieve targets.

As a result, despite acknowledgement of the general deterrent effect of high levels of RBT enforcement, many managers questioned the overall usefulness and cost effectiveness of the current strategy. This concern was commonly raised as a quality vs. quantity issue. In other words, the major problem according to these managers was that in an effort to reach set targets, various aspects of policing were being compromised. In general, it was stated that the quotas played a role but should not be “numbers for numbers sake”.

In contrast, there were some managers who conceded that a quota system was probably a good idea as it gave everyone “something tangible to work towards”. Several traffic managers stated that without the quota system, RBT enforcement (and traffic matters in general) would be in danger of losing status as a policing priority. It was explained that senior management’s insistence on reaching yearly targets forced GD officers to assist traffic with operations and this helped to diffuse negative attitudes towards the traffic branch in general.

The interviews also revealed that managers wanted the freedom to be proactive with consideration for the differing needs and problems of the various regions. For some areas, the set quotas were argued to be unachievable due to a predominance of other policing issues such as domestic violence complaints, tourist activity or street offences. Topographical and social differences were also cited as a reason for increased flexibility. Jurisdictions with islands and mining areas, for example, have different socio-demographic and physical characteristics that arguably require unique responses to impaired driving.
Although many managers stated that RBT had historically proven effective in reducing the road toll, many believed that a saturation point had been reached in terms of number of tests performed and that it was time to re-evaluate the current situation.

3.3.4 Culture

Many managers, including those responsible for traffic, stated that RBT is stigmatised because it “goes against the grain of policing”. It was explained that policing is culturally geared towards catching offenders and as a result, RBT duties are “unpopular” with many officers due to its characteristically low apprehension rate. Not surprisingly, non-traffic managers stated that crime reduction was the primary function of policing and it was argued that traffic enforcement was, or should be, a lesser priority for GD police. A small number of GD interviewees believed that RBT was a core function of the traffic section and not GD. These managers expressed the desire to leave all traffic policing to traffic officers. Others saw the need for RBT to be a part of all policing duties in the interest of improving road safety in the community and ensuring that members recognise the importance of traffic policing.

Traffic managers reported that often it was difficult to organise GD staff and other resources to assist with RBT operations. They said that this problem started with senior management who modelled poor attitudes to traffic policing in general, with crime issues and crime operations taking first priority. It was claimed that more often than not, senior officers came from a criminal investigation background and so were biased towards crime issues. This attitude was perceived to have a negative impact upon the RBT program overall and as a result; suggestions for operations, requests for extra staff and equipment or vehicle requisitions were often put at the bottom of the list in terms of attention and resources.

All these concerns were considered to be a cultural problem that reportedly begins when recruits get out of the academy and are posted to GD areas where they become “indoctrinated into a crime mentality”. Consequently, it was said that traffic was not viewed as an important policing function from the very start of an officers’ career and that this attitude was reinforced in many ways. For example, through
derogatory comments made by staff, including senior staff, jokes and the lack of praise for traffic apprehensions. Even so, some traffic managers believed that their staff would rather be doing other traffic-related duties, for example, Lidar (speed gun) duties than conducting RBT because of the higher hit rate. For these managers, traffic officers were dedicated to RBT only because it was viewed as “their lot”.

Several managers said that many assumptions were due to outdated beliefs and they suggested a need for ongoing education about the importance of both general and specific deterrence. These members reported that attitudes within the QPS were slowly changing and that RBT operations were being increasingly accepted as having the capacity to impact on crime. Examples were given where RBT operations were set up in response to a crime issue in the area. It was explained that RBT operations would then become a “one stop shop” to check for not only alcohol impairment but also persons and vehicles of interest. These operations were reported to involve a mix of officers including traffic, CIB, GD and others depending on the aims of the operation and are claimed to be more rewarding for all those involved and responsible for breaking down barriers between specialist units, general patrols and traffic police. In areas where joint operations were utilised, there was a perception that the personality of staff in senior management played an important role in fostering this change at the regional level.

3.3.5 Structure and Systems

There are several components to this element that are detailed in the sub-sections below. These categories were not prompted by the researchers but reflected the responses of participants to the open-ended questioning about the systems and processes that exist within the QPS that are designed to facilitate the operation of RBT and to achieve goals.

3.3.5.1 Staffing and rostering

In many instances, staffing RBT operations was viewed as problematic, especially when GD staff were required to help out traffic members with larger operations. Traffic managers complained of a lack of support by GD staff who reportedly called in sick when rostered to help traffic out with RBT operations. In some areas, this problem was countered by allocating overtime for GD reliefs.
Traffic managers also said that staffing RBT operations was hampered due to the lack of late shifts for traffic personnel. This was seen as one area that could easily be rectified, as most traffic officers were reportedly keen to work these times.

The GD managers complained that their staff were often too busy responding to calls from the general public to conduct the required amount of RBT to reach targets. Despite these concerns, most areas reported that they were able to meet requirements by specifying a certain amount of RBT to be conducted on a per shift basis. In some instances, when RBT numbers were low, large operations involving many officers would be organised to make up the shortfall.

3.3.5.2 RBT data

There was a wide range of opinion about the quality and reliability of RBT data and the systems in place to monitor data collection. As previously mentioned, in some cases, managers were aware of or suspected that officers were deliberately falsifying figures by conducting “dummy” RBT tests. Several managers said that they checked patrol logs on a regular basis to ensure data integrity. Others claimed that their figures were completely reliable and that there was no need for concern. It was pointed out that large discrepancies would be obvious and so this issue was not a major concern.

With regard to the issue of data quality, it was reported that the data generated from alcometers was unreliable in many cases as it was argued that officers often forgot to input the information required at each breath test (eg. sex of driver/location/stationary or mobile) causing the machine to return to default settings of male and stationary operation. It was also believed that the RBT data downloaded on a monthly basis was of limited use due to these issues and the lack of feedback on the success of RBT suggested to the managers that the data was not being strategically utilised by the STSB in any case.

3.3.5.3 Equipment

Most managers were happy with the provision and replacement of equipment required for RBT operations although the process of acquiring resources was reportedly slow in some instances. In some areas it was claimed that more alcometers
and safety vests were urgently required. It was frequently suggested that Mavericks\textsuperscript{1} should be installed in every patrol car to assist with driver checks. In rural areas, there were unique RBT equipment problems expressed. For example, in rural areas radio traffic sometimes made it difficult to get through to communications and it was also claimed that there were ‘black spots’ were the computers dropped out. In addition, it was commented that there were cases when drivers blew readings close to .08, that these drivers were allowed to drive away due to the fact that officers believed that they would blow under the limit by the time they were transported to the closest station for the evidentiary breath test. In response to this problem, rural managers said that they would prefer evidentiary breath analysis equipment to be installed in more patrol cars.

3.3.5.4 Vehicles

It was claimed that the larger booze buses were labour intensive but good for highly visible, general deterrence type operations. These vehicles were managed by allocating one dedicated officer to look after their maintenance and usage. Despite this, the big booze buses were shared between regions and as a result, could often be neglected. The larger buses were claimed to be better for officer safety because they offered greater visibility to the driving public. They were said to be labour intensive because they required many officers to man, required a lot of maintenance, were difficult to drive and required a driver with a special licence. In addition, their use was governed by many occupational health and safety guidelines. In other words, you could not just take them out and set them up anywhere.

In contrast, it was commented that the smaller booze buses were not properly equipped and as a result, were not very useful beyond basic RBT duties. Others believed that the smaller buses required less staff to operate and were easier to drive and use. Managers in some rural areas believed that they would be served better by station wagons or traffic trailers which could be fitted with the evidentiary breath analysis equipment. Other areas found the trailers time consuming and preferred car-based RBT enforcement for the increased flexibility that the cars were able to

\textsuperscript{1} The Maverick is a car-based computer that provides access to driver licensing and motor vehicle registration data.
provide. Overall, there was a strong perception that different areas had different vehicle requirements and that in the case of RBT; ‘one size did not fit all’.

3.3.5.5 Feedback

Most managers reported that the only feedback they received about RBT was from senior management when there was a shortfall in testing numbers. They did not believe, therefore, that the QPS had mechanisms in place to address this area in relation to RBT. It was highlighted that at this point in time, all they were doing was ensuring that quotas were met. As a result, they said that they did know how successful RBT enforcement has been in their particular jurisdiction with regard to the overall road toll and the level of drink driving and drink driving recidivism.

When asked to indicate some possible measures for feedback, some managers regarded ‘hit rate’ as the best measure of success, while others focused on a reduction in the road toll. Some managers recognised that there were difficulties involved in measuring the ‘success’ of RBT, given the complexities of all the factors involved. Nearly all, however, believed that the data that was being collected in relation to RBT enforcement could be put to better use. It was suggested that this would improve the overall credibility of RBT for the officers who were required to conduct it.

In general, all managers reported that this was an area that required urgent attention by QPS and that quality feedback was the key to the future success of RBT.

3.3.5.6 Technology and intelligence

Some managers complained that the crash database tool WebCrash 2 was difficult to use and/or not up to date to be of any use. Others found the database invaluable in organising the deployment of RBT operations. Some argued that the QPS should make use of the current traffic enforcement technology that currently exists in other police jurisdictions around the world. For example, it was believed that consideration should be given to introducing passive alcohol-sensors to save police time at RBT sites.

Many traffic managers or traffic-oriented GD managers reported that intelligence was good for crime-related matters but was seriously lacking for traffic matters. It was suggested that the appointment of dedicated traffic analysts to each region to work alongside crime analysts would alleviate this concern. This way, the
traffic analysts would be able to highlight particular ‘hot spots’ in relation to drink
driving or alcohol-related crashes. This information could then be coupled with local
crime intelligence so that special operations could be organised. There were many
reasons given for why intelligence pooling could be useful to the QPS. For example,
it was pointed out that drink driving offenders, especially recidivist offenders, were
often involved in other criminal activity. In addition, because offenders often use
their cars to travel to and from their crimes, RBT was seen as a useful stopping tool
to check for offenders and evidence of crimes committed.

All managers expressed the need for structured intelligence systems to guide
RBT deployment. At the present time, it was up to individual officers to decide what
particular areas required RBT attention. Some managers believed that the
information that is currently available, such as last known place of drinking from
previous drink driving offenders, could be used in a more systematic way.

3.3.5.7 Training and education

It was often stated that there was not enough breath analysis training and that
this has reportedly led to a shortage in those qualified to conduct the evidentiary
tests. These managers also said that not many officers wanted to spend the time or
the effort to become trained anymore because they were not being paid, praised or
otherwise encouraged to utilise and maintain their skills.

In relation to general traffic training, some managers said that they were
attempting to secure more regular traffic training days for their crews. Organising
and allowing staff to attend refresher courses, however, was perceived to be
logistically difficult. As a result, it was claimed by some that that what training was
organised was only the result of the dedication and persistence of managers.

Several interviewees said that they had not been properly trained to use the
crash database (Webcrash 2). Others believed that it was up to the individual to
ensure that they sought out the necessary resources to ensure that the technology at
their disposal was utilised effectively. Some managers said that they did not have the
time to learn how to use the available technology. In a few areas, managers had
developed or been involved in the design and development of novel traffic–oriented
software systems and other technology.
In relation to recruit training, traffic managers complained about what they believed was poor quality traffic training at the academy. This was perceived to be especially true in relation to the psychology underpinning RBT and drink driving enforcement in general. For example, managers did not believe that deterrence principles were properly explained. They also believed that crime issues were given a much higher priority and were “glamorised” while traffic matters were treated like a “mundane duty”.

The lack of education about the importance of traffic duties was seen as a having a major impact on the current negative attitudes about RBT. This was seen to lead to a perception that traffic is boring, that the public despise traffic police and that traffic is not part of the “core business of policing”. As a result, many traffic managers did not believe that many new officers would be interested in working in traffic positions after probation.

3.3.6 Rewards

Many interviewees reported that there were no formal and few informal rewards from senior management for conducting RBT operations and reaching or exceeding set quotas. In all cases it was claimed that negative feedback was received when quotas were not achieved. GD managers said they were more likely to provide informal praise to their troops for catching drink drivers, rather than for the amount of RBT tests conducted. Traffic managers said that they were more likely to praise officers for both. In some areas, attention to road safety and RBT duties were recorded on member’s Personal Performance Appraisals (PPA). Most felt that there were no incentives for their staff to conduct RBT except for overtime provisions that were claimed to be on the decline.

3.3.7 Practices

As highlighted in section 3.3.3, nearly all jurisdictions reported that stationary operations would often be conducted at high volume traffic times in order to meet quotas. This would mean that officers were concentrating RBT at times of the day when it was unlikely that drink drivers would be caught, during peak hour traffic or on a Sunday morning, for example. Despite acknowledgment that such operations
were able to create an initial general deterrent effect, managers were concerned that such practices would reduce motorists’ perceived predictability of apprehension over time. In addition, these operations were also believed to have negative consequences for the staff involved. For example, it was believed that officers would become focused on just getting cars through the RBT station and would sometimes miss signs of impairment demonstrated by drivers. Officers were also believed to be less likely to check driver’s cars for possible defects or check driver’s licenses as they did not want to hold up the flow through the station. Non-traffic managers were less concerned, saying that there were too many other things to do so it was just a way of getting the numbers quickly and efficiently without letting RBT get in the way of other tasks and priorities.

Despite this, many managers did report meeting or exceeding targets for their respective areas. It was often said that this was due to having a good team. The implication was that the team worked together to achieve quotas to avoid criticism from police hierarchy. In other words, RBT was conducted for the sake of team credibility not necessarily for road safety. In some cases, managers compared their performance with other areas, which suggests that achieving RBT targets was competitive between jurisdictions.

In the metropolitan area, regional traffic coordinators were normally responsible for the organisation of large-scale, highly visible RBT operations involving GD, traffic personnel and other specialist officers from time to time. Such operations sometimes involved a complete block of traffic flow on either side of the Brisbane river and were reportedly effective for after work drink drivers or after concerts and other big events. Smaller operations were usually organised by local managers and were conducted where time and other work commitments allowed. Some managers encouraged their staff to be more proactive in relation to RBT and try and utilise local knowledge to conduct tests in high risk areas such as on roads leading away from liquor outlets. Many managers said that occupational health and safety guidelines often restricted approved RBT sites to a “handful of main roads” which made the sites predictable to members of the public and particularly recidivist drink drivers.
In areas where regular inclusive management meetings were held, operations were likely to be more innovative, overlaying RBT operations with crime ‘hot spots’. These types of operations were generally seen to be the future of drink driving enforcement because they are based on intelligence and have the potential to deter criminal activity as well as detect it. It was, however, conceded that the personalities of senior management were crucial to the quality and style of operations. In areas where it was claimed that senior management was crime focused, RBT operations were the “last priority”.

3.3.8 Performance capability

Although Behaviour and Performance capability are the last two constructs in the alignment model, they were not directly measured in the interviews with the managers. Nonetheless, the comments made by the managers thus far, constitute a description of issues that reflect performance capability\(^2\). As a result, it is not necessary to reiterate these issues. Instead, the following section deals with the managers’ responses when asked to discuss the nature and meaning of performance with regard to RBT.

Most managers spoke about good RBT performance in terms of meeting quotas. This was apparently a reflection of the attitude of the Senior Executive where the inability to meet quotas was met with criticism. In many instances, managers compared their quotas and levels of RBT achieved with other areas which suggests that meeting quotas was synonymous with good performance.

When asked what should be an indicator of good performance, many participants believed that increases in drink driving detections should be regarded as an indicator of a successful RBT program. It was pointed out that decreases in the road toll and decreases in alcohol-related crashes were also success measures but that for the police, outputs such as apprehension rates were more likely to be rewarded with extra government funding.

\(^2\) Performance capability- the composite construct comprised of the sub elements knowledge, individual capability, motivation and system capability.
The majority of interviewees did not think that the QPS had a consistent, reliable format for calculating the current state of affairs regarding the success of RBT. In order to improve the measurement of performance, some managers believed that major changes needed to be made in relation to many aspects of the current system. Some examples include improved technology, education, equipment, training and a change in the attitude that traffic is part of the core business of policing.

3.3.9 Suggestions

Managers were also asked to provide suggestions for the improvement of RBT operations. The suggestions provided fell into several main categories that, for the sake of continuity, can be described in terms of the alignment constructs. For example, environmental suggestions included increased publicity and attempting to secure greater responsibility for the drink driving problem by the community and the liquor industry. Strategic suggestions included determining the optimal mix between stationary and mobile RBT and optimal testing rates.

Although it was believed that negative attitudes toward traffic policing would be difficult to change, many believed that the QPS could make a start by changing the nature and focus of training at the Police Academy. Ideas for enforcement practices involved expanding RBT stops to general stops where drivers and vehicles are subjected to thorough checks and not just breath tests. Suggestions aimed at the structure and systems of the QPS were centred on improving feedback, rostering changes and the appointment of dedicated traffic intelligence officers. A total list of suggestions is provided in Appendix C.

3.4 Discussion

The overall aim of this study was to explore the perceived barriers and facilitators experienced by managers involved in the planning and delivery of RBT operations. In addition, this study was designed to investigate the state of alignment between organisational elements explored in the interviews and the best practice features of RBT identified in the literature.
The interviews revealed that a range of factors facilitates best practice RBT activity but that there are some areas that appear to be misaligned. In particular, the structures and systems construct revealed several aspects where improvements could be made.

In terms of the Travelsafe best practice recommendations (Travelsafe, 1996), the QPS has achieved the recommend testing levels and has managed to ensure that the majority of operations are highly visible, ubiquitous and carried out in stationary mode. However, a number of apparent barriers to the effective operation of RBT were identified.

Firstly, the issue of quality vs. quantity of RBT testing was a recurring concern raised by all managers interviewed. The general consensus was that a focus on reaching quotas impacts on the quality of RBT, leading to operations that are conducted at low alcohol/high traffic times. Such operations were reported to deskill officers, lower morale and contribute to a traffic vs. crime mentality. In addition, it was believed that they reduce the overall deterrent impact of RBT in terms of perceived predictability. In areas where stationary operations are combined with criminal history, vehicle and licence checks, concerns appear to be offset. Such strategies appear to bolster morale; foster better relationships between the members involved; and also provide a training ground where specialist knowledge can be shared. Whether such operations compromise the overall aims of RBT, however, is yet to be evaluated.

The managers’ criticisms of the current RBT strategy seem to indicate a lack of understanding about the theoretical basis for the original parliamentary recommendation of one test per licensed driver per year (Travelsafe, 1996). The apparent lack of feedback for the success of RBT as a crash prevention measure may be exacerbating this misunderstanding and there also seems to be a major cultural barrier to the acceptance of traffic enforcement as an important aspect of policing in general. These issues are dealt with in greater detail in Chapter 5.

Secondly, there appears to be confusion about the role of RBT. Many managers, particularly GD managers, felt that detection of drink drivers should be the primary goal of RBT and that the success of an operation should be judged upon the number of drink drivers detected (hit rate). Stationary operations are often viewed
as a means to satisfy quotas but are counterproductive to the main goal of policing. Recognition of the importance of RBT as a preventive policing activity seems to have eroded over time. Some managers suggested that the program should be updated, repackaged and resold to both the QPS and the community in general.

Thirdly, responses suggest that there is a general lack of education about the role of deterrence and apprehension in RBT operations. Some managers were aware of the complex relationship between both functions of enforcement. Most believed general deterrence operations were characterised by stationary operations and detection was maximised by mobile operations with apprehension rates provided as evidence. As a result, these enforcement strategies were often viewed as separate, rather than complementary, activities.

There are several practical implications of these responses, including the opportunities to improve alignment between the identified best practice features of RBT and the organisational elements explored in this study. For example, improving education about the role of deterrence may facilitate a greater appreciation of the importance of high visibility RBT operations. The suggestions made by managers to improve RBT operations indicate a genuine desire to improve the current state of affairs.

3.5 Chapter summary

The present study revealed some significant areas of misalignment between best practices features of RBT and the current organisational features designed to facilitate the planning and delivery of RBT operations in the QPS. Managers appear to be generally unaware of both the rationale underpinning the RBT strategy and the success of RBT as a road safety tool. There also appears to be some confusion about the role and nature of deterrence in RBT. There is a general perception that RBT is a traffic branch responsibility, which causes problems with staff motivation and rostering.

Facilitating factors include: the belief in the importance of RBT; awareness that RBT encompasses both a deterrent function and a detection function; the increasing use of innovative RBT strategies (eg. doubling RBT operations with crime operations); and a general desire to improve the current state of affairs. The
implications of this study highlight the need for greater education about the goals of RBT and feedback about its success so that future operations can be organised in a more strategic way.

In the next study, the views and perceptions of operational police officers are examined to determine the degree of alignment with best practice. The results of this study will also show whether their perceptions mirror the views and perceptions of the managers.
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4.1 Introduction

The aims of Study Two are the same as those for Study One and are listed in section 2.5.1. The difference of this study was that the focus was upon the perceptions of operational police. It was expected that as operational police are responsible for conducting RBT on a daily basis, they would most likely be aware of hindering or facilitating organisational factors. With the research aims in mind, it was expected that an efficient RBT program, based on the premise of alignment, would be characterised by the situation where the various organisational elements of the QPS related to the operation of RBT were closely aligned to the best practice features identified in the literature. It was also expected that close alignment would lead to greater reported performance capability. In other words, when the various organisational elements required for undertaking RBT duties were congruent with best practice guidelines, officers would report agreement that they possessed the necessary skills, knowledge and motivation to perform RBT duties. The hypothesised relationships are highlighted in Figure 4.1.

![Diagram of proposed model of effective RBT operation]

*Figure 4.1: Proposed model of effective RBT operation*
Figure 4.1 is designed to illustrate that as best practice guidelines are more closely aligned with the organisational elements designed to facilitate RBT operation, this leads to greater performance capability.

4.2 Method

4.2.1 Background

With regard to Study Two, it was considered important to ensure that the wording and topics covered in the questionnaire would adequately reflect the language and culture of operational police within the QPS. Consequently, a focus group was held with members from a suburban traffic branch to assist with this task (see section 4.2.4.1 for details). In addition, it was considered important to ensure that the research issues covered in the questionnaire were handled in a sensitive, professional manner. Members from the QPS’s Ethical Standards Command and the STSB were, therefore, involved in the questionnaire development process.

4.2.2 Participants

The STSB generated a random sample from a database of personnel of 1100 names and posting information of non-commissioned operational officers who were most likely to be involved in some form of traffic duties such as RBT, stratified across the regions. Out of this pool, 950 names were retained for the sample. The various 150 names that were excluded were those members whose posting information revealed that they were working in areas such as child protection, Criminal Investigation Branch or other specialised areas that are not required to undertake RBT duties on a regular basis. Of the 950 officers who were invited to take part in the research, 425 officers responded.

4.2.3 Materials

4.2.3.1 Questionnaire

Using the constructs of the alignment model and information gathered from the interviews with managers, the questionnaire for operational members was developed with the assistance of members from the QPS’s Ethical Standards
Command and STSB. The primary role of both these bodies was to ensure that operational police would understand the wording and concepts embedded in the questionnaire. In addition, involvement of the police was considered necessary to ally any fears related to sensitivity. As a result, several drafts of the questionnaire were considered before both researchers and police were satisfied.

With regard to the overall questionnaire design, members of the Ethical Standards Command suggested that a greater response rate would be achieved if the questionnaire was quick and easy to complete, taking into consideration the workload of operational police. The majority of items in the questionnaire, therefore, were based on short statements with a 5-point Likert scale (1= Strongly agree, 2= Agree, 3= Neutral/Unsure, 4= Disagree and 5= Strongly disagree) to indicate level of agreement with these statements. Overall, the questionnaire comprised four A4 pages, with all questions on the first three pages and space for additional comments on the fourth. The questionnaire took approximately twenty minutes to complete.

QPS members assisting with questionnaire development also suggested that a cover letter from a superior officer attached to the questionnaire would possibly improve the response rate. This suggestion was based on their past experiences with internal surveys. For this study, a cover letter from the Chief Superintendent in charge of the STSB was attached to the questionnaire. This cover letter outlined the purpose of the research and pointed out that although participation was voluntary, completion would assist in establishing best practice for RBT.

The questionnaire comprised 39 items with 36 items structured around the nine alignment constructs (see section 2.3.4 for descriptions of the constructs). Most items were based on the principles of best practice identified in the literature and also various aspects of RBT operation that the managers in Study One believed were important or influential. Three items allowed respondents to make comments about drink driving enforcement preferences, operational obstacles and suggestions for improvement. There were five socio-demographic items regarding gender, age, length of service, rank and region.
4.2.4 Procedure

4.2.4.1 Focus group

A focus group was held with members of a suburban traffic branch. Prior to conducting the session, the focus group protocol was provided to the officer in charge of the branch for approval. The focus group consisted of nine operational traffic members of various levels of experience and seniority. Members were advised at the start of the session that their responses would be confidential and that they would be assisting with the development of the questionnaire. A copy of the focus group protocol is presented in Appendix D. The session lasted approximately one hour and notes were made of the comments. In general, the issues raised during the focus group were similar to issues raised by the managers. Although no new issues emerged, it was noted that the officers who took part held very strong opinions about the current RBT program.

4.2.4.2 Questionnaire

The 950 questionnaires were forwarded directly to the members whose names had been randomly selected. As previously stated, each questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter from the Chief Superintendent of the STSB outlining the purpose of the research and highlighting the fact that the research had received QPS ethical clearance. A reply paid envelope addressed to the researchers and an information sheet (Appendix E) were also enclosed. Questionnaires were returned directly to the researchers to enhance response rates and ensure that officers were assured of the anonymity of their responses. A copy of the Questionnaire is presented in Appendix F.

4.2.5 Statistical analyses

The data was analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 12. As many of the items in the questionnaire were based on a Likert scale and there were no apparent issues with normality or homogeneity of variance, the data generated was dealt with as interval data so parametric analyses could be utilised. For questions that required several responses for the same topic, repeated
measures ANOVAs were carried out to test the differences between the means for the various items. Where the sphericity assumptions were not met, the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied. A significance level of $\alpha < 0.05$ was used except for post-hoc tests where a more stringent $\alpha$ was adapted via a Bonferroni adjustment. For questions that generated two related responses, paired sample t-tests were conducted. Chi-square ($\chi^2$) tests of independence were used in particular cases to examine associations between various categorical variables. The strength of association between categorical variables was measured using the Cramer’s Phi ($\phi$) coefficient.

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was not utilised to examine the data collected in this study as the aim of the research was not to test the utility of Semler’s alignment model but to use it as a framework for exploring the level of alignment between police management and operational practices relating to RBT and best practice guidelines.

**4.3 Results**

**4.3.1 Descriptive data**

A total of 421 questionnaires were returned resulting in a 44% response rate. The sample comprised 80% men and 20% women. These percentages were representative of the overall male and female split within the QPS for operational police of the ranks of Constable and Senior Constable (QPS, 2004). Ages ranged between 21 years to 55 years ($M=34, SD=6.91$) although 72 participants (17%) did not provide information about their age. Of those who did supply age details, 34% were aged between 21 years and 30 years, 49% were aged between 31 and 40, 15% between 41 and 50 and 2% were aged between 51 years and 55 years. The rank categories represented in the sample were: Probationary Constable (6%); Constable (36%); Senior Constable (33%); Sergeant (24%); and Senior Sergeant (1%). The majority of participants (35%) had been employed with the QPS for a period of between 11 to 20 years, a large number (31%) had been employed for a period of between 1-5 years, 20% reported that they had been employed between 6-10 years and 9% and 5% were employed less than one year and more than 21 years.
respectively. The mean years of service was 8.5 years and all regions were equally represented. A complete list of sample characteristics is detailed in Appendix G.

4.3.2 Alignment constructs

The results relating to the alignment constructs are presented under the individual alignment construct headings. For all constructs, questionnaire items are listed and tables of mean scores are shown. Mean scores above 3 represent agreement, scores below 3 indicate disagreement and scores of 3 indicate neutral/unsure responses. In most cases, graphs showing distributions of agreement scores are also presented for clarification of results, especially as several item response means are close to the neutral/unsure score of 3. The percentages for all responses are listed in Appendix H.

4.3.2.1 Environment

Results for this construct showed that the majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the QPS played a major role in setting both the number of RBT tests each year (85%) and also determining the way in which RBT is conducted (94%). Table 4.1 reports the mean responses and Figure 4.2 highlights the frequency of responses for both items 1 and 2.

A repeated measures ANOVA found a significant difference between agreement scores for items 1 and 2 \[ F(3.44, 1439) = 171.32, \ p < .001 \] and \[ F(3.61,1507) = 279, \ p < .001 \]. Post-hoc comparisons revealed that all means were significantly different \( p < .001 \) from each other except for ‘Queensland Transport’ and ‘Politicians’ for both questions. These results appear to reveal that this is an area that is in a state of alignment since the QPS is perceived to be the strongest influence in setting the number of tests to be performed and also in determining the way in which RBT operations are conducted.
Table 4.1:

*Environment items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The following groups currently play a major role in setting the number of RBT tests conducted each year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. the community</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the QPS</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Queensland Transport</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. other government agencies</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. politicians</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The following groups have a major role in determining the way in which RBT is conducted:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. the community</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the QPS</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Queensland Transport</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. other government agencies</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. politicians</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: Frequency of agreement scores for questionnaire items 1 and 2

4.3.2.2 Vision, values and purpose

Over 90% of respondents indicated agreement or strong agreement with all of the items for this construct except for 3d, ‘catch drink driving offenders’ where the overall agreement (agree/strongly agree) was 75%. Table 4.2 lists the means for the
responses and Figure 4.3 shows the frequency of responses. A repeated measures ANOVA found a significant overall difference for the items relating to this construct \( [F(2.7, 1110) = 49.48, p < .001] \) and not surprisingly, post-hoc comparisons revealed that the mean of item 3d ‘catch drink driving offenders’ was significantly different from all other item means at the \( p < .001 \) level. These results may suggest that the respondents do not perceive that the QPS vision of the RBT program is as equally geared towards prevention aims as it is toward apprehension goals. Nonetheless, these results indicate strong alignment with departmental mission statements in relation to RBT and best practice literature.

Chi-square tests of independence revealed that there were significant associations between item 3d and the different ranks of the participants \( [\chi^2 (df 8) = 24.64, p < .01, \phi = .17, p < .01] \). For this item, a greater number of Senior Constables (51%) disagreed than agreed (30%) that one of the goals of the RBT program was to catch drink driving offenders. This was in contrast to Constables where 40% agreed with this goal compared to 19% who disagreed. The strength of this association, however, was relatively low (ie. \( \phi = .17 \)).

Table 4.2:

Vision, values and purpose items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The overall goals of the Service’s RBT program are to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. promote safe and responsible road use in Queensland</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. increase public safety</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. reduce drink driving crashes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. catch drink driving offenders</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. discourage drink driving behaviour</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.3 Strategy

The results for this construct showed that there was greater consensus in some areas than others. For example, 97% of respondents agreed/strongly agreed that one of the QPS RBT strategies was to conduct operations in a highly visible manner and 63% agreed/strongly agreed that these operations were done in an unpredictable manner. Respondents were more divided, however, in relation to operations being unavoidable. For example, while 50% of respondents agreed/strongly agreed with this item, 22% disagreed and 24% reported being neutral/unsure. Although 45% agreed/strongly agreed that the strategy ensured that the majority of operations were conducted by stationary operations, 30% were neutral/unsure and 22% disagreed. In addition, while 63% believed that the QPS had a clear rationale for determining the number of tests undertaken, 21% were neutral and 17% disagreed/strongly disagreed. While 53% agreed/strongly agreed that there was a clear rationale for the strategy of where and how RBT was undertaken, 23% reported being neutral/unsure and 23% disagreed/strongly disagreed. Even less consensus, however, was evident in relation to the statement that the strategy of one test per licensed driver was realistic, where 37% disagreed/strongly disagreed, 24% were neutral or unsure and 39% either agreed or strongly agreed. The means of responses are listed in Table 4.3 and a graph
illuminating the distribution of the data is presented in Figure 4.4 to help clarify the results.

A repeated measures ANOVA for the items of Question 4 found a significant overall difference for the items relating to this construct \( F(2.45, 1028) = 136.93, p < .001 \). Post hoc tests revealed that all item means were significantly different from each other \( (p < .001) \) except for 4c paired with 4d.

Table 4.3:  
Strategy items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The main strategies QPS uses to achieve these goals are to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. conduct RBT in a highly visible manner</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ensure that RBT operations are unpredictable in their timing/location</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ensure that RBT is unavoidable</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ensure that the majority of tests are done by stationary operations</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The QPS has a clear rationale underpinning:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. the number of RBT tests performed each year</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. where and how RBT is conducted</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The current objective of one breath test per licensed driver per year is realistic</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4: Frequency of agreement scores for questionnaire items 4a-6
4.3.2.4 Culture

In the case of culture, 85% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that RBT is the responsibility of general duties police while 95% indicated agreement or strong agreement that it was a traffic police responsibility. For the second statement, 83% of respondents agreed/strongly agreed that operational members see mobile RBT as part of core policing business compared to 60% for stationary RBT duties. The means for these responses are listed in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture items</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 RBT is the responsibility of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. general duties police</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. traffic police</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Operational members see:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. stationary RBT as part of core policing business</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. mobile RBT as part of core policing business</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paired sample t-tests revealed significant differences between items for questions 7 and 8, \( t(420) = - .803, p < .001, \) \( t(419) = - 11.36, p < .001, \) respectively. While most members appeared to agree that RBT is generally the responsibility of both general duties and traffic personnel, the majority of them perceived mobile RBT rather than stationary RBT to be part of the core business of policing.

4.3.2.5 Structure and systems

Over half the respondents (53%) agreed/strongly agreed that the QPS communicates the objectives related to RBT and 67% agreed/strongly agreed that policies and procedures were also communicated. However, half disagreed/strongly disagreed that this communication extended to the rationale for the number of tests expected, while 23% were unsure or neutral on this item and 27% agreed/strongly agreed. The statement dealing with rostering systems met with a divided response where 36% disagreed/strongly disagreed, 21% were unsure/neutral and 33%
agreed/strongly agreed with this statement. The final question for this construct, question 11a-11g, also met with divided responses. This was evidenced by the mean scores and further illustrated by Figure 4.5 that shows the distribution of scores.

A repeated measures ANOVA found a significant difference between agreement scores for items for question 9, \( F(1.85, 779) = 190, p < .001 \) and post hoc comparisons revealed that all means were significantly different \( (p < .001) \). Means testing was also carried out for items related to question 11 and a significant difference was also found \( [F(1.79, 746) = 50.83, p < .001] \). Post hoc tests revealed that nearly all items means were significantly different from each other at \( p < .001 \) for most items and \( p < .005 \) for the pairing of 11c, ‘monitor the ratio of stationary to mobile RBT tests’ and 11d, ‘provide feedback on the performance of RBT to regional mangers’. The paired items that were not significant included ‘provide feedback on the performance of RBT to regional managers’ and ‘guide the deployment of RBT operations’.

Table 4.5:

**Structure and systems items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. The QPS communicates the following to operational members:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. the objectives of RBT</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. policies and procedures related to the operation of RBT</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. the rationale for determining the number of tests expected</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. There are rostering systems in place at my station to ensure that</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBT operations are adequately staffed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The QPS has systems and processes in place to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. reliably record the number of RBT tests conducted</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. measure the impact of RBT in reducing drink driving crashes</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. monitor the ratio of stationary to mobile RBT tests</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. provide feedback on the performance of RBT to regional managers</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. provide feedback on the success of RBT to operational police</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. measure the impact on RBT in discouraging drink driving behaviour</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. guide the deployment of RBT operations</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.6 Rewards

The responses for the rewards construct showed that 53% agreed/strongly agreed that their peers would praise them for the apprehension of a drink driver compared to 30% who disagreed/strongly disagreed with this. With regard to praise being provided by peers as a result of helping to reach testing quotas, only 29% agreed/strongly agreed with this while 22% were neutral/unsure. In relation to praise from supervisors, 59% agreed that supervisors would be likely to praise them for helping to reach testing quotas while 47% agreed/strongly agreed that this praise would be given for catching drink drivers. A large proportion of respondents (84%) did not agree that RBT represented good way of securing extra money via shift penalties. Nearly half (45%) indicated that RBT participation was not formally acknowledged in performance appraisals, although 33% were neutral or unsure about this. Paired sample t-tests revealed that there were significant differences between items for questions 12 and 13 \( t(419) = 7.89, p < .001, t(420) = -4.9, p < .001 \) respectively.

In other words, participants were more likely to report that other members would be praising them for catching drink drivers than for helping to reach targets, whereas the opposite was the case for their supervisors.

*Figure 4.5: Frequency of agreement scores for questionnaire items 11a-11g*
Table 4.6:

Rewards items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. When conducting RBT, it is likely that other members will:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. praise you for catching drink drivers</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. praise you for helping to reach testing quotas</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. When conducting RBT, it is likely that your supervisors will:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. praise you for catching drink drivers</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. praise you for helping to reach testing quotas</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Conducting RBT provides opportunities to make extra money</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(shift penalties)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In my area, performance appraisals take into account the amount</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of RBT you conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.7 Practices

Results related to the practices construct revealed differences in perceptions demonstrated in Figure 4.6. For example, the results showed that for question 16, the question that dealt with the practice of conducting RBT during high volume/low alcohol traffic times, 34% of respondents disagreed/strongly disagreed that this practice occurred in their area, 24% indicated being neutral/unsure and 42% agreed/strongly agreed. Half the respondents believed that targets for their jurisdictions were met and 59% agreed that the RBT tests conducted were accurately recorded.

Around 48% of respondents disagreed/strongly disagreed that every driver intercepted by police was breath tested compared to 39% who agreed/strongly agreed. Just over half (53%) agreed that RBT operations in their area involved targeted operations that also considered crime intelligence while 63% disagreed that RBT was included in multi-functional operations involving other groups.
Respondents also indicated mixed responses for the item that dealt with the avoidance of RBT duties by other members with 22% disagreeing/strongly disagreeing, 37% neutral or unsure about this and 38% who agreed/strongly agreed. The mixed responses for practices questions suggested that there were possible regional differences but Chi-square tests of independence (comparing the eight regions on the items) did not reveal any significant differences.

A repeated measures ANOVA found a significant overall difference between agreement scores for those items that comprised the Practices items (Q16-23) \(F(6.16,2555.97)= 75.85, p < .001\). Not surprisingly, post hoc tests revealed that most items were significantly different from each other \(p < .001\) except for the pairings of Q17 with Q18, Q16 with 23, Q16 with Q19 and Q17 with Q22. These differences are also evidenced in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7:

*Practices items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. In order to meet targets in our area, RBT operations are often set</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up during high volume traffic times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The amount of RBT conducted in my areas meets or exceeds targets</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on most occasions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The number of RBT tests conducted in my area is accurately</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. In my experience, every driver intercepted by police is breath</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. RBT operations in my area include targeted operations that focus</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on crime-related as well as traffic “hot spots”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Multi-functional operations in my area involving other specialist</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups such as CIB, JAB etc. always incorporate RBT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. At my station, members are expected to conduct a minimum amount of</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBT during each roster cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Despite rostering, some members manage to avoid RBT duties</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3.8 *Behaviour*

As shown in Figure 4.7, the results for *Behaviour* showed that over half (58%) of participants agreed/strongly agreed that they chose RBT locations where it was more likely that drink drivers would be caught while 25% disagree/strongly disagreed with this statement and 17% were neutral/unsure. Over 80% agreed/strongly agreed that they conducted RBT operations in a highly visible manner and while 80% also agreed/strongly agreed to testing every driver stopped during RBT operations, 15% disagreed/strongly disagreed to doing this with 5% neutral or unsure. Respondents were divided in relation to the drawing up of site safety plans prior to RBT operations with 46% agreeing/strongly agreeing, 38% disagreeing/strongly disagreeing and 21% being neutral/unsure (see also Table 4.8).

A repeated measures ANOVA found a significant overall difference between agreement scores for the *Behaviour* items \([F(2.71, 1121.33) = 221.14, p < .001]\). Post-hoc comparisons revealed that all items were significantly different from each other \((p<.001)\) except for Q26 and Q 27.
Chi-square tests of independence revealed that there were significant associations between question 26, ‘I/we (partner/team) draw up site plans when we conduct RBT’ and the eight regions \[ \chi^2 (df 14) = 47.57, p < .001, \phi = .24, p < .001 \]. In particular, officers working in the South East region were the most likely to indicate disagreement with this practice (23%) compared to 16% who agreed. In addition, 18% of officers from the Northern Region were more likely to disagree compared to 6% who indicated agreement. North Coast officers were more likely to indicate agreement with this practice (22%) followed by Metro South region (19%). There were no significant associations between the behaviour items and rank.

Table 4.8:

*Behaviour items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. I/we (partner/team) tend to choose RBT locations where it is more likely that drink drivers will be caught, rather than try to vary the places where we conduct them</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I/we (partner/team) conduct RBT in a highly visible way</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I/we (partner/team) draw up site plans when we conduct RBT</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I/we (partner/team) test every driver that we stop during RBT</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.7: Distribution of agreement scores for questionnaire items 24-27*
4.2.3.9 Performance capability

Over 90% of respondents agreed/strongly agreed that they were adequately trained to conduct RBT and were aware of the policies and procedures involved. Similarly, 80% were in support of the overall goals of RBT but 63% said that they found it difficult to carry out the required amount of RBT due to other policing duties. Just over half (52%) agreed/strongly agreed that they supported the way the current RBT program is conducted compared to 28% who disagreed/strongly disagreed with this statement and 20% of those who were neutral or unsure. Similarly, 58% of respondents said that they would volunteer for RBT duties if the need arose compared to 27% who disagreed/strongly disagreed to this statement while 15% were neutral or unsure. The means of the statements for this construct are listed in Table 4.9 and the frequencies of responses are highlighted in Figure 4.8.

A repeated measures ANOVA found a significant overall difference between agreement scores for Performance capability items \[ F(3.72, 1557.69) = 366.21 \]
\[ p < .001 \]. All means were significantly different from each other \((p< .01)\) except for Q29 paired with Q30, Q32 paired with Q33.

Chi-square tests of independence for rank and region categories showed that there were no significant regional differences. There were, however significant associations between Questions 31, 32 and 33 for the rank categories. For Q31 \[ \chi^2 \text{ (df } 8) = 33.95, p < .001, \phi_c = .20, p < .001 \], 50% of Constables agreed in comparison to 7% who disagreed with the statement ‘I support the overall goals of RBT, as I understand them’ in contrast to Senior Constables where 27% agreed compared to 54% who disagreed and 17% of Sergeants who agreed compared to 37% who disagreed. For Q32, ‘I support the way that the RBT program is currently conducted’ \[ \chi^2 \text{ (df } 8) = 54.96, p < .001, \phi_c = .26, p < .001 \], the split among agreement and disagreement was 58% to 16% of Constables, 18% and 53% for Senior Constables and 16% and 30% for Sergeants. For Q33, ‘I would volunteer for RBT duties if the need arose’ \[ \chi^2 \text{ (df } 14) = 47.57, p < .001, \phi_c = .24, p < .001 \] the percentages of responses representing agreement compared to disagreement was 56% to 19% for Constables, 20% to 48% for Senior Constables and 16% to 30% for Sergeants. These results appear to suggest that support for RBT is greatest among more junior officers.
Table 4.9:

Performance capability items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. I find it difficult to conduct the amount of RBT required due to other policing duties</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I feel that I am adequately trained to conduct RBT</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am aware of the policies and procedures relating to RBT</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I support the overall goals of RBT, as I understand them</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I support the way that the RBT program is currently conducted</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I would volunteer for RBT duties if the need arose</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.8: Frequency of agreement scores for questionnaire items 28-33

4.3.3 Open ended questions and additional comments

Although not directly related to the alignment constructs, there were three open-ended questions provided at the end of the questionnaire and a section that allowed for free comments. There were over two hundred responses to each question and 70 respondents made additional comments. A summary of the major topics provided for each question is listed below. In some cases, specific comments are included.
Q: What method(s) of drink driving enforcement do you prefer and why?

Responses for this question could be divided into four major groups that are listed below.

**Targeted operations**: Respondents who indicated their preference for targeted operations cited typical targets as being pubs and clubs, known or repeat offenders and areas with a history of previous drink driving detections and/or crashes. The use of unmarked cars for these types of operations was also suggested. The reported benefits of targeted operations were higher detection rates and ensuring that enforcement is directed at those people who are most likely to offend or reoffend.

“I prefer to target known locations where a drink driver will be caught. This is because to catch one drink driver and get him off the road (at least in the short term)- the results may well be higher than to conduct 100 RBT’s with no drink drivers detected”.

**Mobile operations**: Respondents who indicated a preference for mobile operations said that in addition to an increase in the number of detections, mobile operations allowed police to cover greater areas and that they reinforced the notion of “anywhere, anytime”. It was said that this type of drink driving enforcement would be of “better quality” as officers would be able to spend time conducting comprehensive checks on drivers and vehicles, rather than “wasting time getting targets”. It was also believed that the public would view mobile operations as a “proactive” policing initiative.

**Stationary operations**: Those in favour of stationary operations commonly said that these operations were safer and more efficient. It was commented that static operations provided greater visibility to the general public and ensured saturation. The use of the booze buses was perceived to add to the increased visibility and that large booze bus operations enabled quotas to be achieved.

**Mixed operations**: Respondents who chose mixed forms of enforcement spoke about the need to simultaneously deter the general public and catch drink driving offenders. It was said that mobile interceptions can have a “higher kill rate” which
was seen as important for maintaining officer interest and satisfaction and that these operations could also be highly visible to the public if conducted on major roadways. Several participants said that although they preferred mobile testing they acknowledged the need for static operations as “both have their place in operational policing”.

Q: What kind of difficulties do you experience in implementing RBT?

Responses to this question revealed two major areas of concern to respondents including resource/organisational issues and officer-related issues.

Resource/organisational difficulties: Many respondents reported that time was a major difficulty, including the time taken to set up a RBT site along with finding time to do RBT during shifts, finding time to achieve testing quotas and also being called away after setting up RBT to attend to other jobs. Site safety was also found to be problematic, resulting in the complaint that there are limited places to set up RBT according to occupational health and safety guidelines. As a result, many officers pointed out that members of the public soon became aware of these places. Officers also complained about a lack of staff, not only to conduct RBT but also a lack of trained evidentiary breath analysis operators.

Officer-related difficulties: Many respondents said that they found it difficult to initiate or conduct RBT duties due to their own boredom and lack of motivation. Others complained about motivating other staff, “especially general duties” members. Some of the more senior officers complained that junior or inexperienced officers were “just going through the motions” during RBT and were not picking up signs of indicia of impairment, other signs of suspect behaviour or using the opportunity to gain intelligence. It was also commented that many officers were not giving the correct request/requirement to members of the public prior to conducting the breath test.

Q: In your opinion, how could the operation of RBT be improved?

Responses to this question included suggestions that addressed many of the expressed difficulties. For example, in order to deal with lack of time and the
reported strain of testing quotas, it was suggested that the majority of RBT be delegated to traffic branch or that the quota system be removed altogether. Suggestions to improve motivation included the provision of overtime for conducting RBT and changing RBT stops to general intercepts where complete driver, passenger and vehicle checks are conducted.

Q: Additional comments/suggestions

For the seventy officers who completed this section, the majority of comments that were made were negative. For example, descriptions of various aspects of the RBT program and the operation of RBT included: “burden”, “failure”, “insult”, “unrealistic”, “unachievable” and “ridiculous”. Several officers complained that supervisors were likely to chastise officers for not reaching targets. When suggestions were provided, however, they were positive. For example, it was suggested that targeted operations should be increased, that there should be better strategic use of intelligence-based data and that RBT should incorporate driver and vehicle checks.

4.4 Discussion

Overall, the results showed, perhaps not surprisingly, that there appeared to be areas of both alignment and misalignment between the way RBT is currently being conducted in the QPS and best practice guidelines as reported by operational members. The purpose of this section is to discuss the findings as they relate to the alignment constructs. For the sake of continuity and clarity this task is structured around the alignment constructs.

4.4.1 Alignment constructs

4.4.1.1 Environment

Firstly, the results for the environment construct suggest that there is a strong perception among rank and file members that the QPS is responsible for setting the number of RBT tests to be conducted along with guidelines for the way in which RBT operations should be undertaken. This implies that the majority of officers who conduct RBT perceive ‘ownership’ of the RBT program. If the majority of members
believe that the QPS is the primary stakeholder in relation to the RBT program, then this appears to be an area that is in a state of alignment for several reasons.

As previously described, the environment construct describes the context in which the organisation operates. It includes those factors that act as facilitating or debilitating forces on the organisation’s freedom of action. In the private sector, the environment is commonly the customer and customer demands that influence the organisation’s strategy. In this study, Queensland police officers involved in the day-to-day operation of RBT perceived the QPS to have a dominant influence over the RBT program. This is a positive finding for the QPS as it indicates that members do not believe that the program is influenced or pressured by external agencies, in this case the community, politicians or other government agencies. The implication of this finding suggests that as long as RBT is considered the responsibility of the QPS, then it will continue to be enforced and treated as a police endeavour regardless of individual officer attitudes.

4.4.1.2. Vision, values and purpose

Alignment of the organisational purpose or goal is important as the goal provides “the direction to which all systems, structures, practices, rewards and behavior should be aligned” (Semler, 2000). The results from this study indicate that there is overwhelming agreement for QPS’s RBT espoused vision, which includes overall road safety goals along with apprehension goals, albeit with slightly less agreement for the latter. This finding suggests that the QPS has been successful in relaying the mission statement regarding the RBT program to those members responsible for its operation. In other words, many members agree that the main focus of the RBT vision is based on principles of general deterrence and not apprehension.

The significant differences found between the item ‘catch drink driving offenders’ and all other items, however, suggest that this is an aspect of the vision that many members do not believe possesses the same value in the organisation. The open questions and free comments reflected this finding with many officers criticising the current program for being overly focused on the general deterrence aspect while minimising the importance of catching offenders or reoffenders.
Overall, it appears that perceptions of the RBT vision indicate that this is an area that is aligned with best practice but that officers do not necessarily believe that the QPS has invested equal value on all aspects of the vision.

4.4.1.3 Strategy

The high level of agreement for the strategy items relating to operations being highly visible and unpredictable highlight that, for these two items at least, members perceptions are aligned with best practice features. The lower agreement scores and higher disagreement scores for the item 4c ‘ensure that RBT is unavoidable’ possibly indicate that this is one aspect of the RBT strategy that is an area of concern for many officers or that that they may find it difficult to ensure. The free comments confirmed this with several officers commented on the predictability of RBT sites and site restriction due to occupational health and safety guidelines. Responses regarding 4d, ‘ensure that the majority of tests are done by stationary operations’ were relatively similar which indicates that officer’s perceptions are divided. Officers appeared to have confidence in the QPS’ rationale for the number of tests conducted and the way RBT is conducted. The almost even split between agreement and disagreement for the perceived achievability of the 1:1 test per licensed driver strategy, however, suggests that this is one aspect of the strategy where there are significant differences in the views of officers. Indeed, the free responses indicated that many officers believe that the 1:1 testing requirement was placing a strain on RBT operations. Nonetheless, the results for this construct taken together highlight officer acceptance of the overall RBT strategy.

4.4.1.4 Culture

Although most members believed that RBT was the responsibility of both general duties (GD) and traffic personnel, the results showed that traffic police were considered to be nearly 100% responsible for RBT. The independent sample t-test results showed that this difference was significant. This suggests that despite the high level of agreement that RBT in the QPS is ‘everyone’s business’, it appears that it is especially the business of traffic police. This belief is reflected in the free
comments and suggestions, with many officers suggesting that RBT should be relegated to traffic police. As traffic personnel are responsible for conducting a large number of RBT operations throughout the year, this perception is not surprising. Although GD officers are required to conduct their own RBT duties when possible, they are more likely to be involved in a support role to traffic for the more organised, large-scale operations. Consequently, traffic police bear most of the burden of RBT.

With regard to the item relating to the core business of policing, a significantly larger number of respondents were more likely to indicate that mobile RBT rather than stationary RBT was part of the core business of policing. The comments made helped illustrate this distinction with several officers questioning the logic of stationary RBT believing it to be inefficient and a burden on resources. Many officers complained about the low ‘hit rate’ associated with stationary RBT and the lack of motivation as a result.

Overall, the responses related to this construct reveal that there is a lack of understanding or simply disagreement about the role that stationary operations play in deterring drink driving. This is not consistent with best practice and highlights that this is an area where further feedback and education is required. Many officers did not seem to understand why they were required to conduct so many RBT tests for what was generally believed to be a “menial task”. These officers believed that officers driving around conducting ‘mobile RBT’, actively looking for drink drivers, would better serve the QPS and the public. This type of enforcement, however, is not RBT in the strict sense of the term. Like many other police officers described in other studies, the officers in this study wanted to catch offenders because this is considered a productive policing activity.

4.4.1.5 Structure and systems

With regard to structures and systems, it appears that the QPS has been relatively successful in communicating the objectives of the RBT program along with the policies and procedures that accompany it. In addition, there was consensus regarding adequate methods of recording RBT numbers. To a lesser extent there was also agreement that there were systems in place to monitor the ratio of mobile to
stationary tests and systems to guide the deployment of RBT operations. Mixed responses in relation to item 10 regarding the existence of rostering systems was not explained by regional differences, however, it is suggested that differences could exist at a local level.

Unfortunately, the results also showed that there lack of alignment with regard to information about the rationale for the number of tests expected, feedback to operational police about the success of RBT as a road safety tool, its impact in reducing drink driving crashes and information about the impact of RBT on drink driving behaviour. This suggests that the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of RBT has been successfully communicated to those responsible for undertaking RBT duties but not the ‘why’. In addition, officers are not aware of how successful RBT has been in reducing the road toll and its impact on drink driving behaviour. The lack of feedback evident in this construct is possibly one of the most concerning issues thus far.

4.4.1.6 Rewards

The best practice literature suggests that alignment in the *Rewards* aspect would be evident if there were both formal and informal rewards for catching drink driving offenders and for carrying out RBT duties in general. However, the results from this study indicate that the apprehension of drink driving offenders was more likely to be informally rewarded by peers and reaching RBT targets was more likely to be rewarded by supervisors.

Once again, the free comments echoed and expanded these beliefs with many officers complaining that supervisors or the ‘hierarchy’ were only interested in RBT numbers and not how many drink drivers had been detected. A few respondents reported being chastised for catching drink drivers as this would tie up resources that could be used to increase testing numbers. The results also showed that RBT was not seen as a valued policing activity due to a lack of shift penalties and the fact that RBT activity was not linked to performance appraisals. Not surprisingly, the literature points out that although management cannot directly control individual or team behaviour, rewards systems can help encourage specific behaviour (Semler,
Clearly, in the case of RBT, the lack of formal rewards appears to have a negative impact upon the motivation of many officers within the QPS.

4.4.1.7 Practices

The divided responses relating to the Practices construct originally suggested that there were different concerns and priorities across the state. As the Chi-square tests were non-significant, however, regional differences could not be attributed. For the practice relating to conducting operations during high volume traffic periods, it appears that slightly more officers agree than disagree that this practice occurs in their area. In this case it is suggested that differences possibly exist at a local level, for example, different stations or even patrol teams. As a reasonable amount of responses were neutral/unsure, this implies that a sizable proportion of officers are simply unaware of the operations that occur in their jurisdictions.

Although 50% of respondents agreed that targets for their areas were either met or exceeded on most occasions, close to 40% were neutral/unsure. Similarly, although officers were more confident that RBT testing levels were accurately recorded, relatively large neutral/unsure responses indicated a lack of awareness of the practices occurring in respondents’ areas. For question 19, however, opinions were almost evenly split that every driver intercepted by police was breath tested. In the free comments, several officers raised concerns that not every driver was breath tested for reasons including not wanting to hold up the line, time and in several cases, the belief that officers could judge driver impairment.

Results for items 20 and 21 revealed that operations were organised in a strategic manner but that specialist operations did not always include RBT. For these two questions, the research intent was not an investigation of alignment but rather an exploratory area examining facilitating factors. As such it appears that officers are attempting to carry out RBT in a more strategic manner but that other specialist groups are yet to employ RBT as a tool in their operations.

The overwhelming agreement regarding expectations that a minimum amount of RBT was to be conducted during an officer’s tour of duty was not surprising considering complaints about the strain of meeting targets. Still, more officers than not agreed that co-workers managed to avoid RBT.
Generally, this is another area that appears to be relatively misaligned in the operation of RBT. Officers are either evenly divided or unsure about the practices that occur in their areas and this is possibly symptomatic of a lack of feedback in relation to RBT.

4.4.1.8 Behaviour

The results relating to self-reported behaviour suggest that members are generally carrying out RBT operations according to best practice but that a main aim is to catch drink drivers. For the first question, ‘I/We (partner/team) tend to choose RBT locations where it is more likely that drink drivers will be caught, rather than try to vary the places where we conduct them’, it was expected that responses would refer to those situations where officers were responsible for conducting self-generated RBT operations. As the majority of respondents agreed with this statement, it appears that officers in this study were more concerned about trying to detect drink drivers than trying to ensure that RBT is deployed throughout the road network. Taking into account the results from the culture construct and the free comments made, the results suggest that officers would prefer to conduct targeted RBT operations whenever possible.

A large percentage of officers also reported conducting RBT in a highly visible manner and testing every driver pulled over which is in accordance with best practice recommendations. This, however, was not consistent with responses related to perception of practices. Officers may have agreed with these behaviours simply in order to avoid revealing negative aspects of their own behaviour. In relation to the preparation of site safety plans, this appears to be a problem for a significant number of officers in certain regions.

4.4.1.9 Performance capability

In this study, nearly all members perceived themselves to be adequately trained to conduct RBT and aware of the policies and procedures related to the operation of RBT. Many members were also supportive of the overall goals of the program and although less were supportive of the way the program is currently conducted, the majority of them said they would volunteer for RBT duties if
required. In other words, it appears that officers are willing and able to carry out RBT duties and many would volunteer if they were required to do so. This means that despite the concerns identified in the previous constructs, officers appear to be capable and willing to conduct RBT.

The main barrier to performance capability identified in this construct is related to the perceived strain of carrying out RBT due to other policing duties. It was not possible to distinguish the difference of this perception between traffic members and general duties members as the question was not asked in order to ally fears of identification. Nonetheless, many of the free comments made revealed greater strain upon general duties members who are required to respond to calls from the general public while maintaining RBT testing numbers. In general, the results related to this construct seems to suggest that despite some perceived barriers to the operation of RBT, officers believe that they have a strong capability to perform RBT.

4.4.2 Concluding comments

Overall, the results from this study highlighted several areas of alignment and possible misalignment regarding the current operation of RBT. Comparisons with the results from Study One involving the interviews with managers are made in the following chapter, Chapter 5. The main barriers to the operation of RBT identified in this study include: the perceived strain of the one test per licensed driver strategy; the lack of feedback regarding the success of RBT; and a misunderstanding or lack of education about the role of deterrence. Facilitating factors include: perception of ownership of the RBT program; an understanding of the overall vision; knowledge of RBT policy and procedure; and perceived performance capability.
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5.1 Introduction

The overall aim of this research project was to investigate the types of organisational systems and processes that hinder or facilitate RBT operations according to the perception of managers and operational police. To facilitate this goal, a systems-based concept known as alignment theory was borrowed from the organisational management and performance literature to structure two studies. The first study was designed to explore the perceptions of QPS managers involved in the day-to-day organisation and delivery of RBT operations. The second study involved a questionnaire that was distributed to a random sample of 950 operational police who are responsible for undertaking RBT on a regular basis. The questionnaire was also designed to explore the perceptions of operational members in relation to various organisational aspects of RBT delivery.

The role of this chapter is to review the major findings of both studies and integrate the findings in a way that will lead to suggestions for the enhancement of RBT management and operations in the future. This chapter will, therefore, cover the following areas. Firstly, a summary of the overall findings of the research project is presented. Secondly, the major results of both studies are discussed in light of the research questions under the alignment construct headings. Thirdly, the theoretical, and applied implications of these findings are presented and discussed. Fourthly, the strengths and limitations of the research program are considered and finally, future research directions are suggested.

5.2 Review of findings

5.2.1 Summary of overall findings

Overall, the results of the two studies identified similar areas of alignment and misalignment regarding the way RBT is currently being managed and operated in the QPS. Both managers and operational police agree that the vision of the RBT program includes both road safety goals and apprehension goals even though they did not agree with the perceived value that the organisation had apparently placed on these goals. Managers and operational police also both agreed that information regarding policy and procedure in relation to RBT is effectively conveyed and that there are
adequate structures and systems to run the program. All officers involved in the studies generally viewed RBT as a policing activity that all operational members are responsible for although it is seen as more of a traffic police function.

The areas of misalignment include three major issues. Firstly, the strategy of 1:1 test per licensed driver appears to be an issue of concern for both managers and operational police alike. For operational members, targets are viewed as a burden especially when there are competing tasks and little time. Managers are also concerned that the strain of reaching targets is linked to the practice of conducting RBT at high volume/low alcohol times to secure testing numbers. The second major area of misalignment is in the structure and system area and includes lack of feedback in relation to the success of RBT and its impact on the road toll and drink driving behaviour. The third major issue relates to the lack of education about the role of deterrence in RBT and how both mobile and stationary operations can contribute to a strategic enforcement approach.

5.2.2 Research questions and explanation of findings

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. What types of organisational systems and processes in the QPS either hinder or facilitate RBT operations according to the perceptions of managers and operational police officers?; and

2. In terms of the key organisational elements identified by Semler (1997; 1999; 2000), how well aligned is the management and delivery of RBT in Queensland with best practice guidelines?

The specific findings of both studies are discussed in terms of the research questions under the elements of the alignment model and in terms of being barriers or facilitators to the management and operation. A brief description of each construct and related meanings in terms of the research is provided to assist with this process. The implications for QPS human resource management relating to this discussion are dealt with in section 5.3.3. It should be noted that the discussion encompasses the findings of both studies, including the comments made in Study Two questionnaire.
5.2.2.1 Environment

The *Environment* construct deals with the context in which an organisation operates. In the organisational performance literature, alignment reflects the fit between external environmental demands and an organisation’s vision and values. In the case of RBT and the QPS, it was expected that this construct would reveal perceived environmental forces that shape and influence the way RBT is managed and operated. It was also proposed that alignment in the environment area would be evident when managers and operational members agreed that external stakeholders did not overly influence the way the RBT program was conducted.

With regard to the interviews with the managers, it was revealed that many believed that there was a strong political influence on RBT policy and procedure. In other words, the majority of managers saw the RBT program as being predominantly externally driven by the political sector. Their main concern related to one aspect of the strategy, the one breath test per licensed driver per year. Conversely, the questionnaire results showed that the majority of operational police involved in the study believed that the RBT program was determined predominately by the QPS. Both managers and operational members did not see the community as being an influential external group.

The results, not surprisingly, suggest that managers are either more aware of or more preoccupied with the influence of external stakeholders, particularly the political sector, regarding the overall RBT strategy. It appears that operational police, despite believing that government bodies such as Queensland Transport and politicians play a role in setting the number of tests expected, see the QPS as primarily responsible for determining the way RBT is carried out. The fact that both groups did not consider the community as an influential stakeholder seems to suggest that the community is viewed as a passive body regarding police policy and procedure.

In terms of alignment, these results indicate that officers perceive RBT as police responsibility. Only a few officers made comments about privatising RBT or allowing another government agency, such as Queensland Transport, to take it over. Although the managers were aware of the external influence on the RBT program, they did not suggest that it should be relegated to another government department or
private organisation. In other words, despite some concerns about political influence regarding testing levels, the majority of officers involved in this research perceived ownership of the RBT program.

5.2.2.2 Vision, values and purpose

This construct refers to the goal or purpose of alignment. The vision, values and purpose outline whatever the organisation decides to focus upon as its main objective or mission (Semler, 2000). This research endeavour set out to discover whether managers and operational members believed that the QPS vision for the RBT program was not only about deterring drink drivers and catching drink drivers but also included broader road safety aims of promoting safe road use, educating the community and overall, attempting to reduce the road toll. Alignment for this construct, therefore, was characterised by agreement that the RBT vision was congruent with all of these aims.

Both managers and operational members believed that the overall goals of the QPS’s RBT program included both a deterrent function, a detection function and an all-encompassing safety aim for the community. Both groups, however, did not believe the detection function was awarded equal priority and that there was less emphasis on catching drink drivers as should be the case according to best practice. In addition, many questioned the deterrent function claiming that it had lost its value and that the vision was more about getting numbers rather than educating the public about the risk of being caught for drink driving. For operational police, this perception was stronger for Senior Constables than Constables, which suggests that either the longer serving officers are becoming increasingly cynical about the vision or that their understanding has been eroded.

Overall, it appears that although the QPS has successfully conveyed the QPS vision to those responsible for its management and operation, the relative value of each of the aims of the vision and the overall intent of the vision are perceived as questionable by many officers.
5.2.2.3 Strategy

Strategy refers to the “process of creating and communicating goals that are intended to place the organization in an advantageous position or configuration within its environment” (Collins & Porras, 1996 cited in Semler, 2000). Strategy, therefore, refers to the configuration of organisational resources in order to meet stakeholder expectations. For RBT, best practice strategies are operations that are: highly visible and threatening; unpredictable in their timing and location; unavoidable; involve stationary operations as the primary mode of delivery; and ensure maximum exposure to RBT through sustained, high levels of enforcement (Travelsafe, 1996). The 1:1 testing strategy was specifically adopted in order to achieve the recommended sustained high levels of enforcement and this ratio was considered best practice at the time. Strategic alignment, therefore, would have been evidenced by agreement that the QPS was utilising these strategies in the RBT program and that the 1:1 objective was realistic and achievable.

For the managers, the 1:1 testing strategy was viewed as excessive and generally unrealistic and unachievable. The managers suggested that pressure to achieve targets led to poor policing practices in relation to RBT. Such practices included setting up RBT operations at low alcohol/high volume traffic times in order to achieve testing numbers. Despite this, both the managers and operational members reported that they regularly managed to meet or exceed targets for their respective areas. Unfortunately, the item that dealt with this practice in the questionnaire revealed divided responses but no regional differences. As a result, it is not known to what extent and in what jurisdictions that RBT operations are being conducted at high volume/low alcohol traffic times to meet targets.

For the operational members, perceptions related to the strategy constructs revealed overall agreement that the RBT strategy was being conducted according to best practice, notably that these operations are highly visible and unpredictable. More mixed responses for the unavoidable and stationary aspects are possibly in response to either confusion about the strategy, local differences, concern in some officers that these aspects are not as prevalent or a lack of awareness of what strategies are actually being utilised.
In sum, there appears to be general agreement that the current RBT strategy includes best practice features. Nonetheless, the perceived excessiveness of the 1:1 testing target by both managers and operational members suggests that this is one aspect of the strategy that is under considerable strain. The reported negative impact on practices and attitudes illustrates the implication of this strain.

5.2.2.4 Culture

The Culture construct relates to collective assumptions about definitions of success in an organisation. It includes the values of the organisation that are generally shared by the majority of members (Semler, 2000). In this research, it was expected that the police would be culturally geared toward ‘catching criminals’, as discussed in the literature review. As a result, it was expected that both managers and operational members would report that stationary RBT operations with their low ‘hit rates’ would be relatively unfavourable and that mobile operations would be more likely to be considered as part of core policing business. It was also expected that the culture construct would reveal to what extent members believed that the RBT program was the responsibility of traffic police or general duties police.

In the questionnaire, although an overwhelming amount of officers agreed that RBT was the responsibility of both general duties and traffic police, more agreed that it was the responsibility of traffic police. Not surprisingly, non-traffic managers were also more likely to state that crime reduction rather than traffic enforcement was the primary responsibility of general duties police. The questionnaire also showed that mobile operations rather than stationary operations were considered to be part of core policing business.

These perceptions were believed to lead to difficulties in organising and conducting RBT operations. For example, there were reported problems organising general duties staff to assist with operations, the fact that RBT was treated as a low priority by senior officers and low morale among staff required to carry out operations. Facilitating cultural aspects include the fact that in some areas, RBT is being utilised as a crime reduction tool where specialist operations are combined with RBT and that attitudes towards traffic policing are beginning to change.
5.2.2.5 *Structure and systems*

This construct deals with tangible aspects of an organisation that facilitate achievement of goals. These aspects include practices and process such as rostering systems, information collection and dissemination, and communication systems for example.

In Study One, the managers suggested their own issues with structures and systems while in Study Two, only a selection of issues that were believed to be pertinent to operational members were explored. Alignment for this construct was characterised by the existence of adequate structures and systems within the QPS that facilitate the deployment of RBT operations in a best practice manner.

The results of both studies showed that both managers and operational police agreed that there was a lack of feedback in relation to the success of RBT and its impact upon the road toll and drink driving behaviour. Operational police agreed that the objectives, policies and procedures related to the operation of RBT were successfully communicated but that this communication did not extend to the rationale for the number of tests expected.

For the majority of items in this construct, operational members appeared to be unsure about the existence of systems and processes to support best practice RBT. This appears to be in direct relation to a lack of feedback regarding RBT in general. It is suggested that in most cases, officers are simply unaware of how the program is structured and managed and perhaps more importantly, the significant impact their efforts have made on reducing the road toll.

Managers brought up various concerns in relation to staffing, rostering, integrity and credibility of RBT data, the lack of structured intelligence to deploy RBT resources and a lack of trained staff for evidentiary breath analysis. There were also concerns about their own training and lack of traffic education at the recruit level. Generally, however, these issues do not appear to have compromised the current operation of RBT. The lack of feedback, however, has the capability to impact upon operations and appears to have fuelled the cynicism regarding the usefulness of stationary operations and the rationale for the 1:1 testing target.
5.2.2.6 Rewards

The *Rewards* construct is comprised of two dimensions, informal and formal rewards. Both deal with the process of attending to specific behaviour in an organisation and can include bonus systems, promotional and disciplinary systems and encouragement from peers. Rewards can be powerful as they are capable of shaping and encouraging desirable employee behaviour.

The research process was expected to reveal what types of formal and informal rewards exist for performing RBT duties and reaching targets. The existence of reward mechanisms was believed to constitute alignment for this construct. For the QPS, formal rewards could take the form of pay incentives (shift penalties for RBT) or recognition for participation (positive comments on annual reviews or promotional paperwork, letters of commendation) for example. Informal rewards could include spoken acknowledgment by peers and supervisors and situations where favours were granted or facilitated (eg. leave being granted).

Unfortunately, most managers reported that there were no formal rewards for meeting targets or conducting RBT operations. They also said that they were more likely to be chastised by senior officers for not reaching targets. The managers said that they did try and encourage their staff by informally praising them but this was more likely to be in response to the detection of drink drivers. Traffic managers were more likely to praise their staff for both detection and general operation of RBT.

Operational members also agreed that there was no formal reward for RBT participation but did acknowledge each other for the detection of drink drivers. They also said that their supervisors were more likely to reward them for reaching targets, which was not what the managers said. It was also reported that RBT was also not linked to yearly performance appraisals and that the QPS had all but stopped shift penalties for conducting extra RBT.

Again, the lack of alignment in this area has the potential to undermine the gains made by RBT in the past in relation to officer confidence and support of the overall program. It appears that this is one organisational area that could be easily be realigned simply by encouraging officers and acknowledging their effort in conducting RBT duties.
5.2.2.7 Practices

Practices deal with the way that organisational members act on a daily basis and represent the assumptions determined by culture in action (Semler, 2000). Although practices appear to be similar to behaviour, practices are concerned with the assumptions of what is done on a day-to-day basis within an organisation.

For this construct, it was expected that results would reveal what aspects of the operation of RBT are being carried out according to best practice and also highlight the existence of innovative strategies that facilitate the operation of RBT.

In Study One, the managers expressed concern about the emergence of maladaptive practices in response to the 1:1 ratio, including concentrating RBT operations at peak traffic times to help reach targets. Managers were also concerned about the deskilling effect of “blow and go” operations and the impact of these operations on officer morale. Despite these concerns, the increasing use of innovative operations involving specialist units with strategic crime-related objectives appeared to offset these issues.

The divided responses in the Study Two questionnaire relating to practices could not be explained by regional differences. It is possible that either different practices are occurring at a local level or that these differences are explained by the officers’ lack of awareness of the practices that occur in their areas. More officers, however, agreed than disagreed that operations were set up in high traffic times to reach targets. A particular practice that is of concern relates to the belief among some officers that not every driver currently being stopped at RBT stations is being breath tested. This practice has the ability to reduce the general public’s perception of the risk of being caught for drink driving. In addition, if drinking drivers are being waved through RBT stations, it has the potential to reinforce successful drink driving episodes.

5.2.2.8 Behaviour

As pointed out in 3.3.8, behaviour was not measured in the interviews with managers. However, it was incorporated into Study Two in terms of individual officer behaviour. For operational members, alignment for this construct was evidenced by agreement that self-reported behaviour consisted of carrying out RBT
in a highly visible manner throughout the road network and ensuring that every driver stopped was breath tested. It was also believed that preparation of site plans constituted best practice so this was also measured. The results showed that members are undertaking highly visible RBT operations but that they are more concerned with catching drink drivers rather than trying to conduct RBT in a ubiquitous manner.

Officers also agreed that they tested every driver stopped during RBT operations. The divided responses in relation to the construction of site safety plans, however, suggests that this is an area that is misaligned with the same amount of officers agreeing to this statement as disagreeing and a slightly less amount reporting a neutral or unsure response.

Interestingly, responses regarding testing every driver differed from responses to a similar item in the practices construct, ‘In my experience every driver intercepted by police is breath tested’ where the majority of officers disagreed with this item. This seems to indicate that officers are witnessing the practice of not testing every driver but they do not report doing this themselves perhaps as a result of social desirability.

5.2.2.8 Performance capability

According to Semler (1999) *Performance capability* is a compound variable comprised of knowledge, individual capability, motivation and system capability. In an aligned organisation, individuals are more likely to report possession of necessary knowledge, capability, motivation and the existence of system capability to meet strategic goals. Although performance capability was not directly explored in the interviews with the managers, their collective comments were viewed as perceptions of performance capability. As a result, it appears that in many ways, managers’ responses were generally indicative of alignment despite their main grievances in relation to testing levels and the lack of feedback. In other words, while many managers complained about some aspects of the current state of affairs regarding RBT, they were by their own admissions, conducting and enabling the operation of RBT as per best practice guidelines. For the managers, the weakest link in the
performance equation was in relation to system capability which included concerns about staffing, rostering, lack of time, feedback and the use of data.

The operational members appeared to possess adequate knowledge, motivation and individual capability to carry out RBT duties but were often hampered by the strain of competing tasks. Generally, all the officers appeared to be capable and willing to conduct RBT. Support for the overall and current goals of the RBT program, however, was more likely to come from Constables which suggests that motivation declines with increasing length of service. While this is not surprising, it has implications for managers involved in the organisation of RBT operations. If less experienced officers are more supportive of RBT then it would follow that they would show greater enthusiasm during their tour of duty. In fact Moloney (1994) has promoted the utilisation of recently graduated officers to conduct booze bus operations as these officers have been found to be more accepting, compliant and willing to carry out large scale, repetitive operations.

5.3 Implications of findings

5.3.1 Theoretical implications

In this study, two theoretical perspectives, deterrence theory and alignment theory were employed to assess the management and operation of RBT within the QPS. Although both theories were not directly tested, they were utilised as frameworks and organising constructs. The following comments, therefore, are directed at the utility of both perspectives in these tasks.

The current RBT strategy is based upon the principles of general deterrence theory which are deemed to constitute best practice by the general road safety community. The tenets of deterrence theory were, therefore, not challenged in this research. The results of both studies, however, revealed an increasing uncertainty of the usefulness of general deterrence in the current RBT program. Officers were the most critical of the best practice recommendations regarding the 1:1 ratio and the majority of operations to be conducted by highly visible, stationary operations. Officers believed that this has resulted in a quality vs. quantity dilemma.

The implication of this suggests that although deterrence theory will continue to play a large role in road safety countermeasures such as RBT, it may be timely to
explore the possibility that other criminological or sociological theories may enhance enforcement practices. At present, deterrence theory underpins RBT simply because it has shown to be effective in the past and that no other theories have been applied and tested thus far. The use of more sophisticated models of deterrence such as Stafford and Warr’s concept of punishment avoidance (1993), recently explored in relation to unlicensed driving (Watson, 1994), may provide a more comprehensive theoretical basis for future enforcement approaches. For example, while the QPS is currently carrying out more breath tests per licensed driver than any other jurisdiction in Australia, the findings of this research suggest that many of these tests are being carried out during low alcohol times to satisfy quotas. As a result, it appears that the possibility of many drink drivers being apprehended would be relatively low. This would seem to encourage drinking drivers to take a chance and for those managing to escape detection, the end result is that drink driving behaviour is reinforced. While operations based on deterrence theory have managed to discourage drink driving in the general community, operations informed by the concept of punishment avoidance theory could enhance enforcement efforts. One example involves undertaking RBT operations when drink drivers expect officer shift changes or meal breaks.

The use of alignment theory in the research process was designed to explore the proposition that alignment between organisational elements in the QPS that facilitate the management and operation of RBT and best practice guidelines lead to more efficient RBT operations. As it was conceptually difficult to define “success” or good performance regarding the operation of RBT, the existence of performance capability within officers was investigated. Overall, the alignment perspective provided a logical and structured framework for the examination of the QPS organisation. Historically, the concepts of alignment are well grounded in systems theory, and in the case of the study of organisations, the open systems perspective. The existence of ‘fit’ between organisational system components naturally assumes that greater performance will be achieved through the attainment of strategic objectives. As such, the constructs of Semler’s alignment model provided a method to explore the ‘fit’ between best practice RBT theory and the management and operation of RBT in the QPS. While direct testing of the alignment model through
methods such as structural equation modelling could have enhanced the findings of this research endeavour, it was beyond the scope of the current research. Nonetheless, the present research shows that the model is a useful tool that can be applied to the study of a public service organisation. Future work will provide a greater understanding of how this model can be operationalised for diagnostic purposes.

5.3.2 Applied implications

There are several practical implications of the findings of this research that have the capability to enhance the existing management and operation of RBT in the QPS. These issues have implications predominantly in the human resource management field.

5.3.2.1 Implications for management

Firstly, in relation to the management of RBT, the issue that appeared to be the biggest concern to managers was the 1:1 test per licensed driver strategy. In most cases, this was described as a ‘quality vs. quantity’ issue that had far reaching effects in other organisational areas. For example, it was claimed to lead to officers conducting operations at high volume, low alcohol times that were believed to deskill officers and negatively impact on morale. Although such operations have best practice features such as high visibility and being conducted in the stationary mode, there are possible problems with this practice. For one, conducting these operations could become predictable and less credible to the public and in particular, drink drivers. Secondly, there is little point in analysing the data generated from operations that are not consistently based on some strategic planning. These issues, coupled with a lack of feedback in relation to the success of RBT and lack of education about deterrence, have the potential to undermine the credibility of the current RBT program. If managers perceive the program to be predominately about getting numbers to ‘please politicians’ then their motivation to employ more strategic methods is likely to wane.

In order to address these concerns, managers require timely feedback in relation to the impact of RBT operations in order to effectively plan future operations
and in order to pass on this information to their staff. To enable feedback to be meaningful to managers, it must be based on intelligence and not simply information. While intelligence includes information it is broader and provides a means of analysing and applying information. Managers suggested the appointment of a dedicated traffic intelligence officer to attend to this task who could work alongside criminal investigation intelligence staff so that joint operations could be utilised. In the study, areas where joint operations were already being conducted were reported to be more satisfying and interesting for all those involved.

There also appears to be a need for education about the difference between general deterrence and specific deterrence and the fact that both are not necessarily mutually exclusive. This would help alleviate concerns about the efficiency of highly visible static operations and enable managers to plan operations with a combination of both elements to achieve general deterrent aims and detection aims. Improved education would also enable managers to educate their staff about the importance of both types of operations and this would improve morale. While it is not expected that attitudes towards the general business of policing (e.g. crime detection) are going to change in the near future, improving education can help dispel myths about the role of traffic policing. This could lead to an understanding that traffic policing has the ability to impact on crime.

5.3.2.2 Operational implications

Again, the 1:1 testing strategy appears to be a major issue for many officers who seem to be under considerable pressure to reach targets while attempting to respond to calls from the members of the public, conduct investigations and carry out associated administrative duties. The implication of this is general negativity in attitudes toward conducting RBT. The results from Study Two showed that officers are either misinformed about the reasons for the high testing levels or are simply unaware of the reasons why they are required to conduct the number of tests that they do. In addition, the lack of feedback in relation to the success of their efforts has probably contributed to this problem. Coupled with a lack of recognition of their efforts, officers may agree that they are capable and willing to conduct RBT if they are required but that a price may be ‘robotic practices’, not testing every driver,
laziness in relation to the preparation of site plans and possible falsification of data. It appears that this is one area that requires urgent attention by the QPS. Site safety inspections, for example, should be introduced (or reintroduced) by supervisors to ensure correct procedures are being carried out.

Similar to managers, operational officers require education about the role of both highly visible, general deterrence oriented methods and more apprehension oriented mobile operations and how both complement each other. Promoting awareness and knowledge about the mechanisms underlying enforcement efforts will improve morale and encourage officers to devise innovative strategies in response to their local problems. The findings of this study suggest that increasing use of mixed crime/traffic operations is important in improving morale and breaking down barriers between GD and traffic members. In addition, officers should be made aware that they are performing an important task and be provided with feedback on the results of their efforts. In general, attention should be given to feedback loops that provide information about the overall operation of RBT. For example, performance appraisals and RBT data should be analysed in relation to strategic objectives to ensure the stability and alignment of the program.

5.4 Strengths and limitations of research

There are several strengths and limitations in relation to both studies. Firstly, for Study One, the semi-structured interview technique allowed issues to be explored in a flexible manner. Although there were structured topics to be covered, interviewees were free to talk about any particular issue they wanted to in relation to these topics and any other topic that they felt was important. As a result, it is believed that the information gathered was reflective of genuine concerns.

Some limitations include the fact that while notes were taken during the interviews, a verbatim record of conversation was not conducted. It was not deemed appropriate to tape the interviews given the fact that the interviewees were police officers and that this would have caused discomfort and suspicion. Consequently, it is possible that some comments were not correctly noted or were missed altogether. This would have been more likely to occur in instances where more than one person was interviewed at a time. Despite this, as it has been noted previously, on those
occasions where the senior researcher was present, both sets of notes were compared to assist with triangulation of data. In addition, the participants in Study One were given the opportunity to review the notes taken at the time or contact the research team after the interview to discuss the content of interviews. Another limitation was that in most instances interviewees were either contacted by RTCs or names were suggested by the RTCs of those officers who may be interested in interview participation. This obviously raises the problem of bias.

In relation to Study Two, it is possible that the cover letter from the Chief Superintendent of the STSB could have, either positively or negatively, influenced members preparedness to participate. The inclusion of the cover letter was designed to enhance response rates but it may have unduly influenced officers. It should, however, be acknowledged that a reasonably high response rate was achieved in Study Two. Nonetheless, due to the anonymous nature of the survey and the reluctance of the research team to collect too much identifying data which may have compromised the anonymity of the participants (eg. whether they were a general duties or traffic branch officer) it was impossible to assess how representative the final sample was of operational police in general. Hence, it is difficult to assess what level and type of non-response bias may have been introduced into the sample.

A second limitation of Study Two also relates to the fact that respondents were not asked to state whether they were traffic members or general duties so comparisons were unable to be made between the two. Again, the main reason for this omission was so that respondents would not fear that questionnaires could be traced. Concerns about identification was evident nonetheless as in several cases where respondents either omitted stating their region and rank on the questionnaire. Their concerns could have also influenced the responses for other items in the questionnaire.

A strength related to Study Two included the fact that the sample was randomly selected by computer and all regions were adequately covered. The response rate was also considered to be good, particularly for police officers as highlighted by senior members of QPS ethical standards command (personal communication, March 2003). The use of both qualitative and quantitative methods to explore the degree of alignment regarding the management and operation of RBT
should also be regarded as an additional strength, providing a broader picture of the overall issues.

5.5 Future directions

Overall, it appears that more research is required regarding the discovery of new and improved enforcement theories and strategies. One way of doing this would be to examine other criminological and sociological theories of crime to help determine what models can be utilised by police in their efforts against drink driving and associated deviant road user behaviour.

In addition, it is evident that this organisational enquiry managed to bring attention to issues that have been concerning officers within the QPS for some time. It appears that these organisational issues have largely been ignored in the RBT literature in the past. Improving organisational aspects that relate to the enforcement of RBT can only improve the way this enforcement is carried out. If officers believe that their concerns are being addressed, then their motivation and willingness to improve existing methods will follow.
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Appendix A:
Semi-structured interview information sheet used in Study One

You are invited to take part in a semi-structured interview examining current police policies and practices regarding Random Breath Testing (RBT). The interview is being conducted as part of a broader review of RBT being undertaken by QUT on behalf of the Queensland Police Service.

If you agree to take part in the interview, you will be asked a range of questions relating to the planning and management of RBT operations. The interview is voluntary and completely anonymous. Your confidentiality will be preserved, no identifying information will be made public and none of your answers will be passed onto the Police Service.

It is anticipated that the interview will take about 60 minutes. If you have any questions you can contact the Chief Investigator, Barry Watson, on the number provided above. You may also contact the Secretary of the QUT Research Human Ethics Committee by phoning 3864 2902, if you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of this research.

Thank you
Appendix B:
Examples of questions/issues discussed in semi-structured interviews (Study One)

How long have you worked within the Queensland Police Service (QPS)?

Are you currently involved in the planning of RBT operations? (This question will allow for clarification of the level and complexity of planning)

Are you currently involved in the management of RBT operations?

What do you consider is the main purpose of Random Breath Testing?

What impact do you think that RBT has had upon levels of drink driving in the community?

Do you believe that RBT has proven effective in reducing drink driving crashes?

Are you aware of the current number of breath tests for the QPS/your area?

What do you think about the current testing levels?

Of all the forms of breath testing, (booze buses, mini buses, trailers, car-based stationary & mobile patrols) what methods do you prefer? Why?

In what ways do you think the operation of RBT in Queensland could be improved in relation to the following categories:

- RBT policy;
- Testing numbers;
- Operational logistics – where to set up, who to target etc?

What statistics should be used to guide the enforcement strategy of RBT?

What are the best times to enforce RBT?

How should effectiveness of RBT be measured at an operational level?

How can the effectiveness of car-based mobile/stationary operations be maximised?

What location/area are you responsible for enforcing?
Appendix C:
QPS managers’ suggestions for improvements to RBT operations reported in Study One

- Designated full-time traffic intelligence officer to analyse population growth, predicted growth, crime statistics etc.
- Use of unmarked cars to patrol licensed premises.
- Full line control to be granted to the RTCs to ensure attention to RBT and other traffic-related matters in each region.
- Change RBT name to Random Interception and conduct full vehicle and person check (eg. breath test, licence test, warrant check, vehicle check). Use mass media to advertise this enforcement focus change to public.
- Enforce nightclubs and licensed premises.
- Make liquor industry more responsible for drink driving problem and aim to encourage community ownership of drink driving problem.
- New advertising campaigns to rejuvenate existing RBT.
- Measure success of enforcement via drink driving detection rate, taking into account the number of tests and number of alcohol-related crashes.
- Ensure optimal mixture of stationary and mobile operations – research to identify what this optimal balance should be.
- Every driver intercepted by police should be breath tested (this idea was not welcomed in some areas).
- Educate police about benefits of RBT.
• Overlay crime statistics with crash sites.
• Allocate one full shift for RBT per 28 day roster cycle.
• Improve rigour and quality of RBT.
• Use booze bus as hub and utilise smaller operations to work around.
• Use per capita instead of per licensed driver as way to calculate quotas.
• Conducting RBT at the “right time” in the “right way” (eg. extra presence during night shift).
• Regular feedback on the success of RBT on road toll.
• Increased targeted operations.
• Utilise last known place of drinking information in strategic way.
• Develop formula for how long it takes to do RBT check with a complete person and vehicle check and divide by 10 to work out quotas.
• Better use of intelligence and utilise local knowledge in strategic plans.
Appendix D:
Focus group protocol used in Study Two

1. Welcome and introductions.

2. General explanation of purpose of focus group, for example:

The purpose of our session today is to try and identify some issues that impact upon the operation of RBT to help us with the design of a questionnaire. Ultimately, you will be helping us get an idea of the type and nature of questions that should be asked about RBT. It is planned to distribute the questionnaire in the near future to operational members who conduct RBT duties. It is expected that the questionnaire will examine operational members’ attitudes toward RBT duties, their understanding of RBT, the level of training received, the way RBT is conducted, the resources devoted to RBT for example. It is hoped that members will also be able to comment about their views on the best way to tackle the drink driving problem. Ultimately, we are aiming to discover how RBT can be improved.

3. Description of length of time for session (1 hour) and any other general matters.

4. Begin session, use guiding questions (Q) or issues (I) listed below.

Q: When I say RBT, what is the first thing that comes into your head?

Q: Thinking about the last time you conducted RBT, what were some of the things that made it difficult?

Q: How do you feel about the way RBT is done?

Q: What would an ideal RBT operation look like?

Q: What makes RBT enjoyable?

I: Booze buses v mobile patrols v other methods?

I: Drink driving problem – size, best way to deal with it, responsibility?

I: Current testing levels.

I: Feedback from operations – type, from whom, what feedback desired?

Q: What kind of incentives are there for doing RBT?
**I:**  
*Equipment – availability, quality, reliability etc.*

**Q:**  
*How are RBT operations organised in your area? (discussion about geographical & logistical issues)*

**I:**  
*The role of intelligence in RBT operations.*

**Q:**  
*Why do RBT?*

**Q:**  
*What are the best times to conduct RBT?*

**Q:**  
*How do you measure the success of RBT?*

It is expected that focus group will enable the researchers to identify issues of interest and concerns relevant to RBT. The session will also enable identification of specific language and cultural aspects unique to policing and possibly, RBT operation that may assist in the development of the Questionnaire.
Appendix E:
Questionnaire information/consent sheet used in Study Two


Information sheet

You are invited to take part in a survey examining current policies and practices relating to the operation of Random Breath Testing (RBT). The survey is being conducted as part of a broader review of RBT being undertaken by QUT on behalf of the Queensland Police Service, and your views are important to us.

Participation in the survey is voluntary and completely anonymous. Your confidentiality will be preserved and no identifying information will be accessible or made available to anyone other than members of the QUT research team.

It is anticipated that you will take about 15-20 minutes to complete the attached questionnaire. When you have done so, please seal it in the enclosed reply-paid envelope and place it in the mail. This will ensure that it is returned directly to the research team.

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact the Chief Investigator, Barry Watson, using the contact details provided below. You may also contact the Secretary of the QUT Research Human Ethics Committee (3864 2902) if you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of this research.

Thank you for taking the time to complete and return the attached questionnaire promptly.
Appendix F:
Questionnaire for operational members Study Two

Random Breath Testing Survey

Thank you for consenting to participate in this survey. We are interested in your perceptions toward RBT based on your knowledge and experience. Your completion of this questionnaire is entirely voluntary and anonymous. There are no right or wrong responses and your answers will be treated in the strictest confidence, so please reply as honestly as possible.

How strongly do you agree with each of the following statements........

(Please circle one number for each of the listed items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The following groups currently play a major role in setting the number of RBT tests conducted each year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the QPS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Transport</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other government agencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politicians</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The following groups have a major role in determining the way in which RBT is conducted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the QPS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Transport</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other government agencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politicians</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The overall goals of the Service’s RBT program are to:
   - promote safe and responsible road use in Qld 5 4 3 2 1
   - increase public safety 5 4 3 2 1
   - reduce drink driving crashes 5 4 3 2 1
   - catch drink driving offenders 5 4 3 2 1
   - discourage drink driving behaviour 5 4 3 2 1

4. The main strategies QPS uses to achieve these goals are to:
   - conduct RBT in a highly visible manner 5 4 3 2 1
   - ensure that the majority of RBT operations are unpredictable in their timing and location 5 4 3 2 1
   - ensure that RBT is unavoidable 5 4 3 2 1
   - ensure that the majority of tests are done by stationary operations 5 4 3 2 1

5. The QPS has a clear rationale underpinning:
   - the number of RBT tests conducted each year 5 4 3 2 1
   - where and how RBT is conducted 5 4 3 2 1

6. The current objective of one breath test per licensed driver per year is realistic: 5 4 3 2 1

7. The QPS communicates the following to operational members:
   - the objectives of RBT 5 4 3 2 1
   - policies and procedures related to the operation of RBT 5 4 3 2 1
   - the rationale for determining the number of tests expected 5 4 3 2 1

8. There are rostering systems in place at my station to ensure that RBT operations are adequately staffed: 5 4 3 2 1

9. The QPS has systems and processes in place to:
   - reliably record the number of tests conducted 5 4 3 2 1
   - measure the impact of RBT in reducing drink driving crashes 5 4 3 2 1
   - monitor the ratio of stationary to mobile RBT tests 5 4 3 2 1
   - provide feedback of the performance of RBT to regional managers (eg, tests performed, impact on road toll) 5 4 3 2 1
   - provide feedback on the success of RBT to operational members 5 4 3 2 1
   - measure the impact of RBT on reducing drink driving behaviour 5 4 3 2 1
guide the deployment of RBT operations

10. RBT is the responsibility of:
   general duties police
   traffic police

11. Operational members see:
   stationary RBT as part of core policing business
   mobile RBT as part of core policing business

12. When conducting RBT, it is likely that other members will:
   praise you for catching drink drivers
   praise you for helping to reach testing quotas

13. When conducting RBT, it is likely that your supervisors will:
   praise you for catching drink drivers
   praise you for helping to reach testing quotas

14. Conducting RBT provides opportunities to make extra money (eg shift penalties):

15. In my area, performance appraisals (PPA’s) take into account the amount of RBT you conduct:

16. In order to meet targets in our area, RBT operations are often set up during high volume traffic times:

17. The amount of RBT conducted in my area meets or exceeds targets on most occasions:

18. The number of RBT tests conducted in my area is accurately recorded:

19. In my experience, every driver intercepted by police is breath tested:

20. RBT operations in my area include targeted operations that focus on crime-related as well as traffic ‘hot spots’:

21. Multi-functional operations in my area involving other specialist groups such as CIB, JAB etc. always incorporate RBT:

22. At my station, members are expected to conduct a minimum amount of RBT during each roster cycle:

23. Despite rostering, some members manage to avoid RBT duties:

24. I find it difficult to conduct the amount of RBT required due to other policing duties:
25. I feel that I am adequately trained to conduct RBT:  
5 4 3 2 1

26. I am aware of the policies and procedures related to RBT:  
5 4 3 2 1

27. I support the overall goals of RBT as I understand them:  
5 4 3 2 1

28. I support the way that the RBT program is currently conducted:  
5 4 3 2 1

29. I would volunteer for RBT duties if the need arose:  
5 4 3 2 1

30. I/we (partner/team) tend to choose RBT locations where it is more likely that drink drivers will be caught, rather than try to vary the locations where we conduct tests:  
5 4 3 2 1

31. I/we (partner/team) conduct RBT in a highly visible way:  
5 4 3 2 1

32. I/we (partner/team) draw up site plans when we conduct RBT operations:  
5 4 3 2 1

33. I/we (partner/team) test every driver that we stop during RBT:  
5 4 3 2 1

34. I prefer to conduct RBT duties than other traffic duties:  
5 4 3 2 1

35. RBT has proven effective in reducing the road toll:  
5 4 3 2 1

36. The booze buses represent an effective way of conducting RBT:  
21 52 15 9 4

37. What method(s) of drink driving enforcement do you prefer and WHY?  
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

38. What kind of difficulties do you experience in implementing RBT?  
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

39. In your opinion, how could the operation of RBT be improved?  
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

Sex: □ Male □ Female Age: ________

Years of service: ________ Region ___________________

Rank (please circle): P/Const Const S/C Sgt Other_________________

Thank you for participating in this research. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.  
****Please feel free to make additional comments on the back page****
Appendix G:
Sample characteristics for Study Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Items</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/Const</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Constable</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sergeant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro North</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro South</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far North</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H:

Questionnaire Results – Percentages for agreement statements in Study Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The following groups currently play a major role in setting the number of RBT tests conducted each year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the QPS</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Transport</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other government agencies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politicians</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The following groups have a major role in determining the way in which RBT is conducted:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the QPS</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Transport</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other government agencies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politicians</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The overall goals of the Service’s RBT program are to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote safe and responsible road use in Qld</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase public safety</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduce drink driving crashes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catch drink driving offenders</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourage drink driving behaviour</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The main strategies QPS uses to achieve these goals are to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct RBT in a highly visible manner</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure that the majority of RBT operations are unpredictable in their timing and location</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure that RBT is unavoidable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure that the majority of tests are done by stationary operations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The QPS has a clear rationale underpinning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the number of RBT tests conducted each year</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where and how RBT is conducted</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The current objective of one breath test per licensed driver per year is realistic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The QPS communicates the following to operational members:
   - the objectives of RBT
     - policies and procedures related to the operation of RBT
   - the rationale for determining the number of tests expected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. There are rostering systems in place at my station to ensure that RBT operations are adequately staffed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The QPS has systems and processes in place to:
   - reliably record the number of tests conducted
   - measure the impact of RBT in reducing drink driving crashes
   - monitor the ratio of stationary to mobile RBT tests
   - provide feedback of the performance of RBT to regional managers (eg, tests performed, impact on road toll)
   - provide feedback on the success of RBT to operational members
   - measure the impact of RBT on reducing drink driving behaviour
   - guide the deployment of RBT operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. RBT is the responsibility of:
   - general duties police
   - traffic police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Operational members see:
   - stationary RBT as part of core policing business
   - mobile RBT as part of core policing business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. When conducting RBT, it is likely that other members will:
   - praise you for catching drink drivers
   - praise you for helping to reach testing quotas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. When conducting RBT, it is likely that your supervisors will:
   - praise you for catching drink drivers
   - praise you for helping to reach testing quotas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral or Unsure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Conducting RBT provides opportunities to make extra money (eg shift penalties):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In my area, performance appraisals (PPA’s) take into account the amount of RBT you conduct:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In order to meet targets in our area, RBT operations are often set up during high volume traffic times:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The amount of RBT conducted in my area meets or exceeds targets on most occasions:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The number of RBT tests conducted in my area is accurately recorded:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. In my experience, every driver intercepted by police is breath tested:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. RBT operations in my area include targeted operations that focus on crime-related as well as traffic ‘hot spots’:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Multi-functional operations in my area involving other specialist groups such as CIB, JAB etc. always incorporate RBT:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. At my station, members are expected to conduct a minimum amount of RBT during each roster cycle:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Despite rostering, some members manage to avoid RBT duties:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I find it difficult to conduct the amount of RBT required due to other policing duties:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel that I am adequately trained to conduct RBT:</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am aware of the policies and procedures related to RBT:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral or Unsure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I support the overall goals of RBT as I understand them:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I support the way that the RBT program is currently conducted:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I would volunteer for RBT duties if the need arose:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I/we (partner/team) tend to choose RBT locations where it is more likely that drink drivers will be caught, rather than try to vary the locations where we conduct tests:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I/we (partner/team) conduct RBT in a highly visible way:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I/we (partner/team) draw up site plans when we conduct RBT operations:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I/we (partner/team) test every driver that we stop during RBT:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I prefer to conduct RBT duties than other traffic duties:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. RBT has proven effective in reducing the road toll:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The booze buses represent an effective way of conducting RBT:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A:

Semi-structured interview information sheet used in Study One

You are invited to take part in a semi-structured interview examining current police policies and practices regarding Random Breath Testing (RBT). The interview is being conducted as part of a broader review of RBT being undertaken by QUT on behalf of the Queensland Police Service.

If you agree to take part in the interview, you will be asked a range of questions relating to the planning and management of RBT operations. The interview is voluntary and completely anonymous. Your confidentiality will be preserved, no identifying information will be made public and none of your answers will be passed onto the Police Service.

It is anticipated that the interview will take about 60 minutes. If you have any questions you can contact the Chief Investigator, Barry Watson, on the number provided above. You may also contact the Secretary of the QUT Research Human Ethics Committee by phoning 3864 2902, if you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of this research.

Thank you
Appendix B:
Examples of questions/issues discussed in semi-structured interviews
(Study One)

How long have you worked within the Queensland Police Service (QPS)?

Are you currently involved in the planning of RBT operations? (This question will allow for clarification of the level and complexity of planning)

Are you currently involved in the management of RBT operations?

What do you consider is the main purpose of Random Breath Testing?

What impact do you think that RBT has had upon levels of drink driving in the community?

Do you believe that RBT has proven effective in reducing drink driving crashes?

Are you aware of the current number of breath tests for the QPS/your area?

What do you think about the current testing levels?

Of all the forms of breath testing, (booze buses, mini buses, trailers, car-based stationary & mobile patrols) what methods do you prefer? Why?

In what ways do you think the operation of RBT in Queensland could be improved in relation to the following categories:

- RBT policy;
- Testing numbers;
- Operational logistics – where to set up, who to target etc?

What statistics should be used to guide the enforcement strategy of RBT?

What are the best times to enforce RBT?

How should effectiveness of RBT be measured at an operational level?

How can the effectiveness of car-based mobile/stationary operations be maximised?

What location/area are you responsible for enforcing?
Appendix C:
QPS managers’ suggestions for improvements to RBT operations reported in Study One

- Designated full-time traffic intelligence officer to analyse population growth, predicted growth, crime statistics etc.
- Use of unmarked cars to patrol licensed premises.
- Full line control to be granted to the RTCs to ensure attention to RBT and other traffic-related matters in each region.
- Change RBT name to Random Interception and conduct full vehicle and person check (e.g. breath test, licence test, warrant check, vehicle check). Use mass media to advertise this enforcement focus change to public.
- Enforce nightclubs and licensed premises.
- Make liquor industry more responsible for drink driving problem and aim to encourage community ownership of drink driving problem.
- New advertising campaigns to rejuvenate existing RBT.
- Measure success of enforcement via drink driving detection rate, taking into account the number of tests and number of alcohol-related crashes.
- Ensure optimal mixture of stationary and mobile operations – research to identify what this optimal balance should be.
- Every driver intercepted by police should be breath tested (this idea was not welcomed in some areas).
• Educate police about benefits of RBT.
• Overlay crime statistics with crash sites.
• Allocate one full shift for RBT per 28 day roster cycle.
• Improve rigour and quality of RBT.
• Use booze bus as hub and utilise smaller operations to work around.
• Use per capita instead of per licensed driver as way to calculate quotas.
• Conducting RBT at the “right time” in the “right way” (eg. extra presence during night shift).
• Regular feedback on the success of RBT on road toll.
• Increased targeted operations.
• Utilise last known place of drinking information in strategic way.
• Develop formula for how long it takes to do RBT check with a complete person and vehicle check and divide by 10 to work out quotas.
• Better use of intelligence and utilise local knowledge in strategic plans.
Appendix D:
Focus group protocol used in Study Two

1. Welcome and introductions.

2. General explanation of purpose of focus group, for example:

The purpose of our session today is to try and identify some issues that impact upon the operation of RBT to help us with the design of a questionnaire. Ultimately, you will be helping us get an idea of the type and nature of questions that should be asked about RBT. It is planned to distribute the questionnaire in the near future to operational members who conduct RBT duties. It is expected that the questionnaire will examine operational members’ attitudes toward RBT duties, their understanding of RBT, the level of training received, the way RBT is conducted, the resources devoted to RBT for example. It is hoped that members will also be able to comment about their views on the best way to tackle the drink driving problem. Ultimately, we are aiming to discover how RBT can be improved.

3. Description of length of time for session (1 hour) and any other general matters.

4. Begin session, use guiding questions (Q) or issues (I) listed below.

   Q: When I say RBT, what is the first thing that comes into your head?

   Q: Thinking about the last time you conducted RBT, what were some of the things that made it difficult?

   Q: How do you feel about the way RBT is done?

   Q: What would an ideal RBT operation look like?

   Q: What makes RBT enjoyable?

   I: Booze buses v mobile patrols v other methods?

   I: Drink driving problem – size, best way to deal with it, responsibility?

   I: Current testing levels.

   I: Feedback from operations – type, from whom, what feedback desired?
Q: What kind of incentives are there for doing RBT?

I: Equipment – availability, quality, reliability etc.

Q: How are RBT operations organised in your area? (discussion about geographical & logistical issues)

I: The role of intelligence in RBT operations.

Q: Why do RBT?

Q: What are the best times to conduct RBT?

Q: How do you measure the success of RBT?

It is expected that focus group will enable the researchers to identify issues of interest and concerns relevant to RBT. The session will also enable identification of specific language and cultural aspects unique to policing and possibly, RBT operation that may assist in the development of the Questionnaire.
Appendix E:
Questionnaire information/consent sheet used in Study Two


Information sheet

You are invited to take part in a survey examining current policies and practices relating to the operation of Random Breath Testing (RBT). The survey is being conducted as part of a broader review of RBT being undertaken by QUT on behalf of the Queensland Police Service, and your views are important to us.

Participation in the survey is voluntary and completely anonymous. Your confidentiality will be preserved and no identifying information will be accessible or made available to anyone other than members of the QUT research team.

It is anticipated that you will take about 15-20 minutes to complete the attached questionnaire. When you have done so, please seal it in the enclosed reply-paid envelope and place it in the mail. This will ensure that it is returned directly to the research team.

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact the Chief Investigator, Barry Watson, using the contact details provided below. You may also contact the Secretary of the QUT Research Human Ethics Committee (3864 2902) if you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of this research.

Thank you for taking the time to complete and return the attached questionnaire promptly.
Appendix F:
Questionnaire for operational members Study Two

Random Breath Testing Survey

Thank you for consenting to participate in this survey. We are interested in your perceptions toward RBT based on your knowledge and experience. Your completion of this questionnaire is entirely voluntary and anonymous. There are no right or wrong responses and your answers will be treated in the strictest confidence, so please reply as honestly as possible.

________________________________________________________________________________

How strongly do you agree with each of the following statements........
(Please circle one number for each of the listed items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The following groups currently play a major role in setting the number of RBT tests conducted each year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the QPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other government agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politicians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The following groups have a major role in determining the way in which RBT is conducted:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the QPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other government agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politicians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The overall goals of the Service’s RBT program are to:
   promote safe and responsible road use in Qld  
   increase public safety  
   reduce drink driving crashes  
   catch drink driving offenders  
   discourage drink driving behaviour

4. The main strategies QPS uses to achieve these goals are to:
   conduct RBT in a highly visible manner  
   ensure that the majority of RBT operations are unpredictable in their timing and location  
   ensure that RBT is unavoidable  
   ensure that the majority of tests are done by stationary operations

5. The QPS has a clear rationale underpinning:
   the number of RBT tests conducted each year  
   where and how RBT is conducted

6. The current objective of one breath test per licensed driver per year is realistic:

7. The QPS communicates the following to operational members:
   the objectives of RBT  
   policies and procedures related to the operation of RBT  
   the rationale for determining the number of tests expected

8. There are rostering systems in place at my station to ensure that RBT operations are adequately staffed:

9. The QPS has systems and processes in place to:
   reliably record the number of tests conducted  
   measure the impact of RBT in reducing drink driving crashes  
   monitor the ratio of stationary to mobile RBT tests  
   provide feedback of the performance of RBT to regional managers (eg, tests performed, impact on road toll)  
   provide feedback on the success of RBT to operational members  
   measure the impact of RBT on reducing drink driving behaviour  
   guide the deployment of RBT operations

10. RBT is the responsibility of:
    general duties police  
    traffic police
11. Operational members see:
- stationary RBT as part of core policing business 5 4 3 2 1
- mobile RBT as part of core policing business 5 4 3 2 1

12. When conducting RBT, it is likely that other members will:
- praise you for catching drink drivers 5 4 3 2 1
- praise you for helping to reach testing quotas 5 4 3 2 1

13. When conducting RBT, it is likely that your supervisors will:
- praise you for catching drink drivers 5 4 3 2 1
- praise you for helping to reach testing quotas 5 4 3 2 1

14. Conducting RBT provides opportunities to make extra money (e.g., shift penalties):
5 4 3 2 1

15. In my area, performance appraisals (PPA’s) take into account the amount of RBT you conduct:
5 4 3 2 1

16. In order to meet targets in our area, RBT operations are often set up during high traffic times:
5 4 3 2 1

17. The amount of RBT conducted in my area meets or exceeds targets on most occasions:
5 4 3 2 1

18. The number of RBT tests conducted in my area is accurately recorded:
5 4 3 2 1

19. In my experience, every driver intercepted by police is breath tested:
5 4 3 2 1

20. RBT operations in my area include targeted operations that focus on crime-related as well as traffic ‘hot spots’:
5 4 3 2 1

21. Multi-functional operations in my area involving other specialist groups such as CIB, JAB etc. always incorporate RBT:
5 4 3 2 1

22. At my station, members are expected to conduct a minimum amount of RBT during each roster cycle:
5 4 3 2 1

23. Despite rostering, some members manage to avoid RBT duties:
5 4 3 2 1

24. I find it difficult to conduct the amount of RBT required due to other policing duties:
5 4 3 2 1

25. I feel that I am adequately trained to conduct RBT:
5 4 3 2 1

26. I am aware of the policies and procedures related to RBT:
5 4 3 2 1

27. I support the overall goals of RBT as I understand them:
5 4 3 2 1
28. I support the way that the RBT program is currently conducted:  
   5  4  3  2  1

29. I would volunteer for RBT duties if the need arose:  
   5  4  3  2  1

30. I/we (partner/team) tend to choose RBT locations where it is more likely that drink drivers will be caught, rather than try to vary the locations where we conduct tests:  
   5  4  3  2  1

31. I/we (partner/team) conduct RBT in a highly visible way:  
   5  4  3  2  1

32. I/we (partner/team) draw up site plans when we conduct RBT operations:  
   5  4  3  2  1

33. I/we (partner/team test every driver that we stop during RBT:  
   5  4  3  2  1

34. I prefer to conduct RBT duties than other traffic duties:  
   5  4  3  2  1

35. RBT has proven effective in reducing the road toll:  
   5  4  3  2  1

36. The booze buses represent an effective way of conducting RBT:  
   21  52  15  9  4

37. What method(s) of drink driving enforcement do you prefer and WHY?  
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

38. What kind of difficulties do you experience in implementing RBT?  
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

39. In your opinion, how could the operation of RBT be improved?  
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

Sex: □ Male □ Female Age: ________

Years of service: ________ Region _______________________

Rank (please circle): P/Const Const S/C Sgt Other ___________________

Thank you for participating in this research. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

****Please feel free to make additional comments on the back page****
### Appendix G:
Sample characteristics for Study Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Items</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/Const</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Constable</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sergeant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro North</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro South</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far North</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H:

Questionnaire Results – Percentages for agreement statements in Study Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The following groups currently play a major role in setting the number of RBT tests conducted each year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the QPS</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Transport</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other government agencies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politicians</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The following groups have a major role in determining the way in which RBT is conducted:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the QPS</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Transport</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other government agencies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politicians</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The overall goals of the Service’s RBT program are to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote safe and responsible road use in Qld</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase public safety</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduce drink driving crashes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catch drink driving offenders</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourage drink driving behaviour</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The main strategies QPS uses to achieve these goals are to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct RBT in a highly visible manner</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure that the majority of RBT operations are unpredictable in their timing and location</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure that RBT is unavoidable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure that the majority of tests are done by stationary operations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The QPS has a clear rationale underpinning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the number of RBT tests conducted each year</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where and how RBT is conducted</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The current objective of one breath test per licensed driver per year is realistic:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The QPS communicates the following to operational members:  
   the objectives of RBT  
   policies and procedures related to the operation of RBT  
   the rationale for determining the number of tests expected  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. There are rostering systems in place at my station to ensure that RBT operations are adequately staffed:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The QPS has systems and processes in place to:  
   reliably record the number of tests conducted  
   measure the impact of RBT in reducing drink driving crashes  
   monitor the ratio of stationary to mobile RBT tests  
   provide feedback of the performance of RBT to regional managers (eg, tests performed, impact on road toll)  
   provide feedback on the success of RBT to operational members  
   measure the impact of RBT on reducing drink driving behaviour  
   guide the deployment of RBT operations  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. RBT is the responsibility of:  
   general duties police  
   traffic police  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Operational members see:  
   stationary RBT as part of core policing business  
   mobile RBT as part of core policing business  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. When conducting RBT, it is likely that other members will:  
   praise you for catching drink drivers  
   praise you for helping to reach testing quotas  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. When conducting RBT, it is likely that your supervisors will:  
   praise you for catching drink drivers  
   praise you for helping to reach testing quotas  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral or Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral or Unsure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Conducting RBT provides opportunities to make extra money (eg shift penalties):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>In my area, performance appraisals (PPA’s) take into account the amount of RBT you conduct:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>In order to meet targets in our area, RBT operations are often set up during high volume traffic times:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The amount of RBT conducted in my area meets or exceeds targets on most occasions:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The number of RBT tests conducted in my area is accurately recorded:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>In my experience, every driver intercepted by police is breath tested:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>RBT operations in my area include targeted operations that focus on crime-related as well as traffic ‘hot spots’:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Multi-functional operations in my area involving other specialist groups such as CIB, JAB etc. always incorporate RBT:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>At my station, members are expected to conduct a minimum amount of RBT during each roster cycle:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Despite rostering, some members manage to avoid RBT duties:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I find it difficult to conduct the amount of RBT required due to other policing duties:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I feel that I am adequately trained to conduct RBT:</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I am aware of the policies and procedures related to RBT:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral or Unsure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I support the overall goals of RBT as I understand them:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I support the way that the RBT program is currently conducted:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I would volunteer for RBT duties if the need arose:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I/we (partner/team) tend to choose RBT locations where it is more likely that drink drivers will be caught, rather than try to vary the locations where we conduct tests:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I/we (partner/team) conduct RBT in a highly visible way:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I/we (partner/team) draw up site plans when we conduct RBT operations:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I/we (partner/team) test every driver that we stop during RBT:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I prefer to conduct RBT duties than other traffic duties:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. RBT has proven effective in reducing the road toll:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The booze buses represent an effective way of conducting RBT:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>