

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND POLICE MISCONDUCT

SCOTT E. WOLFE

Arizona State University

ALEX R. PIQUERO

Florida State University

Although police misconduct has interested policing scholars for many years, extant research has been largely atheoretical and has ignored the role of organizational justice in understanding the behavior. This study uses survey data from a random sample of 483 police officers employed in the Philadelphia Police Department to explore the role of organizational justice in police misconduct. Results indicate that officers who view their agency as fair and just in managerial practices are less likely to adhere to the code of silence or believe that police corruption in pursuit of a noble cause is justified. Furthermore, perceptions of organizational justice are associated with lower levels of engagement in several forms of police misconduct. The results suggest that organizational justice is a promising framework to understand police misconduct and may help guide police administrators in the implementation of effective management strategies to reduce the incidence of the behavior.

Keywords: police misconduct; organizational justice; organizational theory; code of silence; police corruption

Police officers—as the gatekeepers of formal social control—are not only responsible for enforcing laws and protecting the public but also are entrusted to represent order and justice in society. Why, then, do some subset of officers with such a high level of social responsibility abuse their power, become corrupt, and engage in misconduct? Beginning with some of the classic police behavior studies (Reiss, 1971; Sherman, 1975), a large body of research has established numerous community-, individual-, and organizational-level correlates of police misconduct (Ivković, 2005; King, 2009). Although the literature has provided results that have helped guide policy, there are still large gaps in our understanding of police misconduct—one of which concerns the largely atheoretical nature of this line of work (Chappell & Piquero, 2004; Hickman, Piquero, Lawton, & Greene, 2001; Kane, 2002; Kane & White, 2009; Lawton, 2007; Pogarsky & Piquero, 2003).

Parallel to research on corporate crime (Simpson, Paternoster, & Piquero, 1998), the literature often neglects examinations of organizational theory despite the fact that it is difficult to separate individual officer misconduct from the organizational context in which it takes place. A number of organizational-level factors, such as recruitment, training, and agency policy, have emerged as significant predictors of officer misconduct (Ivković, 2005; Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993); however, this line of research has largely ignored the role of organizational

AUTHORS' NOTE: *This research was supported in part by a grant from the National Institute of Justice (98-IJ-CX-0066). Points of view are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice. An earlier version of this article was presented at the annual meeting of the Western Society of Criminology, Honolulu, Hawaii, February 4-6, 2010. The authors thank Kristy Holtfreter, Scott Decker, the anonymous reviewers, and the editor for their helpful suggestions on earlier drafts of this article. Please address all correspondence to Scott E. Wolfe, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Arizona State University, Phoenix, Arizona 85004; e-mail: sewolfe1@asu.edu.*

CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND BEHAVIOR, Vol. 38 No. 4, April 2011 332-353

DOI: 10.1177/0093854810397739

© 2011 International Association for Correctional and Forensic Psychology

injustice (e.g., perceived unfair policies and managerial practices) in perpetuating the behavior. Scholars have suggested that responsibility for officer misconduct ultimately resides at the organizational level (Ivković, 2005, 2009; King, 2009), but research has not investigated the organizational mechanisms that may contribute to police misconduct or attitudes favorable to such behavior. Research in organizational theory, however, has suggested that organizations perceived as unjust and unfair by their employees are more likely to experience employee deviance (Greenberg, 1993). Thus, organizational justice may offer a useful framework from which to build a theoretical understanding of individual-level police misconduct, given its focus on the social psychological relationship between organizations and human behavior (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Not only should perceptions of organizational injustice be associated with police misconduct, but it may also help explain other correlates of the behavior, such as the “code of silence” and “noble-cause corruption,” to be defined below.

Using survey data from a random sample of 483 officers from the Philadelphia Police Department, this study examines whether organizational justice explains adherence to the code of silence and noble-cause corruption beliefs and then assesses the effect of perceptions of organizational justice on several forms of police misconduct while controlling for code-of-silence attitudes and noble-cause beliefs. The study concludes with a discussion of how organizational justice can serve as a useful theoretical model for understanding police misconduct. In so doing, the study moves beyond blaming police agency administrators for individual officer deviance (Manning, 2009) and instead focuses on understanding the organizational mechanisms that may relate to police misconduct, which will allow administrators to improve agency operation and policy to assist in proactively reducing this deviance.

POLICE MISCONDUCT RESEARCH

Officer misconduct has been an oft-studied topic despite the fact that a consistent theoretical understanding of the phenomenon has remained elusive. The inability to test theories is not the fault of the scholarly community but rather the consequence of the lack of access to sufficient data and the ambiguity that is attached to the term *police misconduct* (Ivković, 2005; Kane, 2002; Kane & White, 2009), a term whose meaning has been frequently debated (Ivković, 2005; Kane & White, 2009; Sherman, 1978). For the purposes of this study, behavior considered to be misconduct refers to actions that resulted in the filing of a formal complaint, an internal affairs investigation, or departmental disciplinary charges against the officer (Chappell & Piquero, 2004; Greene, Piquero, Hickman, & Lawton, 2004; Hickman et al., 2001; Hickman, Piquero, & Greene, 2000; Hickman, Piquero, & Piquero, 2004).

Extant research has ascertained a great many explanatory variables related to police misconduct. For example, Ivković (2005) demonstrated that the predictors of misconduct can be classified as community, individual, or organizational characteristics. With respect to the community correlates, Kane (2002) used a social ecological approach to demonstrate that neighborhoods characterized by structural disadvantage and population mobility were more likely to experience police misconduct. Terrill and Reisig (2003) showed similar neighborhood characteristics to be associated with a greater likelihood of elevated officer use of force. The influence of neighborhood context on police misconduct seems to be a promising avenue for future research; however, relatively few data permit testing this hypothesis.

For this reason, research has mainly focused on the link between individual-level correlates, such as age (Greene et al., 2004; McElvain & Kposowa, 2004), gender (Greene et al., 2004; Grennan, 1987; Hickman et al., 2000; McElvain & Kposowa, 2004; Sherman, 1975), race (Greene et al., 2004; Hickman et al., 2004; Kane & White, 2009; Rojek & Decker, 2009), education (Kane & White, 2009; Truxillo, Bennett, & Collins, 1998), length of service (Hickman et al., 2004; McElvain & Kposowa, 2004; Micucci & Gomme, 2005), rank (Hickman et al., 2004), prior employment problems (Greene et al., 2004; Kane & White, 2009), and criminal history (Greene et al., 2004; Kane & White, 2009; Mollen Commission, 1994), with various forms of misconduct. Although many of these factors can be used to guide agency policy, the discussion of each has rarely been explained in a theoretically meaningful manner (see Kane & White, 2009, for an exception). Understanding the reasons behind the role of significant predictors of misconduct allows for more informed strategies to reduce the behavior. Absent theory, police administrators are left to blindly apply policies that target a “significant” correlate of misconduct with no idea *why* the variable has an impact or, perhaps more importantly, whether the variable even has a logical causal relationship with misconduct.

It has only been recently that researchers have started to study police misconduct with a rigorous theoretical lens. For example, control balance theory (Hickman et al., 2001), social disorganization theory (Kane, 2002; Terrill & Reisig, 2003), deterrence theory (Pogarsky & Piquero, 2003), and the racial threat hypothesis (Lawton, 2007) have been used to explain police misconduct. A recent analysis by Chappell and Piquero (2004) using social learning theory as a theoretical guide found that deviant peers had a significant effect on whether officers had citizen complaints filed against them. According to these scholars, officers’ susceptibility to organizational subcultures makes differential peer associations important, as they “may facilitate deviant behavior by transmitting the beliefs, values, definitions, and manners of expression that depart from acceptable behavior” (Chappell & Piquero, 2004, p. 93).

Two additional individual-level explanations of police misconduct, code-of-silence attitudes and noble-cause beliefs, also warrant attention. The code of silence has been discussed at length and has been shown to be present in agencies throughout the United States and internationally (Brereton & Ede, 1996; Chin & Wells, 1997; Knapp Commission, 1972; Micucci & Gomme, 2005; Mollen Commission, 1994; Rothwell & Baldwin, 2007a, 2007b; Skolnick, 2002, 2005). Research has shown that officers who adhere to the code of silence are less likely to report fellow officer excessive use of force or corruption (Knapp Commission, 1972; Micucci & Gomme, 2005; Mollen Commission, 1994; Skolnick, 2005) and more likely to commit perjury during a trial (Chin & Wells, 1997). Policing is characterized by a close-knit subculture because the “unique demands that are placed on police officers, such as the threat of danger as well as scrutiny by the public, generate a tightly woven environment conducive to the development of feelings of loyalty” (Skolnick, 2005, p. 302). The code of silence, therefore, develops into a subcultural attitude on how one must behave to be perceived as a “good” officer by peers. Although Skolnick (2005) contended that the code of silence and corruption are intertwined, he stated that the code “cannot, strictly speaking, be considered *the* cause of police corruption . . . partly because understanding [corruption] . . . is a complex causal undertaking” (p. 302). Thus, a goal of research should be to determine the factors that are associated with officer adherence to the code of silence and to better assess whether and to what extent adherence to the code of silence is related to actual involvement in police misconduct.

Along similar lines, noble-cause police corruption has also been an important concept in police deviance research (Caldero & Crank, 2004; Crank, Flaherty, & Giacomazzi, 2007). Although noble cause is normally discussed in negative terms (e.g., in connection with corruption), it is technically defined as “a moral commitment to make the world a safer place to live. . . . Put simply, it is getting bad guys off the street” (Caldero & Crank, 2004, p. 29). Klockars (1983) was one of the first to give attention to corruption of the noble cause with his discussion of the “Dirty Harry” problem. His discussion and subsequent research led to the definition of noble-cause corruption as “the achievement of a good greater than the harm caused by any illegal behavior of the police” (Crank et al., 2007, p. 105). The corruption of noble cause is, therefore, a utilitarian action (Crank et al., 2007) where officers feel justified in committing what would normally be conceived as misconduct to achieve the noble cause of public safety and justice. Similar to code-of-silence research, studies that examine whether beliefs supportive of corruption for a noble cause are associated with actual police misconduct and the determination of the factors associated with such beliefs are currently lacking.

The above-cited research indicates that several important individual-level correlates of police misconduct warrant further investigation. Specifically, research needs to determine the factors associated with code-of-silence attitudes and noble-cause corruption beliefs and the relationship these concepts have with police misconduct. In turn, these issues bring forward a third broad category of misconduct predictors. As Ivković (2005) highlighted, organizational factors, such as managerial ambivalence to misconduct, ambiguous policies about misconduct, and poor recruitment and training practices, are associated with officer deviance. However, little research has examined how the organizational behavior of a police agency can lead to and/or produce a context that fosters or permits misconduct. One potentially useful framework, organizational justice, may offer an opportunity to build our understanding of the behavior.

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

The study of fairness in organizations has a long history in social psychology. Two recent meta-analyses on the effects of justice in organizations showed that the various components of organizational justice have implications for how employees react when faced with different managing approaches (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Hg, 2001). Although some disagreement exists, scholars of organizational justice tend to agree that there are three main components to organizational justice—distributive, procedural, and interactional—that if followed by supervisors will be associated with positive outcomes for the given organization (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

Adam’s (1963) research on equity theory stressing the value of distributive justice was largely responsible for the study of justice within organizations. The concept of distributive justice concerns the perceived fairness of outcomes and, thus, has implications in the organizational context. Employees who perceive their superiors to distribute outcomes (e.g., pay and promotion decisions) fairly to all subordinates of equal status have been shown to increase both the quantity and quality of their work production (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). As Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001, p. 280) discussed, outcomes that are perceived by employees to be unfair will affect their emotions, cognitions, and ultimately, their behavior in negative ways.

Scholars shifted their attention from distributive to procedural justice as a result of the “inability of equity theory and other distributive justice models to completely explain and predict peoples’ reactions to perceived injustice” (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001, p. 279). Rather than focusing on the outcome, the procedural-justice perspective emphasizes the perceived fairness of the process by which the outcome was determined. Procedural-justice research took root with the work of Lind and Tyler (1988) that showed that the fairness of the process by which an outcome is reached is often more important than the distributional fairness of the outcome. Thus, even in the face of undesirable outcomes (e.g., pay reduction, disciplinary action), employees may remain committed to the organization if they perceive the process that allocated the outcome to be fair (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 2006). Supervisors of organizations can attain positive procedural-justice perceptions by interacting with subordinates in respectful, nonthreatening, and unbiased ways; clearly explaining the purpose and reasons for their actions; and allowing the subordinates to have a voice and express their opinions (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 2006; Tyler & Huo, 2002).

Around the same time that the procedural-justice perspective was gaining popularity, a third form of justice, interactional justice, drew attention (Bies & Moag, 1986). Similar to the previous concepts, interactional justice emphasizes the role of supervisor politeness, honesty, and respect during the interpersonal communication with and treatment of employees (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). When taken together, the concepts of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice form organizational justice (Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). Scholars tend to agree that adherence to all three concepts is essential for an organization to truly be perceived by its employees as just and fair. Thus, it is important for research that focuses on organizational justice to incorporate aspects of all three concepts. Research has revealed that organizational justice is related to increased work performance, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior, whereas organizational injustice is associated with counterproductive work behavior (Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). Employees who experience some form of injustice from the organization sometimes restore feelings of justice by reducing the quality or quantity of their production (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

ORGANIZATIONAL INJUSTICE AND EMPLOYEE DEVIANCE

Overall, research has consistently shown that organizations that are perceived as unjust by their employees produce situations conducive to employee deviance (Aquino et al., 1999; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Greenberg, 1990, 1993). As Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) observe,

To the extent employees perceive their organization to be unfair because it uses unfair procedures for resource allocations, employees will develop negative attitudes toward the organization (e.g., lower trust and commitment and greater anger). Negative attitudes and emotions lead to employees not having incentives to work in favor of the organization. Moreover, they might lead employees to act against the organization. (p. 288)

Early research in the area of organizational justice and workplace deviance demonstrated that perceptions of distributive injustice were associated with employee theft from

the organization (Greenberg, 1990, 1993). More recent research has incorporated all aspects of organizational justice and demonstrated that perceptions of injustice predicted retaliatory behavior toward the organization (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) and deviance directed at the organization and its employees (Aquino et al., 1999). It has been argued that “when employees are dissatisfied with fairness of procedures, they are more likely to violate organizational norms and commit acts of deviance” (Aquino et al., 1999, p. 1076).

ORGANIZATIONAL INJUSTICE AND POLICE MISCONDUCT

In the context of policing, organizational-injustice perceptions may be associated with retaliatory behavior toward the agency but may also yield perceptions of managerial illegitimacy (French & Raven, 1959; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 2006). Lack of legitimacy is likely to be related to disobedience of organizational rules and regulations (French & Raven, 1959; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 2006). Accordingly, police officers who perceive their organization to engage in unfair managing procedures, inequitable distribution of resources, or disrespectful interpersonal treatment may be more inclined to violate agency norms and regulations by committing acts of misconduct. And while procedural and distributive justice has been examined, most notably in the context of law obedience (Reisig, Bratton, & Gertz, 2007; Tyler, 2006; Tyler & Huo, 2002), satisfaction with the police (Reisig & Parks, 2000) and courts (Higgins, Wolfe, & Walters, 2009), and its relation to criminal activity (Fagan & Piquero, 2007; Piquero, Fagan, Mulvey, Steinberg, & Odgers, 2005), no research has explored the role of organizational justice in explaining police misconduct.

Some critics have argued that examining organizational correlates of police misconduct wrongly places blame on police supervisors when, in reality, individual officers must *choose* to engage in the behavior regardless of other circumstances (Manning, 2009). Although plausible, this criticism does not negate the fact that police officers and their behavior are enmeshed within the organization that employs them. One cannot separate individual officer behavior from the social context in which it takes place (Smith, 1986). More importantly, identifying the organizational correlates of misconduct does not relinquish responsibility from the officer but instead emphasizes ways in which agencies can improve their operation and policy to subvert situations that are conducive to individuals' choosing to engage in misconduct. Armacost (2003), for instance, argued that officers “are embedded in an organization that makes them more likely to frame their judgments in terms of role-based obligations and expectations than according to a simple cost-benefit analysis of their potential actions” and that placing blame for misconduct solely at the feet of individual officers (e.g., using the “rotten apple” explanation) is simply “a search for scapegoats” (p. 493).

Recent research has shown that organizational justice constructs are related to correctional officer job stress, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007; Taxman & Gordon, 2009). Perceptions of procedural and distributive justice by officers given undercover assignments were also shown to be related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work performance (Farmer, Beehr, & Love, 2003). Furthermore, investigations of complaints against officers that were perceived to be carried out in a procedurally fair manner were associated with officers' satisfaction with the process regardless of the outcome (De Angelis & Kupchik, 2007). Although research has separately examined organizational justice and employee deviance, there has yet to be a study that connects the two ideas in an attempt to explain police misconduct.

As such, research is needed to examine whether perceptions of organizational injustice are associated with this behavior. The interpersonal communications and relations that occur between police administrators and subordinate officers are complex social-psychological processes. Organizational justice is a theoretical construct that can be used to understand how officers view the fairness of their supervisors' managerial practices and policies and to determine whether these perceptions are related to individual officer misconduct. Not only may this offer a more theoretically informed understanding of the organizational mechanisms associated with misconduct, it could also help inform police administrators on ways to proactively combat the problem by demonstrating interpersonal managerial techniques that are likely to produce perceptions of organizational justice from subordinates.

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND CORRELATES OF POLICE MISCONDUCT

Organizational injustice should be related to misconduct, but it should also help explain other variables related to police deviance. Schein (1993, p. 361) has noted that "organizational cultures are created in part by leaders, and one of the most decisive functions of leadership is the creation, the management, and sometimes even the destruction of culture." Superiors who use fair and just managing techniques are perceived as legitimate authority figures whose cultural norms and rules should be followed (French & Raven, 1959; Schein, 1993). Conversely, police administrators who consistently violate organizational justice may legitimize deviant activity or delegitimize their authority to enforce rules and create situations conducive to adherence to the code of silence and noble-cause corruption beliefs.

Organizational culture is viewed as a mechanism of social control that can be used to manipulate subordinates into perceiving, thinking, and feeling in certain ways (Schein, 1993). Because of this fact, the consequences of illegitimate use of managerial power can be devastating to an organization. Tosi, Mero, and Rizzo (2000) argued that when legitimate use of power fails, individual goals become paramount to organizational goals. Ultimately, subordinates who perceive managerial practices as lacking organizational fairness are more likely to pursue individual interests (French & Raven, 1959; Tyler, 2006). This pursuit may manifest itself in one of two ways. For one, organizational injustice may lead some officers to engage in noble-cause corruption out of the belief that unfair organizational policies and managerial practices prevent the true pursuit of justice. Thus, engaging in "street justice" is seen as the only means to achieve public protection and justice (Caldero & Crank, 2004).¹ Second, and similarly, those who feel that their agency has unfair investigatory procedures of police misconduct may be more likely to adhere to the code of silence out of fear that regardless of the circumstances of a particular incident, an officer accused of misconduct will never receive a fair hearing. Rothwell and Baldwin (2007b) provided evidence supporting this assertion by showing that policies perceived as procedurally just were more likely to result in officer willingness to report misconduct. In short, organizational injustice is likely to result in the individual goals of code-of-silence attitudes and noble-cause corruption beliefs that override the organizational goals of honesty, public protection, and due process.

CURRENT STUDY

This study offers and applies the organizational-justice framework as a potentially useful explanatory mechanism for police misconduct. Specifically, the study examines two issues.

First, the role of organizational justice in explaining adherence to the code of silence and beliefs in noble-cause corruption is explored. It is expected that officers who perceive their organization to be more just and fair will have weaker adherence to the code of silence and be less likely to believe that corruption of the noble cause is justified. The second purpose is to assess whether perceptions of organizational justice relate to police misconduct. Officers perceiving their agency to engage in fair managing practices are expected to have engaged in less misconduct. To remove as many potential spurious relationships as possible, these hypotheses are tested while controlling for individual characteristics (i.e., officer age, gender, race-ethnicity, rank, years of service, and deviant peers) that research has shown to be associated with misconduct.

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

This study uses data originally collected by Greene and Piquero (2000) in a study of police integrity in Philadelphia funded by the National Institute of Justice. A simple random sample of 504 police officers was drawn from all 3,810 Philadelphia Police Department (PPD) officers of rank patrol officer, sergeant, or lieutenant as of January 2000 (see Chappell & Piquero, 2004; Greene et al., 2004; Hickman et al., 2000, 2001, 2004; Lawton, 2007). A total of 499 officer surveys were returned for a response rate of 99%. The high response rate is likely attributable to the fact that surveys were administered after the respondents' roll call and directly before going out on the street for duty. Therefore, all selected officers were easily contacted to participate. Similar response pattern imputation (SRPI) was used to replace missing values, which is available in PRELIS Version 2.30 (Scientific Software International, Chicago, IL). SRPI replaces missing values on a specific case with values from a "donor case" that has a similar response pattern across a set of matching variables. Gmel (2001) showed SRPI to be an effective and reliable procedure for imputing missing values. After imputation, complete information for 483 officer respondents was available for analysis.

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Three dependent variables were examined in this study, each capturing varying degrees of police misconduct that the officers were responsible for during their time with the PPD: how many times they had been (1) subject to a formal citizen complaint, (2) investigated by the department's internal affairs division (IAD), or (3) charged with a violation of the department's disciplinary code. These measures have been previously used to capture a wide range of officer misconduct (Chappell & Piquero, 2004; Greene et al., 2004; Hickman et al., 2000, 2001, 2004; Lawton, 2007). Officers with higher frequencies of each of these variables have engaged in more misconduct, as their actions have more readily come to the attention of the public or the PPD's IAD or have violated a formal departmental disciplinary code.² Officers' frequency of each measure of misconduct was coded trichotomously (i.e., zero times, one time, or two or more times). Although the three dependent variables may appear to be steps in a process that emerge from a single event, this does not necessarily have

to be the case, as these data contain the officers' history with respect to these specific outcomes during the course of their careers in the PPD. Accordingly, the analyses treat these variables as separate measures that represent simple counts and are not reflective of a single event that produced multiple outcomes.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Organizational justice. Six items were used to capture the three aspects of organizational justice (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactional), and all were measured on the same 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *agree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). Distributive justice was measured by asking officers their level of agreement with the following questions: "Disciplinary action is a result of pressure on supervisors from command staff to give out discipline," and "Getting special assignments in the police department depends on who [*sic*] you know, not on merit." Procedural justice was measured with two items: "When a police officer appears before the Police Board of Inquiry, the officer will probably be found guilty even when he/she has a good defense," and "The rules and regulations dealing with officer conduct are fair and sensible." Last, interactional justice was captured by asking officers two questions: "When you get to know the department from the inside, you begin to think that it is a wonder that it does one-half as well as it does," and "Police supervisors are very interested in their subordinates." The items are consistent with those used in previous organizational justice research (Aquino et al., 1999; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001).

All of the questions were coded so higher scores indicated higher perceptions of justice. Principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was used to examine the dimensionality of the six organizational justice items. PCA showed that the items were homogeneous as they loaded onto a single component ($\lambda = 2.272$, component loadings $> .500$). Accordingly, the items were combined into an additive scale referred to as Organizational Justice. This scale displayed adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = .666$, mean interitem $r = .250$) and did not depart from normality (skewness = $.037$, kurtosis = $-.041$).

Code-of-silence attitudes and noble-cause beliefs. To assess the role of the code of silence in police misconduct and to determine the factors associated with higher beliefs in "the code," three questions were asked in the survey. Officers were asked to respond on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *agree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) to the following questions: "Unless it is an extremely serious matter, officers should protect each other when misconduct is alleged"; "Professional courtesy (excusing a fellow officer for minor violations of the law) is generally OK"; and "Most officers would take action if they knew of misconduct, even if it was a friend" (reverse coded).

To measure noble-cause beliefs, the officers were asked to respond to eight questions on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *agree*, 5 = *strongly agree*): "Sometimes, an officer has to use methods prohibited by directives to enforce the law or make an arrest"; "An officer cannot be consistently productive unless he/she bends or breaks the rules from time to time"; "Sometimes officers use methods prohibited by directives to achieve arrest of a criminal, if it's the only way that it can be done"; "It is sometimes necessary to be verbally disrespectful or abusive to a person because that is the only way they will understand or comply"; "Most supervisors agree that rules must

be broken or bent to get the job done, but wouldn't admit it"; "Sometimes officers have to exaggerate probable cause to get a crook off the street"; "An officer occasionally has to bend the facts a little in court or in a report in order to get a criminal convicted"; and "Some people should get street justice after hurting a police officer because that is the only real punishment they will get."

All of the code-of-silence and noble-cause items were analyzed using PCA with varimax rotation to determine whether two distinct constructs are observable or whether they simply represent an overall factor of ethics. Consistent with expectations, the items loaded onto their hypothesized constructs. The code-of-silence attitude items ($\lambda = 1.07$, component loadings $> .620$) and the noble-cause belief items ($\lambda = 4.488$, component loadings $> .510$) were combined into additive scales, both of which demonstrated reasonable to strong internal consistency ($\alpha = .547$, mean interitem $r = .284$; $\alpha = .845$, mean interitem $r = .408$, respectively).

Control variables. To isolate the direct effect of our key independent variables on the misconduct measures, several potential intervening variables were controlled for in the analysis. As several demographic variables have been shown to be relevant correlates of police misconduct, the analyses control for officer age, gender (1 = male, 0 = female), race-ethnicity (1 = racial-ethnic minority, 0 = White), rank (1 = patrol officer, 0 = supervisor), and years of service.³

Additionally, we controlled for deviant police officer peer associations. As Chappell and Piquero (2004) showed, association with officer peers who adhere to deviant norms and beliefs regarding police misconduct increases a respondent officer's chances of engaging in his or her own deviance. Specifically, a set of six hypothetical vignettes (Klockars, Ivković, Harver, & Haberfield, 2000) was used in the survey to measure officers' perceptions of deviant peer associations within the PPD (see appendix). This procedure is commonly used and is believed to be an appropriate method for measuring differential association (Akers, 2009; Chappell & Piquero, 2004; Holtfreter, Reisig, Piquero, & Piquero, 2010; Piquero & Bouffard, 2007). Two of the vignettes involved an officer accepting free meals and gifts, one involved an officer not reporting a fellow officer for drunk driving (i.e., professional courtesy), one involved street justice of a fleeing suspect, and two involved officer theft. After reading each of the vignettes, the officers were asked to respond on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not at all serious*, 5 = *very serious*) to the following question: "How serious do most police officers in the Philadelphia Police Department consider this behavior to be?" The dimensionality of the items was assessed using PCA with varimax rotation. The six questions were first reverse coded so higher scores indicated peer associations favorable to misconduct. PCA demonstrated two distinct differential association components. The first included the free gifts or meals, street justice, and drunk driving vignette questions ($\lambda = 2.541$, component loadings $> .550$). These items were combined into an additive scale labeled Minor Deviant Peers (i.e., differential peer associations favorable to lesser forms of police misconduct) ($\alpha = .721$, mean interitem $r = .392$). The second component included the two theft vignette questions ($\lambda = 1.352$, component loadings $> .830$) and was labeled Serious Deviant Peers (i.e., differential peer associations favorable to serious forms of police misconduct; $r = .576$, $p < .01$). Higher scores on each of the scales indicated peer associations favorable to police misconduct. Controlling for the above variables allows one to be confident that the effect of organizational justice, code-of-silence

TABLE 1: Sample Descriptive Statistics (N = 483)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min-Max</i>
Dependent variables			
Citizen complaints	0.665	0.815	0.00-2.00
IAD Investigations	0.511	0.766	0.00-2.00
Disciplinary charges	0.267	0.537	0.00-2.00
Independent variables			
Organizational justice	17.008	3.959	6.00-30.00
Minor deviant peers	12.813	3.732	4.00-20.00
Serious deviant peers	2.885	1.407	2.00-10.00
Code of silence	8.085	2.155	3.00-14.00
Noble cause	19.113	5.681	8.00-36.00
Control variables			
Age	34.900	8.080	20.00-61.00
Male	69%	—	0-1
Racial-ethnic minority	54%	—	0-1
Patrol officer	90%	—	0-1
Years of service	7.838	6.987	0.50-37.50

Note. IAD = internal affairs division.

attitudes, and noble-cause beliefs on the misconduct outcomes is unbiased and not simply a spurious result of officer demographics, rank, years of service, or the influence of associating with deviant peers. Summary statistics for all variables are presented in Table 1.

ANALYSIS

The analysis proceeded in two steps. First, the relationships between organizational justice, code-of-silence attitudes, and noble-cause beliefs were analyzed. Two ordinary least squares (OLS) regression equations were used to regress (a) code-of-silence attitudes and (b) noble-cause beliefs on organizational justice and the control variables. These analyses were designed to shed light on the organizational factors linked to adherence to the code of silence and belief in corruption of the noble cause, controlling for the potential confounding influence of officer demographic characteristics, rank, years of service, or deviant peers. The second step examined the relationship between organizational justice, code-of-silence attitudes, noble-cause beliefs, and the control variables and the outcome measures of police misconduct. Given the coding scheme of the dependent variables (i.e., zero times, one time, and two or more times), multinomial logistic regression was used to compare each of the response categories to one another, with the category *two or more times* serving as the reference category for all analyses.⁴ Separate multinomial logistic regressions were analyzed for each of the three outcome measures.⁵

RESULTS

PREDICTING CODE-OF-SILENCE ATTITUDES AND NOBLE-CAUSE CORRUPTION BELIEFS

Table 2 presents the two OLS regressions that predict code-of-silence attitudes and noble-cause beliefs. The first column displays regression results that account for more than

TABLE 2: Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Code of Silence and Noble Cause

Variable	Code-of-Silence Attitudes				Noble-Cause Beliefs			
	b	B	t ratio	(SE)	b	B	t ratio	(SE)
Organizational justice	-.065	-.120	-2.693**	(.024)	-.287	-.198	-4.685**	(.061)
Minor deviant peers	.168	.293	6.226**	(.027)	.551	.360	8.091**	(.068)
Serious deviant peers	.097	.064	1.457	(.067)	.247	.061	1.454	(.170)
Age	-.026	-.098	-1.628	(.016)	-.026	-.036	-0.633	(.040)
Male	.254	.055	1.242	(.204)	.343	.028	0.662	(.518)
Racial/ethnic minority	-.390	-.091	-2.039*	(.191)	-.832	-.073	-1.719	(.484)
Rank	.364	.050	1.057	(.345)	.479	.024	0.549	(.874)
Years of service	-.001	-.003	-0.004	(.020)	.048	.058	0.932	(.051)
F test			12.395**				20.589**	
R ²			.173				.258	

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

17% of the variation in code-of-silence attitudes. Association with peers who favor minor forms of police misconduct is associated with significant increases in code-of-silence attitudes ($b = .168, p < .01$). For every standard deviation increase in minor deviant peers, one would expect a .293 standard deviation increase in attitudes favorable to the code of silence. Association with peers who favor serious misconduct did not significantly influence attitudes about the code of silence. Importantly, organizational justice significantly predicted code-of-silence attitudes ($b = -.065, p < .01$), such that a standard deviation increase in perceived organizational justice corresponded with a .120 standard deviation decrease in code-of-silence attitudes. Racial- or ethnic-minority officers had weaker adherence to the code of silence than Whites ($b = -.390, p < .05$). In all, it seems that associating with peers who favor minor forms of police misconduct may increase individuals' adherence to the code of silence, whereas increased perceptions of organizational justice are linked with weaker adherence to the code of silence.

The second model in Table 2 examines beliefs in noble-cause corruption. The model accounted for 26% of the variation in noble-cause beliefs. Organizational justice ($b = -.287, p < .01$) and minor deviant peers ($b = .551, p < .01$) significantly predicted beliefs in noble-cause corruption. Specifically, with every standard deviation increase in minor deviant peers, one would expect a .360 standard deviation increase in noble-cause beliefs, and a 1 standard deviation increase in organizational justice corresponded with a .198 standard deviation decrease in noble-cause beliefs. Officers who perceived more of their peers to favor minor forms of police misconduct held stronger beliefs in noble-cause corruption, whereas those who viewed the agency as engaging in fair managing practices held fewer beliefs favorable to noble-cause corruption.

CITIZEN COMPLAINTS

The first model in Table 3 presents the multinomial logistic regression predicting the frequency of citizen complaints against the respondent officers. The two columns contrast the likelihood of having zero versus two or more complaints and one versus two or more complaints. Deviant peers, code-of-silence attitudes, and noble-cause beliefs failed to significantly

predict citizen complaints. However, for every 1-year increase in age, officers were approximately 6% more likely to have zero versus two or more complaints (odds ratio = 1.058, $p < .05$), whereas for every 1-year increase in years of service, officers were approximately 13% less likely to have zero complaints compared to two or more (odds ratio = 0.876, $p < .01$). Accordingly, older officers were less likely to have complaints filed against them, but more years on the job placed officers at greater risk to have complaints filed against them. Interestingly, these effects were not significant in the one- versus two-or-more-complaint contrast, but racial-ethnic-minority officers were approximately 93% more likely to have only one versus two or more complaints filed against them compared to their White colleagues (odds ratio = 1.925, $p < .05$). Most importantly, with all other variables held constant, organizational justice had a significant effect on the likelihood of being in the lower-frequency-of-complaints groups. Specifically, every unit increase in organizational justice was associated with an 18% greater likelihood of having zero citizen complaints versus two or more (odds ratio = 1.182, $p < .01$) and a 12% greater likelihood of having only one complaint versus two or more (odds ratio = 1.123, $p < .01$). These are rather large effects, given that the Organizational Justice scale has a range of 24. Officers who perceived the PPD to be just and fair were less likely to have citizen complaints filed against them.

IAD INVESTIGATIONS

The second model in Table 3 presents the results of the multinomial logistic regression predicting frequency of IAD investigations that have been conducted against the officer. Once again, deviant peer associations do not seem to play a role in predicting police misconduct in the presence of the other variables. Age and years of service had a significant effect on both contrasts. One-year increases in age were associated with a 6% greater likelihood of having zero versus two or more IAD investigations (odds ratio = 1.063, $p < .05$) and a 12% greater likelihood of having been investigated only once versus two or more times (odds ratio = 1.120, $p < .01$). Conversely, 1-year increases in years of service was associated with officers being 11% less likely to have zero versus two or more and one versus two or more complaints (odds ratio = 0.893, $p < .01$; odds ratio = 0.892, $p < .01$, respectively). Organizational justice significantly predicted whether an officer would have zero investigations against him or her versus two or more (odds ratio = 1.137, $p < .01$). Accordingly, a one-unit increase in perceived organizational justice corresponded to a 14% greater likelihood of having zero IAD investigations against the officer compared to having two or more. Interestingly, officers who more strongly adhere to the code of silence are more likely to have fewer IAD investigation against them. That is, one-unit increases in code-of-silence attitudes provided officers with a 23% greater likelihood of having only one investigation versus two or more (odds ratio = 1.230, $p < .05$). This relationship, which will be discussed in more detail later, suggests that the code of silence shields officers from IAD investigations.

DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY CHARGES

The final model in Table 3 predicts the frequency of disciplinary charges filed against the officer. Organizational justice had a significant effect on disciplinary charges across the two

contrasts. One-unit increases in organizational justice resulted in a 25% greater likelihood of having zero charges filed against an officer versus having two or more (odds ratio = 1.245, $p < .01$) and an 18% greater likelihood of having only one charge versus two or more (odds ratio = 1.179, $p < .05$). Thus, officers are less likely to have departmental charges filed against them if they perceive organizational justice in the department. None of the other variables had a significant effect on frequency of disciplinary charges.

DISCUSSION

Police misconduct is a topic of great interest to police administrators who are responsible for enacting policies and strategies to control the behavior. Numerous studies have been conducted on the subject, and several commissions have famously investigated allegations of corruption and misconduct within police agencies (e.g., Knapp Commission, 1972; Mollen Commission, 1994). Although many variables have been found to be associated with police misconduct, ultimate responsibility for such behavior is often levied against the police agency (Ivković, 2005). Still, a theoretical explanation of the organizational mechanisms that are associated with the incidence of individual officer misconduct has remained elusive. The current study addressed this gap in the literature by examining the role of organizational justice in predicting police misconduct. The application of this organizational theory to police misconduct in a large police department provided four theoretical and policy-relevant implications that should be considered by future researchers and police administrators.

The first, and perhaps most important, finding was that organizational justice was associated with several forms of police misconduct. Officers who viewed the PPD as distributing decisions fairly, engaging in procedurally just managerial actions, and interacting in a polite and courteous manner toward subordinates were more likely to have been involved in few incidents of police misconduct. Specifically, perceptions of organizational justice were associated with lower likelihoods of officers having citizen complaints filed, IAD investigations instigated, or disciplinary charges brought against them. As this is the first empirical linkage between officers' perceptions of organizational justice and their misconduct, this finding suggests that from a policy perspective, agencies that engage in organizational justice may reduce the chances of their officers engaging in these forms of misconduct. Police supervisors need to pay particular attention to developing agency policies that are procedurally fair, communicating with subordinate officers about specific policies and why they are in place, and allowing officers to voice concerns about such policies. This suggestion applies to policies concerning departmental rules, disciplinary processes, hiring and firing practices, and promotional procedures, to name a few. In sum, police administrators can learn much from the principles of organizational justice when designing policies, which in turn will make police agencies more successful organizations.

At the same time, however, an alternative relationship between organizational justice and police misconduct is possible. Although our focus was on how perceptions of organizational injustice increase the likelihood that officers will engage in misconduct, it is possible that

officers who have been the subject of (especially erroneous) complaints, investigations, or discipline are more likely to react with feelings of unfairness (i.e., within the context of general strain theory), which may generate feelings that the organization is unjust. Agnew (1992) argued that feelings of injustice may morph into anger and ultimately produce deviance. Thus, future research is needed to determine not only whether experiencing negative outcomes from a department produces perceptions of injustice but also whether, in turn, these emotions increase officers' chances of resorting to misconduct or deviance as a way to cope with the experienced strain. Given the cross-sectional nature of our data, we cannot speak to these relationships, but future scholars are poised to answer such questions when appropriate data become available.

Second, organizational justice and deviant peers (favoring less serious forms of police misconduct) significantly predicted code-of-silence attitudes and noble-cause corruption beliefs. Not only are deviant peer associations important in predicting police misconduct (Chappell & Piquero, 2004), it seems that they may also be an important precursor to adherence to the code of silence and belief that noble-cause corruption is justified. These findings suggest that officers who associate with deviant peers are more likely to subscribe to the police subcultural belief that an officer should protect his or her colleagues regardless of allegations of misconduct. Furthermore, association with deviant officer peers places officers at increased risk to believe that violating suspect constitutional rights is required if one is to achieve justice and protect the public from harm. Conversely, officers adhere to the code of silence less strictly and have fewer beliefs that justify noble-cause corruption if they view their agency to behave in organizationally just ways. That is, as officers' perceptions of organizational justice increase, their level of attitudes favorable to the code of silence and noble-cause corruption is likely to decrease. From a policy perspective, police administrators who make an honest effort to ensure that departmental discipline is disseminated in a fair manner (i.e., not arbitrarily or as a result of external pressure), disciplinary proceedings are procedurally fair (i.e., represent fair rules and regulations), promotions are distributed on the basis of legitimate factors (i.e., not simply on "who you know"), and communication between subordinates is polite and sincere are likely to have lower levels of adherence to the code of silence within their departments and fewer officers under their control who feel that noble-cause corruption is necessary in the pursuit of justice. Once again, future research should attempt to further examine the causal structure underlying this relationship, as our cross-sectional data are unable to establish perfect time-order of the independent and dependent variables.

Third, aside from organizational justice, several other variables were associated with police misconduct. Increases in officer age were shown to correspond with lower frequencies of citizen complaints and IAD investigations. This finding may be attributable to several factors. First, it may be that supervisors view an officer as more trustworthy with every year he or she ages and is not investigated by IAD. This increased trust may result in less IAD suspicion. Alternatively, citizens may be more likely to complain against younger officers. However, it seems most logical that older officers would engage in less misconduct because they occupy different positions in the department or possess more stakes in conformity (e.g., promotion potential, pension) that could be jeopardized by deviant involvement. If this is the case, it is interesting to note that quite paradoxically increases in years of service were related to citizen complaints and IAD investigations in

the opposite direction. That is, the longer an officer served on the department, the more likely he or she was to have more citizen complaints and IAD investigations filed against him or her.

In analyses not shown, we attempted to explain this peculiar finding by conducting several ancillary investigations of the issue. For example, although varying slightly in magnitude, both age and years of service were positively correlated with the dependent variables. We also examined cross-tabulations and scatter plots of age and years of service on each of the dependent variables to determine whether several officers were driving the effects. The results of both analyses suggested that there were no influential cases. Last, we reestimated the models while excluding age and years of service. Importantly, the effect of the key independent variables on the misconduct measures remained substantively unchanged. Potentially, although aging may protect officers from misconduct through a bonding mechanism, more years on duty may inevitably place an officer at greater risk to have a complaint or IAD investigation against him or her. This finding raises several interesting questions that await further data collection and analysis.

Despite theoretical expectations, noble-cause corruption beliefs were not significantly related to any forms of misconduct, and code-of-silence attitudes were related only with IAD investigations. However, the direction of this relationship was somewhat counterintuitive at first inspection. Results showed that officers who had stronger attitudes favorable to the code of silence were more likely to have only one IAD investigation against them versus two or more. It seems that stronger adherence to the code of silence protects officers who have been investigated by IAD once from being subject to a second investigation. This result is interesting because it presents a compelling policy issue. A number of questions are yet to be answered. For example, are officers who are strong adherents to the code of silence so quiet about their own and others' behavior that IAD investigations are difficult to conduct? Are these officers more apt at avoiding detection? Do officers who were investigated once feel that it is necessary to subscribe more strongly to the code of silence to avoid future investigations? Or is the actual IAD investigation process flawed in that it gives officers the perception of organizational injustice and, in turn, produces more attitudes favorable to the code? These questions notwithstanding, the results show that police departments that manage and supervise officers in ways consistent with organizational justice may have weaker adherence to the code of silence and fewer officers engaging in misconduct that necessitates IAD investigations.

Last, the organizational-justice framework has offered a theoretically useful explanation of the interpersonal organizational-justice (distributive, procedural, interactional) mechanisms and potential correlates associated with police misconduct. That is to say, police agencies that adhere to these constructs are using the mechanisms that are associated with less officer misconduct, and they may create organizational environments that control against the proliferation of behavior guided by the code of silence and beliefs that justify the use of noble-cause corruption. The organizational-justice theoretical model has moved the study of police misconduct forward by demonstrating the organizational behavioral mechanisms that are associated with such behavior. Thus, scholars can move beyond attributing police misconduct to police agencies and instead offer suggestions to administrators on how they can behave toward subordinates in ways that are likely to

reduce misconduct. Although data agreement restrictions precluded a cross-check analysis of officer self-reported misconduct and official departmental misconduct records, some research has reported a moderate correspondence between self-report and official police discipline data (Hickman, 2007). Still, future research should examine this issue in greater detail so as to afford an investigation into whether officers who have a greater link to the agency and express a sense of organizational justice are more likely to answer in a socially desirable way (i.e., not report their misconduct when, in fact, they have committed deviance).

The results of this study provide five broad actions that police administrators can take to reduce individual officer misconduct: (a) Fairly allocate promotions and special assignments and ensure that officers understand why such decisions are made; (b) fairly distribute disciplinary actions and clearly explain the reasons for such actions; (c) engage in investigations of officers that are procedurally fair and ensure that officers perceive the procedures as such; (d) ensure that agency policies, rules, and regulations allow the goals of justice to be accomplished while simultaneously being fair and sensible to individual officers; and (e) honestly show subordinate officers that the agency cares for their well-being and that their opinions are taken seriously.

In this regard, Acker (1992) discussed how organizational efforts to gender-norm the work environment can backfire on managers, as employees sometimes develop feelings of unfairness. Thus, simple organizational policies, such as gender-neutral physical fitness standards, in police departments may result in subordinate perceptions that managers engage in illegitimate hiring practices. It is imperative for police managers to realize such nuances in the development of justice perceptions, especially because their reach may extend beyond reducing misconduct. Officers who perceived the department to be organizationally just were likely to have fewer citizen complaints filed against them. Therefore, police agencies that implement managerial practices shaped by organizational justice are not only likely to reduce officer misconduct, but they may also enhance implementation of community policing initiatives.

In the end, organizational justice offers an important theoretical perspective of police misconduct, yet further analysis is required. Specifically, research is needed to better understand the relationship that appears to exist between organizational justice, deviant peer associations, the code of silence, and noble-cause corruption beliefs. Although it is plausible to assume that organizational factors contribute to the proliferation of the code of silence and noble-cause beliefs, it may also be that such variables have reciprocal relationships with organizational justice. For example, officers who are punished for violating agency policy may be more likely in the future to adhere to the code of silence, which may in turn influence their perceptions of agency organizational justice. Such questions cannot be adequately addressed until longitudinal data are collected that assess changes in officers' perceptions, peer associations, attitudes, and beliefs over time. Future study should investigate whether our findings generalize to other agencies. Because this study focused on one large, eastern, inner-city police department, the results may not generalize to smaller, rural, or western agencies. For now, however, it seems that organizational justice holds promise in the pursuit of explaining police officer misconduct and should be considered as part of criminologists' understanding of this behavior.

APPENDIX

Police Misconduct Vignettes Used to Measure Deviant Peer Associations

1. A police officer routinely accepts free meals, cigarettes, and other items of small value from merchants on his beat. The officer does not solicit these gifts and is careful not to abuse the generosity of those who gave the gifts to him.
2. A police officer is widely liked in the community, and on holidays, local merchants and restaurant and bar owners show their appreciation for the officer's attention by giving the officer gifts of food and liquor.
3. At 2 a.m., a police officer who is on duty is driving his patrol car on a deserted road. The officer sees a vehicle that has been driven off the road and is stuck in a ditch. The officer approaches the vehicle and observes that the driver is not hurt but is obviously intoxicated. The officer also finds that the driver is a police officer. Instead of reporting this accident and offense, the officer transports the driver to his home.
4. A police officer on foot patrol surprises a man who is attempting to break into an automobile. The man flees. The officer chases him for about two blocks before apprehending him by tackling him and wrestling him to the ground. After the offender is under control, the officer punches him a couple of times in the stomach as punishment for fleeing.
5. A police officer discovers a burglary of a jewelry shop. The display cases are smashed and it is obvious that many items have been taken. While searching the shop, the officer takes a watch, worth about two days' pay for that officer. The officer reports the watch had been stolen during the burglary.
6. While on duty, a police officer finds a wallet in a parking lot. It contains the amount of money equivalent to a full day's pay for that officer. The officer reports the wallet as lost property but keeps the money.

Note. To measure deviant peer associations, the officers were asked the following question after reading each vignette: "How serious do most police officers in the Philadelphia Police Department consider this behavior to be?"

NOTES

1. Although pursuing the utilitarian motive of public safety (i.e., the noble cause) may not seem to be acting in self-interest at first, it is the fixation on the noble cause that propels officers to accomplish the goal despite having to violate laws and departmental regulations (i.e., individual interests taking supremacy over the dual departmental goals of public safety and protection of individual rights). As a reviewer astutely observed, the experience of organizational injustice may also weaken an officer's ties to his or her department, thereby opening the door for the officer to align with influential social pressures (e.g., peers) that also see the department's policies as a hindrance to the pursuit of the noble cause and, in turn, lead to noble cause corruption beliefs.

2. The data do not distinguish between complaints or investigations that resulted from officer conduct while on or off duty. Importantly, however, all complaints, investigations, and disciplinary charges were handled within the police agency. Thus, all three dependent variables represent acts that are deemed unacceptable by the public or the agency itself.

3. The supervisor category included corporals, sergeants, detectives, and lieutenants. Because of the low frequency of each of these groups, they were collapsed into a single supervisor category.

4. This category was chosen as the reference as additional analyses revealed no substantively relevant differences between those officers who had committed zero versus one of each of the misconduct measures. Thus, the most meaningful differences of each misconduct measure were observed between those with zero or one event and those who had engaged in two or more acts of misconduct. This fact highlights the importance of using multinomial logistic regression as opposed to collapsing the one and two-or-more response groups into a single category to allow the use of binary logistic regression.

5. Multicollinearity is not a concern in these data because principal component analysis showed the code-of-silence and noble-cause items to load on their respective components, all of the variance inflation factors were below 3, and condition indices fell below 30 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1992). Gendering organizational theory. In J. M. Shafritz, J. S. Ott, & Y. S. Jang (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (pp. 450-459). Florence, KY: Wadsworth.
- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *67*, 422-436.
- Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology*, *30*, 47-87.

- Akers, R. L. (2009). *Social learning and social structure: A general theory of crime and deviance*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 1073-1091.
- Armacost, B. E. (2003). Organizational culture and police misconduct. *George Washington Law Review, 72*, 453-545.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Brereton, D., & Ede, A. (1996). The police code of silence in Queensland: The impact of the Fitzgerald Inquiry Reform. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice, 8*, 107-129.
- Caldero, M. A., & Crank, J. P. (2004). *Police ethics: The corruption of noble cause*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Chappell, A. T., & Piquero, A. R. (2004). Applying social learning theory to police misconduct. *Deviant Behavior, 25*, 85-108.
- Chin, G. J., & Wells, S. C. (1997). The "blue wall of silence" as evidence of bias and motive to lie: A new approach to police perjury. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review, 59*, 233-258.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Mueller, J. S. (2007). Does perceived unfairness exacerbate or mitigate interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors related to envy? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 666-680.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*, 278-321.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. & Hg, K. Y. (2001). Justice in the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 425-445.
- Crank, J., Flaherty, D., & Giacomazzi, A. (2007). The noble cause: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 35*, 103-116.
- De Angelis, J., & Kupchik, A. (2007). Citizen oversight, procedural justice, and officer perceptions of the complaint investigation process. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 30*, 651-671.
- Fagan, J., & Piquero, A. R. (2007). Rational choice and developmental influences on recidivism among adolescent felony offenders. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies, 4*, 715-748.
- Farmer, S. J., Beehr, T. A., & Love, K. G. (2003). Becoming an undercover police officer: A not on fairness perceptions, behavior, and attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 373-387.
- French J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.
- Gmel, G. (2001). Imputation of missing values in the case of multiple item instrument measuring alcohol consumption. *Statistics in Medicine, 20*, 2369-2381.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 561-568.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 54*, 81-103.
- Greene, J. R., & Piquero, A. R. (2000). *Supporting police integrity in Philadelphia [Pennsylvania] Police Department, 1991-1998 and 2000* [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Boston, MA: Northeastern University (producer), 2002. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (distributor), 2004. doi:10.3886/ICPSR03977
- Greene, J. R., Piquero, A. R., Hickman, M. J., & Lawton, B. A. (2004). *Police integrity and accountability in Philadelphia: Predicting and assessing police misconduct*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Grennan, S. A. (1987). Findings on the role of officer gender in violent encounters with citizens. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 15*, 78-85.
- Hickman, M. J. (2007). Validity of officer self-reported citizen complaints: A research note. *Police Quarterly, 10*, 332-341.
- Hickman, M. J., Piquero, A. R. & Greene, J. R. (2000). Discretion and gender disproportionality in police disciplinary systems. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 23*, 105-116.
- Hickman, M. J., Piquero, A. R., Lawton, B. A., & Greene, J. R. (2001). Applying Tittle's control balance theory to police deviance. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 24*, 497-519.
- Hickman, M. J., Piquero, N. L., & Piquero, A. R. (2004). The validity of Niederhoffer's Cynicism scale. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 32*, 1-13.
- Higgins, G., Wolfe, S. E., & Walters, N. (2009). Sex and experience: Modeling the public's perceptions of justice, satisfaction, and attitude toward the courts. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*, 116-130.
- Holtfreter, K., Reisig, M. D., Piquero, N. L., & Piquero, A. R. (2010). Low self-control and fraud: Offending, victimization, and their overlap. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37*, 188-203.
- Ivković, S. K. (2005). *Fallen blue knights: Controlling police corruption*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ivković, S. K. (2009). Rotten apples, rotten branches, and rotten orchards. *Criminology and Public Policy, 8*, 777-785.
- Kane, R. J. (2002). The social ecology of police misconduct. *Criminology, 40*, 867-896.
- Kane, R. J., & White, M. D. (2009). Bad cops: A study of career-ending misconduct among New York City police officers. *Criminology and Public Policy, 8*, 735-767.

- King, W. R. (2009). Police officer misconduct as normal accidents: An organizational perspective. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 8, 771-776.
- Klockars, C. B. (1983). The Dirty Harry problem. In C. Klockars (Ed.), *Thinking about police: Contemporary readings* (pp. 238-438). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Klockars, C. B., Ivković, S. K., Harver, W. E., & Haberfield, M. R. (2000). The measurement of police integrity. *National Institute of Justice Research in Brief*, 1-11.
- Knapp Commission. (1972). *Report of the New York City Commission to Investigate Allegations of Police Corruption and the City's Anti-Corruption Procedures*. New York, NY: Bar Press.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 644-656.
- Lawton, B. A. (2007). Levels of nonlethal force: An examination of individual, situational, and contextual factors. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 44, 163-184.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Manning, P. K. (2009). Bad cops. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 8, 787-794.
- McElvain, J. P., & Kposowa, A. J. (2004). Police officer characteristics and internal affairs investigations for use of force allegations. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 265-279.
- Micucci, A. J., & Gomme, I. M. (2005). American police and subcultural support for the use of excessive force. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, 487-500.
- Mollen Commission. (1994). *Anatomy of failure, a path for success: The report of the Commission to Investigate Allegations of Police Corruption and the Anti-Corruption Procedures of the New York City Police Department*. New York, NY: City of New York.
- Piquero, A. R., & Bouffard, J. A. (2007). Something old, something new: A preliminary investigation of Hirschi's redefined self-control. *Justice Quarterly*, 24, 1-27.
- Piquero, A. R., Fagan, J., Mulvey, E., Steinberg, L., & Odgers, C. (2005). Developmental trajectories of legal socialization among serious adolescent offenders. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 96, 267-298.
- Pogarsky, G., & Piquero, A. R. (2003). Studying the reach of deterrence: Can deterrence theory help explain police misconduct? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 371-386.
- Reisig, M. D., Bratton, J., & Gertz, M. (2007). The construct validity and refinement of process-based policing measures. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 1005-1028.
- Reisig, M. D., & Parks, R. (2000). Experience, quality of life, and neighborhood context: A hierarchical analysis of satisfaction with police. *Justice Quarterly*, 17, 607-630.
- Reiss, A. J. (1971). *The police and the public*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rojek, J., & Decker, S. H. (2009). Examining racial disparity in the police discipline process. *Police Quarterly*, 12, 388-407.
- Rothwell, G. R., & Baldwin, J. N. (2007a). Ethical climate theory, whistle-blowing, and the code of silence in police agencies in the state of Georgia. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 70, 341-361.
- Rothwell, G. R., & Baldwin, J. N. (2007b). Whistle-blowing and the code of silence in police agencies. *Crime & Delinquency*, 53, 605-632.
- Schein, E. H. (1993). Defining organizational culture. In J. M. Shafritz, J. S. Ott, & Y. S. Jang (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (pp. 360-367). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Sherman, L. (1975). An evaluation of policewomen on patrol in a suburban police department. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 3, 434-438.
- Sherman, L. (1978). *Scandal and reform: Controlling police corruption*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443.
- Skolnick, J. H. (2002). Corruption and the blue code of silence. *Police Practice and Research*, 3, 7-19.
- Skolnick, J. H. (2005). *Corruption and the blue code of silence*. In R. Sarre, D. K. Das, & H. J. Albrecht (Eds.), *Police corruption: An international perspective* (pp. 301-316). Oxford, UK: Lexington Books.
- Skolnick, J. H., & Fyfe, J. J. (1993). *Above the law: Police and the excessive use of force*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Simpson, S., Paternoster, R., & Piquero, N. L. (1998). Exploring the micro-macro link in corporate crime research. In P. Bamberger & W. J. Sonnenstuhl (Eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations: Special volume on deviance in and of organizations*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Smith, D. A. (1986). The neighborhood context of police behavior. In A. J. Reiss Jr. & M. Tonry (Eds.), *Crime and justice: Vol. 8. Communities and crime*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Taxman, F. S., & Gordon, J. A. (2009). Do fairness and equity matter? An examination of organizational justice among correctional officers in adult prisons. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 695-711.
- Terrill, W., & Reisig, M. D. (2003). Neighborhood context and police use of force. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40, 291-321.

- Tosi, H. L., Mero, N. P., & Rizzo, J. R. (2000). *Managing organizational behavior*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Truxillo, D. M., Bennett, S. R., & Collins, M. L. (1998). College education and police job performance: A ten-year study. *Public Personnel Management, 27*, 269-280.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Scott E. Wolfe is a doctoral student in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Arizona State University. His research interests include criminological theory, policing, and the intersection between theory and policy.

Alex R. Piquero is Gordon P. Waldo Professor of Criminology in the College of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Florida State University, an adjunct professor in the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice, and Governance at Griffith University Australia, and a coeditor of the *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. His research interests include criminal careers, criminological theory, and quantitative research methods.