

Police Integrity: The Unwillingness to Report Misconduct

Final Report

Stephanie Blouin

Bachelor of Law Enforcement Studies

LAWS-4003 Research Project

Justice Institute of British Columbia

Florence Daddey & Gregory Keenan

Ronald Bowles

April 9, 2018

Abstract

Relevant literature regarding police integrity has been analysed and reviewed to identify factors surrounding police officer's unwillingness to report a peer's misconduct. It is important to note that when police officers engage in unethical behaviours it can cause damage to the police organization's image and reduce public confidence in them (Payam, 2016). In order to reduce unethical behaviours in police organizations, police officers need to be effective in reporting misconduct they witness. Therefore, this research aims to explore the factors playing a role in the effectiveness of peer reporting. The method used to complete this project was a critical appraisal. A thorough literature review of the existing research on this dilemma was conducted, and the most relevant information was chosen for review. The findings from the literature are clear with respect to police peer reporting intentions. The perceived seriousness of the acts, individual peer reporting intentions and police culture are all factors that play a role in the failure to report a peer. The present research provides a list of recommendations to deal with this dilemma.

Keywords

Police integrity, peer reporting, police unethical behaviour, corruption, police culture

Table of contents

Abstract.....	2
Background.....	4
Research Rationale.....	5
Literature Search.....	6
Research Design.....	6
Methodology.....	7
Seriousness of Acts.....	9
Individual Reporting Intentions.....	10
Police Culture.....	11
Critical Appraisal.....	12
Seriousness of Acts.....	12
Individual Reporting Intentions.....	15
Police Culture.....	17
Discussion.....	18
Conclusion.....	21
References.....	23

Background

All law enforcement personnel are aware that one of the most important values to have in this type of career is integrity. A person that has integrity is known to adhere to moral and ethical principles, to have good moral character and to be honest (Dictionary, 2018). Every police officers should have integrity because they need to treat everyone equally and make society better (McCartney & Parent, 2015). Police officers also have to be virtuous because if they compromise or abuse their position they will not earn trust from the public. Even those in pursuit of a law enforcement career are constantly reminded of the principles of police ethics. Police ethics principles consist of integrity, honesty, professional responsibility, protection of rights and freedoms (Payam, 2016).

One aspect of integrity is peer reporting of unethical police behaviours. Peer reporting is best described as an officer reporting to his or her chain of command misconduct done by co-workers. Some of the misconducts required to report or to refrain from doing are briberies, discrimination, neglect, exploitation, mixing policy in relationships, abuse of power and physical abuse (Payam, 2016). The public puts a lot of trust in the police and if the officers engage in unethical behaviours it will damage the police organization's image and reduce public confidence in them (Payam, 2016). Police organizations encourage their officers to report unethical activities however, studies have demonstrated that police officers who actually report a peer are damaging the overall team structure of the law enforcement agency (McCartney & Parent, 2015). Even though peer reporting is not positive for a team environment, unethical behaviours will never be welcomed in a police organization.

Unethical behaviours are most likely impossible to prevent because of some existing factors to the law enforcement career. During their shifts, police officers are mostly unsupervised, making it possible for them to make unethical decisions (Kargin, 2011). Even while performing their duties police officers have a discretionary power that can also lead to more opportunities of unethical behaviours. A factor that makes unethical behaviours less likely to be discovered from the public is the “blue code of silence.” The blue code of silence is defined as a police subculture that consists of loyalty and unwritten rules forbidding police officers from revealing a co-worker’s misconduct (Kargin, 2011).

Research Rationale

As stated in the background this research will explore peer reporting of unethical police behaviours. At the beginning of this research the primary focus was in exploring what role does police subcultures play in the effectiveness of peer reporting misconduct. However, the literature review manifested that police subcultures are not the only factor to peer reporting of unethical police behaviours. The articles reviewed indicated that other factors such as perceived seriousness of acts and cynicism are influencing peer reporting. Consequently the research question had to be reoriented. Based on the evidence of more than one factor to peer reporting of unethical police behaviours the question will be the following: What are the factors that play a role in the effectiveness of peer reporting unethical police behaviours? This question is likewise an exploratory question which will give a better understanding of the unwillingness to peer report.

According to Rowe (2018), the unwillingness of peer reporting starts as soon as recruits are trained by more experienced police officers. The recruits are often told by other police officers to forget what they learned in the academy and to start learning real police work (Rowe, 2018). The recruits soon learn about secrets shared among police officers, and that these secrets

should not be reported to higher ups. Based on the following statement, recruits rapidly become part of the police subculture. The further this topic is studied the more it can be valuable to law enforcement organizations because many organizations stress the importance of integrity and precisely peer reporting of misconduct. Law enforcement organizations are aware that once an individual is hired he or she is quickly part of the police subculture which leads that individual to build resistance on reporting the misconduct of a peer. It is worthwhile understanding what will influence a police officer to report or not to report a fellow officer. Exploring the dilemma of peer reporting will lead to questions that are not yet answered.

Since this project is an undergraduate research, the scope is fairly narrow and time constraints do not encourage the collection of primary data. The goals of this project are the following:

- Identify the current factors playing a role in the unwillingness to report peer misconduct;
- Critically appraise the data collected in relation to the unwillingness to report peer misconduct
- Determine any gaps in the research; and,
- Define strategy options to increase the willingness to report peer misconduct.

Narrowing the scope of this project will lead to better results because more time will be used to analyze the data and provide helpful recommendations.

Literature Search

Research Design

The method chosen for this research was mixed methods. The rationale for utilizing the mixed methods approach was that it is the easiest way to describe peer reporting of unethical police behaviours. Because there is already both qualitative and quantitative data existing on this

topic, mixed method is a possible option. The chosen main source of data collection was existing literature because based on this project's requirements there was not enough time to collect primary data. The collection of secondary data is less time consuming and cost-effective which increases the quality of this research.

Methodology

This research started with a comprehensive search of articles on the Justice Institute of British Columbia (JIBC) online library resource. The JIBC online library allows students to conduct searches throughout many databases; this library has access to databases on various subjects for instance criminology, law, legislation and statistics. The procedure to search the JIBC online library starts with writing a keyword in the JIBC library search engine and it will automatically search all the databases available within its library. The majority of the articles for this research were found in the JIBC library databases and the following keywords were used to find relevant information:

Police Integrity, Peer Reporting of Police Misconduct, Corruption, Police Culture, Police Subculture, Police Ethics, Blue Code of Silence, Ethics Law Enforcement, Police deviance, Whistleblower, Bad Cops.

The initial search consisted of using only keywords, the JIBC library found a result of 19 to 5000 articles depending on the keyword used. Having more than a thousand hits was not desirable because not all articles were scholarly and full text articles. The JIBC online library permits users to conduct an advanced search. As a means to narrow the number of hits an advanced search was conducted using the following terms: full text, scholarly (peer reviewed journals) and dates varying from 2000 to 2018. The advanced search led to the return of 4 to 4500 hits. The

search for keywords and terms generated hits in specific databases such as Criminal Justice Abstracts, PsycINFO, Emerald Insight and EBSCOhost.

Along the searches conducted on the JIBC online library, more searches were conducted using Google Search. Approximately 3 literature sources were referred by teachers and a classmate from the JIBC.

The first selection consisted of selecting articles based on their appealing title and a total of 20 articles were identified. Not all articles with interesting titles were found to be relevant to the focus of this research. In total 15 articles were selected for abstract review. The rationale behind the selection was for their relevance to the research topic, for the likelihood of being written by credible authors and for being applicable to police organizations in North America. The advance search criteria made sure to exclude links that did not give access to the full texts. The articles were written between the years 2000–2018 which increases the probability of being more contemporary facts.

After reading the abstracts of these 15 articles, some articles were excluded. The articles that were eliminated after the abstract review are articles that were too broad to analyze. For the final review a total of 9 articles were reviewed, these articles all had in common similar themes. These articles were also all related to police integrity and discussed the unwillingness to report a peer's misconduct. The majority of the articles chosen tried to answer a question similar to the question of this research. An important feature that most articles had was the use of surveys, the information gathered from surveys provides meaningful evidence. The chosen articles were not all of research conducted in North America, however, they can easily correspond to law enforcement in North America.

Themes

There were three recurring themes that emerged from the literature review. The themes that were identified were all different factors that lead either to the willingness or unwillingness to report a co-worker's misconduct. The first theme and factor that was identified by most scholars was how the perceived seriousness of acts plays a role in peer reporting. The second theme is individual predictors of police officers peer reporting intentions, in other words, what can predict if an officer has the intention to report or not. A third theme that is also a factor to this issue is how police culture affects peer reporting. Finally, in the discussion part of this report the solutions recommended by most scholars studying the dilemma of peer reporting will be addressed.

Seriousness of Acts

The research identified different factors to peer reporting of police unethical behaviours, however, the factor that was mentioned in most articles was regarding the seriousness of the act committed by the police officer. According to Klockars et al. (2000) the more serious the officers perceived the misconduct to be, the more they were willing to report their colleague who had committed such misconduct. In order to determine the perceived seriousness of acts and the willingness to report misconduct the majority of researchers conducted surveys using Klockars et al. (2000) scenario methodology. This scenario methodology consists of presenting approximately 10 different scenarios of misconduct acts, and these scenarios range from less serious to very serious. The respondents are asked different questions concerning the scenarios.

Louise Westmarland (2005) conducted a survey that included questions to identify officers' attitudes towards certain unethical behaviours. The unethical behaviours presented in her survey were varying from minor rule breaking to taking large amounts of money or goods in the course of their duties. Westmarland (2005) research demonstrated that the majority of respondent

(65 percent) thought that a police officer running a private business in off-duty hours was not serious, even if 50 percent of respondent knew it was not authorized. The act that was considered the most serious by respondent (98.5 percent) was the scenario of an officer taking a watch after burglary. Although every respondent considered this act to be very serious, respondent thought that only 86 percent of their co-workers would report this behaviour (Westmarland, 2005). Westmarland (2005) findings are comparable to Klockars et al. (2000) findings. Their findings suggested that the scenarios perceived as most serious were the ones most likely to be reported, the ones that were perceived as more serious are involving the acquisition of money or goods (Westmarland, 2005).

One of the concerns that arises from reviewing the findings of other scholars is regarding the surveys. Respondents to surveys mentioned that questions were hard to answer because of their ambiguity. If this is the case would the creation of more detailed scenario-based questions result in a different perception of the seriousness of acts. These uncertainties will be further discussed later in this project.

Individual Reporting Intentions

The second theme to emerge from the research is individual attitudinal factors. The specific individual attitudinal factors that were identified are ethical perspective towards professional ethics codes and cynicism. Based on research findings “Police officers who have more supportive attitudes towards professional ethics codes were found to be more likely to report a peer’s activities that violate the professional ethical standards than police officers who have weaker attitudes” (Kargin, 2011, p. 127). Given this fact, a way to increase peer reporting would be to enhance an ethical environment within the organization. If not only recruits would receive

ethical awareness training organizations as a whole could have more supportive attitudes towards the ethics codes.

The literature also shows a second individual factor which is cynicism. According to McCartney and Parent (2015) “Cynicism can include a negative response to morality that illustrates a contempt for community standards”(p.8,3). A good example of cynicism is when a young officer develop cynical attitudes towards the police organization and public they serve after realizing that policing is not what they expected it to be (Kargin, 2011). Low job satisfaction and high levels of cynicism go hand in hand, when an officer scores high on cynicism he is less willing to report the negative behaviour of fellow officers (Hickman, Piquero, Powell & Greene, 2016). For future research it would be interesting to study methods that prevent police officers from reaching cynical attitudes. If cynicism is a factor that leads to low integrity, programs should address this issue. Further discussion will demonstrate that low level of cynicism increase the likelihood of peer reporting within police departments.

Police Culture

The final theme that surfaced from the literature review was how police culture affected the willingness to report a peer. Police culture is viewed as loyalty to other police officers and an “us versus them” attitude (McCartney and Parent, 2015). Scholars believe that police culture is truly a factor to peer reporting. According to Westmarland (2005) in cases where police officers did not report a peer it was because of comradeship, or perhaps other forms of resolution, such as telling the officer to give the money back. The reason why an officer might not report a peer is because “The Blue Code” which is a title given to describe police subcultures, discourages police officers from reporting the misconduct of their colleagues (Klockars et al., 2000). There is a huge

dilemma felt by police officers within the police culture. Skolnick (2002) gave a good explanation of this dilemma “If the officer promptly reports, he’s labelled a ‘rat’ or a ‘cheese eater.’ If he doesn’t, he may later have a hard time explaining why he failed to report promptly. Given these pressures, police usually lapse into silence and talk about the misconduct of other cops only when pressured by Internal Affairs investigators or by threat of prosecution” (Skolnick, 2002, p.12).

The influence that police culture has on peer reporting of unethical behaviours is a negative factor, however; there are not only negative aspects to the police culture. Police officers need this team structure because it provides support to each of them and with the dangerous situations they face, camaraderie allows some of them to survive through tough times. Therefore police officers who breach loyalty to report minor ethical violations may damage the overall team or structure of a law enforcement agency (McCartney and Parent, 2015).

Critical appraisal

Seriousness of Acts

Exploring the seriousness of unethical acts can have some valuable insight on whether a police officer will report a peer. Many scholars seek to measure police ethical decision-making with regard to peer reporting. The articles of Westmarland (2005), Klockars et al. (2000) as well as Hickman, Piquero, Powell and Greene (2016) discussed how police officers would not report a peer if they considered the misconduct not to be serious.

These scholars were able to determine what type of unethical behaviours was considered more serious by police officers. Surveys were conducted with scenario-based questions, the scenarios presented in these surveys were unethical behaviours ranging from taking free meals and items of small value to physical abuse to taking money from a wallet and to taking a bribe for not

reporting a speeder (Hickman, Piquero, Powell & Greene, 2016). These scenarios were then followed with questions to determine if they considered these behaviours to be “not at all serious,” “very serious”, or “serious.” The authors stated that the respondent of these surveys would be more likely to report the acts that they perceived as the most serious (Westmarland, 2005). For the majority of articles measuring the seriousness of acts the ones that were selected as most serious were generally acts that involved the acquisition of money or property (Klockars et al., 2000). According to Westmarland (2005) the actual value of the money or property taken by the officer did not play a role in whether it was a serious act or not. Westmarland (2005) suggest that the punishment for either an acquisitive act or a physical abuse act might affect what the respondents perceived as serious or whether they would report their colleague’s behaviours.

Overall scholars that measured the perceived seriousness of acts have similar findings, however; there are important gaps that needed appraisal. Concerns were raised in relation to the reliability of the method used to measure the perceived seriousness of acts. First, can the respondents’ level of honesty be determined, because if the respondents of these surveys did not answer with honesty, the results are not valid. Furthermore another concern related to the reliability of the method used was that the surveys used ambiguous questions, in this case did these surveys generate unreliable answers from respondents.

The method used by Klockars et al. (2000) shows that their survey results are more likely to be valid than the opposite. Klockars et al. (2000) included the steps they took to make sure the results of their survey were legitimate. Their surveys included two questions to evaluate the honesty of the respondents. The first question asked the respondents if they thought most police officers would give their honest opinion in filling out this questionnaire and secondly they asked if the respondent did answer honestly. These steps allowed (Klockars et al., 2000) to disregard the

surveys of respondent that did not answer truthfully. According to these questions the majority of respondent (84.4 percent) reported that they thought most officers would answer the questions honestly, and even more respondents (97.8 percent) reported that they themselves had done so (Klockars et al., 2000). Based on Klockars et al. (2000) demonstration of steps used to ensure reliability, it can be inferred that the results of these surveys will provide reliable outcomes.

Further concerns about the reliability of the method used was that the surveys used ambiguous questions. This concern was raised while analyzing “Police Ethics and Integrity: Breaking the Blue Code of Silence” by Louise Westmarland (2005). Westmarland (2005) states that quite a few respondents from the survey she conducted complained that the questions were ambiguous. Ambiguous questions can impact the respondent's way of interpreting what is asked, which makes the data collected harder to compare. Secondly, if the questions are difficult to answer because of ambiguity, it might influence respondents to answer with a shortcut, which is simply choosing any answer that seems reasonable. In the case of Westmarland's (2005) survey, the respondents said they needed “more context” or to know the “home circumstances of the officer involved”(p. 153). Westmarland (2005) reported that the questions were purposely made to have respondents struggle with “what if?” thoughts. The author said that respondents are well capable of applying their beliefs in terms of ethics and integrity.

These research studies are clearly related to the purposes of this study. Both articles are written by reliable scholars and they were published in credible journals. Questions about the reliability of methods used by these researchers have been explained, supporting the reliability of their results. While there is a list of misconduct committed by police officers, these results prove that some misconduct is considered more serious than others. The result demonstrates that the

more serious the officers perceived the misconduct to be, the more probable they were willing to report their colleague who had committed such misconduct (Klockars et al., 2000).

Individual Reporting Intentions

The second theme as mentioned above is a different factor that plays a role in determining whether a police officer will report a peer or not. This study will concentrate on two of the main components that were identified by scholars. The ethical perspective towards professional ethics codes and cynicism are two different components of the individual intentions.

One article which discusses the influence of individual reporting intentions is that of Kargin (2011). This article investigates police officers' ethical decision-making in relation to peer reporting. Kargin (2011) uses a three-level model of factors that influence peer reporting decisions. This article is of particular value to the current project as it explores how officers' attitudes towards the ethics codes will influence peer reporting. This author's (2011) research examined many other studies to gather evidence that proved a link between individual's ethical decision-making and ethical codes. According to Kargin (2011) "the majority of these studies consistently found ethical codes to be one of the strongest predictors of an individual's ethical decision-making within organization settings"(p.127). Kargin's (2011) research attempts to answer a similar question as this current research, the value and relevance of the author's research are legitimate because his research has findings similar to other scholars studying this topic. What made Kargin's (2011) research reliable was also his acknowledgement of the limitations he encountered. The major limitation mentioned is the fact that the original data were obtained from only one department, the Philadelphia Police Department (PPD) (Kargin, 2011). Obtaining data from only one police department limits the external validity of findings. To further generalize this study, more police departments should provide data. The focus of the study was also directed

to only one rank, which was the rank of patrol officer (Kargin, 2011). Kargin (2011) also identifies an important limitation and that is the fact that his research concentrated only on the intentions of peer reporting and not the actual peer reporting behaviours. Stating this limitation clarifies the distinction between the intentions and the behaviour of peer reporting.

A second article that relates to individual factors more precisely the impact of cynicism on peer reporting is that of Hickman et al. (2016). The purpose behind this article was to measure perceived seriousness, the level of discipline warranted, and the willingness to report a co-worker's misconduct. Similar to other research, the authors conducted a survey using Klockars et al.'s (2000) method. In addition to using similar survey method, Hickman et al. (2016) collected their data from the PPD, same as Kargin (2011). These scholars have found that "bivariate relationships between officer-level demographics and willingness to report fellow officers are negated when controlling for theoretically relevant attitudinal variables such as cynicism and, consistent with Klockars et al (2000)., perceived seriousness of the underlying behaviour (Hickman et al., 2016, p. 246)" These findings provide the current research with contemporary data because the article was recently published. The article "Expanding the measurement of police integrity" by Hickman et al. (2016) used reliable and valid measurement methods as they used Klockars et al. (2000), method, and it was determined earlier that Klockars et al (2000)., method is reliable. Hickman et al. (2016) began by comparing their results from PPD to Klockars et al.'s (2000) previous national study. Afore stated Hickman et al. (2016) were able to validate their results with Klockars et al. (2000), as they were consistent with variables such as cynicism.

Police Culture

The final theme to be critically appraised is that of the role played by police culture on the effectiveness of peer reporting. As mentioned above, police culture negatively impacts peer

reporting of police unethical behaviours. Police cultures encourage loyalty among police officers and create an “us versus them” attitude (McCartney and Parent, 2015). Therefore, reporting a peer is seen as “snitching” and is discouraged by police culture. Many scholars were able to explain the link between police culture and peer reporting. One of the interesting articles regarding the police culture is that of Skolnick (2002). Skolnick (2002) examines the “blue code of silence” and its contribution to police corruption. As mention in Skolnick’s (2002) article, if an officer reports a fellow officer, he will be labelled as a “rat.” The police culture makes it a dilemma for officers to report, if they do not report they may later have a hard time explaining why they failed to report promptly (Skolnick, 2002). This article provides a clear answer to the current research as it states that some police officers who witness misconduct are likely to back up the wrongdoer. Skolnick (2002) also explores the etiology of the code. The code also known as “the blue code of silence” is apparently a key facilitator of police corruption, which then relates to the refusal to report misconduct. Although Skolnick presents interesting information, the validity of his results is questioned. In his article Skolnick(2002) states the rationale behind his research, he also states his research question, however, he does not describe his research method. Not stating the research method does not allow the reader to establish whether the information is biased or not.

Since the validity of the information from the article written by Skolnick(2002) was unsure, a second article was analyzed and compared with Skolnick’s article to ensure the validity. The second article reviewed was that of Westmarland (2005). Westmarland (2005) article was already critically appraised in this current research and considered as a credible study. According to Westmarland (2005) findings “If an officer behaves in a way that is out of character due to some sort of life crisis or finds some incident particularly stressful for a personal reason, it could

be considered mitigating circumstances by colleagues”(p.155). This statement suggests that police officer will try to rationalize their co-worker’s misconduct. Doing so will give them reason not to report their peers. Both the articles reviewed had similar findings, which reinforce their credibility.

Discussion

The findings from the literature are clear with respect to police peer reporting intentions. The perceived seriousness of the acts, individual peer reporting intentions and police culture are all factors that play a role in the failure to report a peer. The various academic studies reviewed during this research have indicated that the seriousness of acts will be taken in consideration by police officers before reporting misconduct. As mentioned above the more the act is considered serious more likely officers were to report it. The acts that were perceived as more serious were those with acquisitive attributions. The theft of money or items of any value is an act that most police officers would report. One can assume that police officers would want to report serious misconduct because the consequences of not reporting such acts would severely damage their integrity. That being said the academic studies reviewed did not prove such affirmation. Therefore further research should be made to evaluate why police officers are more inclined to report acquisitive act than act that consists of physical abuse.

As for individual peer reporting intentions, the academic literature stated that when police officers have higher levels of cynicism it will decrease their peer reporting intentions. While exploring this factor a gap was identified. The existing studies that were reviewed stated that low level of cynicism increase the likelihood of peer reporting within police departments, however;

these scholars did not provide data that indicate how many officers become cynical. It is important to know if many police officers are at risk of becoming cynical and why higher levels of cynicism decreases the intentions to report a peer's misconduct.

Police officers are not inclined to report their peers because they share a bond. The bond between police officers includes loyalty and creates "us versus them" situation. This situation strengthens internal solidarity, but also inappropriate loyalties or secrecies (Westmarland, 2005). Police officers will try to rationalize their colleague's misconduct because they might view losing a valued colleague as being against the interest of the public good (Westmarland, 2005, Pg 152). Another reason why police officers would avoid reporting a peer is because of the punishment. There is a difference in the severity of punishments when the same acts are committed by civilians or by a police officer. The police officer would receive a more severe punishment which can make it difficult to secure similar employment (Westmarland, 2005, pg 152).

Although this current study provides answers to important questions, other questions related to this topic remain unanswered. Throughout the paper several subjects were mentioned for further research. The following are a list of subjects that remains to be explored:

- Why are police officers more inclined to report acquisitive acts rather than acts that consists of physical abuse?
- Why higher levels of cynicism decreases the intentions to report a peer's misconduct?
- How can police department encourage police officers to report minor ethical violations without damaging the overall team or structure of a law enforcement agency?

Including these subjects, further research should collect additional data from actual incidences of peer reporting by police officers. If researchers would use actual incidents of peers reporting, it could be used as supplementary data sources to better explore peer reporting in police departments.

Limitations

This current research has a couple of limitations. Firstly, the literature reviewed was mostly published between 2000 and 2006, making the findings less current. Since 2006 police officers and recruits have been receiving more ethical and integrity training. If scholars were to conduct newer scenario based surveys, the results might indicate higher levels of peer reporting because police officers receive more ethical training. This first is linked to the second one which is the limitation of having only secondary data. Using secondary data increases the risk of gathering inaccurate data. However in this current research, the secondary data was closely evaluated and well chosen. Another limitation of the chosen articles is that they focused on a small number of officers from a certain geographic area. The majority of studies were done on police organizations in the United States. The United States and Canada have similar policing styles but organizational structures and code of ethics might have differences. Therefore generalizations cannot be accurately portrayed across police officers as a whole.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the research shows that police officer's intentions to report a peer consist of three different factors. Police officers will evaluate the misconduct, they will look at the circumstances surrounding the act and decide whether it is a serious misconduct deserving to be reported. Following the evaluation of the act, officers individual intentions to report will vary based on if they are supportive of the professional ethics code and have low levels of cynicism.

In that case they will be more likely to report misconduct. The last factor that is considered is the police culture within organizations. As scholars state, reporting ethical violations may have consequences on the overall police team. Therefore, police officers may be reluctant to report a peer's misconduct. Police officers may rationalize the misconduct and be more forgiving of noble cause corruption, brutality, and rule bending (McCartney & Parent, 2015).

After reviewing and analyzing the literature, and exploring the factors influencing peer reporting of police misconduct, there are a number of recommendations that can be made. These recommendations include, but are not limited to:

- Further ethical training for both new recruits and current police officers.
- Reducing the number of unethical behaviours and maintaining an ethical environment will simultaneously reduce the need for peer reporting.
- Rewarding ethical behaviours in order to support ethical decision-making.

The ethical trainings should address the negative aspects of police culture (McCartney, 2012). Since recruits become part of the police culture in the academies, this is where recruits can start taking unethical decisions such as protecting other officers who have committed unethical acts. The police organizations should consider rewarding police officers who report another officer's unethical activities, because rewarding an ethical behavior is the most influential method to increase ethical decision making. Additionally, police organizations should establish a policy stating that failure to report and/or overlook a co-worker's unethical activities will result in punishment or discipline. These recommendations should be taken in consideration because unethical activities of police officers have large influences on the quality of the police departments and will damage public trust.

References

- Hickman, M. J., Piquero, A. R., Powell, Z. A. & Greene, J. (2016). Expanding the measurement of police integrity. *Policing: An International Journal*, 39(2), 246–267. doi:10.1108/PIJPSM-09-2015-0104
- Kargin, V. (2011). *Peer reporting of unethical police behaviour*. El Paso: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
- Klockars, C. B., Ivkovich, S. J., Harver, W. E., & Haberfeld, M. R. (2000). The measurement of police integrity. Retrieved from <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn31951d02727437c>
- Lim, H. & Sloan, J. J. (2016). Police officer integrity: A partial replication and extension. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 39(2), 284–301. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-10-2015-0127>
- McCartney, S. (2012). *Changing ethical perspectives of police recruits in cohort 134 at the British Columbia Police Academy: The impact of neutralization theory and the police subculture*. (Master's Thesis, Leicester University, Leicester, UK).
- McCartney, S. & Parent, R. (2015). *Ethics in law enforcement*. Victoria, BC: BC campus. Retrieved from <http://opentextbc.ca/ethicsinlawenforcement/>
- Payam, M. M. (2016). Police officers' and candidates' views on professionally unethical behaviors: The Elazığ and Malatya case. *Turkish Journal of Business Ethics*, 9(1), 20–24. doi:10.12711/behavior.2016.9.0002

- Porter, E. L. & Prenzler, T.(2016). The code of silence and ethical perceptions: Exploring police officer unwillingness to report misconduct. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 39(2), 370–386. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-10-2015-0108>
- Rowe, M. (2018). *Introduction to policing*. Retrieved from <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/introduction-to-policing/book250114>
- Skolnick, J. H. (2002). Corruption and the blue code of silence. *Police Practice and Research*, 7(1), 7–19. doi:10.1080/15614260290011309
- Stinson, P. M. (2015). Police crime: The criminal behaviour of sworn law enforcement officers. *Sociology Compass*, 9(1), 1–13. doi:10.1111/soc4.12234
- Westmarland, L. (2005). Police ethics and integrity: Breaking the blue code of silence. *Policing & Society*, 15(2), 145–165. doi:10.1080/10439460500071721
- Wolfe, S. E. & Piquero, A. R. (2011). Organizational justice and police misconduct. *Criminal Justice & Behaviour*, 38(4), 332–353. doi:10.1177/0093854810397739