

Integrity in the South African police service: the role of organisational climate and dispositional variables

by Anton Grobler*

Abstract

The objective of this study was to determine the relationship between integrity, organisational climate, sense of coherence and locus of control in the South African Police Service (SAPS). A cross-sectional design was used for this purpose and the population involved consisted of 1776 police personnel stationed at the 14 presidential police stations. The questionnaires administered were a biographical questionnaire, the adapted Integrity Profile 200 questionnaire, the Organisational Climate questionnaire, the Locus of Control questionnaire and the Life Orientation questionnaire. Canonical and multiple regression analysis showed that the individual and corporate facets of integrity are indeed multidimensional. The individual and corporate facets of integrity are predicted by combinations of situational factors (organisational climate), such as interpersonal climate, organisational support, supervision and task characteristics, as well as dispositional factors (locus of control and sense of coherence). The partial correlations showed that the dispositional variables were not moderating or intervening variables. The relationship that the dispositional variables have with the integrity factors is therefore direct and not indirect as is the case with moderating variables.

Key words: *integrity, organisational climate, locus of control, sense of coherence*

Acknowledgement

It is with sincere appreciation that the author wishes to acknowledge the contribution of Prof S Rothmann of North West University, as well as that of the SAPS management for mandating this study, and for their support in terms of resources. The author also wishes to thank the EAS personnel for gathering the data and all the SAPS officials who participated in this study.

1 Introduction

So far, little attention has been paid to the development and testing of comprehensive models with regard to the effect that individual and/or organisational variables have on the integrity of both the individual and his or her working environment or the organisation (D'Amato & Zijlstra 2008). The problem with the construct of integrity, as well as integrity-violating behaviour, is that it is very complex and the causes are difficult to identify (Bayram, Gursakal & Bilgel 2009; Fick 2001), supported by Lee and

* Dr Grobler is on the staff of the College of Economic and Management Sciences at the University of South Africa.

Vaughn (2010), who specified that integrity causes are difficult to identify, especially in a policing context.

Up to now no studies have been undertaken in the SAPS to explain integrity and integrity-violating behaviour. This study will investigate integrity, in terms of the role played by organisational variables, specifically the organisational climate, as well as individual variables (dispositional variables, including sense of coherence and locus of control).

2 Literature review

Integrity (Latin *integritas*) is defined by Gouws, Louw, Meyer and Plug (1997) as a quality of wholeness and unity, and includes characteristics such as moral consistency, honesty and credibility. According to Kaptein and Van Reenen (2001), Treviño-Rodriguez (2007), and Van Aswegen and Engelbrecht (2009), integrity is characterised by purity, unity, involvement and sincerity, while both Simons (1999) and Van Aswegen and Engelbrecht (2009) describe it as the expression of moral and ethical principles. Murphy (1995) describes integrity in terms of honesty, reliability and accountability, which form the essence of morality (Congress of the US 1990).

Although high integrity might be expected of police officials, integrity-deviating behaviour often occurs (Benson 2010; Gottschalk 2010; Huberts, Kaptein & Lasthuizen 2007; Lee & Vaughn 2010; Schafer & Martinelli 2008; Wright 2010). According to Benson (2010) and Grobler (2003), the SAPS have responded to the issue of integrity-deviating behaviour with a corruption and fraud prevention plan, disciplinary regulations and an ethical code. In spite of these initiatives and actions, deviant behaviour, for example corruption in the SAPS, results in the SAPS being seen as one of the least trustworthy organisations in South Africa (Benson 2010). This phenomenon is not restricted to South Africa, but is also found in other countries and police organisations (Gottschalk 2010; Huberts et al 2007; Lee & Vaughn 2010; Miller 2010; Sellbom, Fischler & Ben-Porath 2007; Wolfe & Piquero 2010; Wright 2010).

Schepers (1995) is of the opinion that the causes of general human behaviour can be broadly divided into two categories, namely situational causes and dispositional causes. Situational causes involve the external world and include all environmental factors (Hertzog 2000). Dispositional causes involve people's natural temperament and include all organic attributes (Reber 1995; Schepers 1995). House, Shane and Harrold (1996) maintain that work behaviour and attitude towards work are determined or at least linked to dispositional variables and individual characteristics. Davis-Blake and Pfeffer (1989) are of the opinion that situational factors, such as work and organisational characteristics, influence an individual's behaviour and attitude more than the individual's personal characteristics. This is supported by Ralston and Chadwick (2010), especially in a policing context. An integrated and comprehensive approach to researching and addressing integrity-related issues is recommended by Bayram et al (2009) and Luo (2004).

The construct of integrity has been studied within the SAPS context by Grobler (2003) and three factor structures have been empirically tested and confirmed. These factor structures are defined as follows by Grobler (2003) and Grobler and Steyn (in press):

Integrity-limiting orientation, which refers to a tendency to justify deviant behaviour by means of rationalisation and other defence mechanisms, to display work behaviour characterised by deviating from the rules and to treat other people unfairly by using

power and position to one's own advantage. This is characterised by unethical behaviour and emotional detachment and isolation. This factor relates mainly to the work environment and the rationalisation of negative behaviour, mainly the satisfaction of needs to the detriment of the organisation, junior employees and colleagues.

Moral conscientiousness and accountability – refers to the value attached to membership of a group, as well as behaviour characterised by self-respect and self-confidence, firm action which shows that the individual has the courage of his or her convictions, and a high degree of responsibility and accountability, especially with regard to goal attainment. This orientation does not relate mainly to the work environment, but rather to general values in relation to the community and the qualities of individual integrity.

According to Grobler (2003) and Grobler and Steyn (in press), the corporate facet of integrity consists of one factor called *Organisational/management integrity*. This refers to the extent to which the organisation provides for the employees' lifestyle aspirations and meets its social responsibilities, and to whether management is creditworthy, and participation is encouraged, as evidenced by a willingness to change. This factor measures the individual's perception of and attitude towards the organisation and its management. This integrity model was tested with reference to the literature on behaviour that violates integrity in a police context. The empirical results and the literature confirm that this model can be used to explain integrity in the SAPS (Grobler, 2003; Grobler & Steyn, in press).

Organisational climate entails the perceptions of members of the organisation and/or work unit, including perceptions of organisational policy, practices and procedures, formal and informal, that manifest in patterns of behaviour, attitudes and feelings that are repeatedly exhibited, experienced and that characterise life in the organisation (Field & Abelson 1982; Isaksen, Lauer, Ekvall & Britz 2001; Lawrence et al 2008; Merkys, Kalinauskaitė & Eitutyte 2007; Tsai & Huang 2008; Weber, Unterrainer & Schmid 2009).

Grobler and Steyn (2010) have developed an organisational climate model for the SAPS comprising a combination of French and Bell's (1984; 1999) systems approach and Field and Abelson's (1982) Causes and Effects of Organisational Climate model. The following four context-specific dimensions of organisational climate were identified: *Interpersonal climate*, which refers to the extent to which employees experience the atmosphere as contributing to free expression of opinion, open communication, cooperation between departments and lack or absence of conflict between different groups in the organisation. *Organisational support* is defined as the degree to which the organisation values the employees and their contribution, as well as the degree to which the organisation cares for the general welfare of the employees, and the support employees receive in terms of remuneration and resources. *Supervision* entails the employees' perception of the extent to which the supervisors care about their general welfare. *Task characteristics* deal with the individual's perception of the job, in other words, whether the work is interesting and challenging and the extent to which the individual is proud of his or her work (Grobler & Steyn 2010).

Kaptein and Van Reenen (2001) are of the opinion that organisational climate is directly linked to integrity. This view is supported by Murphy (1995), because integrity-violating behaviour can be ascribed to environmental factors which can be addressed in an organisational context (Kaptein & Van Reenen 2001). This view is supported by Weber et al (2009), writing from a socio-moral perspective.

Reber (1995) and Schepers (1995) define a dispositional variable as one that has to do with a person's nature, including a person's attributes. In this study use will be made of two constructs, namely sense of coherence and locus of control, which are defined as dispositional factors by Evans, March and Weigel (2009) and Aremu, Pakes and Johnston (2009) respectively.

The construct sense of coherence was developed by Antonovsky (1987) and is defined as a comprehensive orientation that indicates the extent to which a person has a long-lasting and dynamic confidence that his or her internal and external environment is predictable, and that a great probability exists that things will work out as well as can be expected. This influences the individual's perception of stimuli, where an individual with a high sense of coherence accepts stimuli as being comprehensible, within the control of the individual and meaningful (Antonovsky 1985). The definition of sense of coherence includes three dimensions which collectively represent the concept: Firstly, *comprehensibility* refers to the degree to which the individual experiences internal and external stimuli as clearly ordered, structured and consistent information. Secondly, *manageability* entails the extent to which people experience events/stimuli as tenable or manageable, even where such events could be regarded as challenging (Antonovsky 1985). Finally, *significance* entails the extent to which a person feels that life makes sense emotionally rather than cognitively (Antonovsky 1987).

Kinman (2008) and Strümpfer (1990) are of the opinion that a well-developed sense of coherence enables individuals to make sense of their work environment on a cognitive level where information is experienced as clear, ordered, structured, consistent and predictable. A person with a high sense of coherence (regardless of the individual's financial and social status) should have the necessary mechanisms available to deal with the stressful external environment (Strümpfer 1990). Antonovsky (1987) regards integrity as a quality that depends on responsible and accountable functioning as well as a search for wholeness, and this can be linked to a sense of coherence.

The construct "locus of control" was developed by Rotter (1966). Locus of control can be described as the extent to which individuals believe that they play a causal role in the events in their lives (Adeyami-Bello 2001; Rothmann 2000). External locus of control manifests in individuals whose perception is that they have no control over their environment (Appelbaum & Hare 1996), while positive or negative outcomes have no connection with the individual's behaviour and are out of his or her control (Rothmann 2000). Individuals with an internal locus of control, on the other hand, perceive themselves as being in control of their environment (Salaki, Kanellaki & Richardson 2009), that is to say, they ascribe all positive or negative outcomes to their own actions or behaviour (Rothmann 2000). Individuals with an internal locus of control are more likely to be able to handle frustrations in the work environment, while people with an external locus of control will generally react distantly and aggressively to frustration (Arslan, Dilmaç & Hamatra 2009), in an organisational environment as well (Adeyami-Bello 2001; Taylor 2010). Internal locus of control is further accompanied by high levels of job satisfaction (Adeyami-Bello 2001; Singh & Dubey 2011), dedication and involvement, low levels of stress, absence and staff turnover (Ng & Butts 2009; Srivastava 2009), successful interpersonal relations (Mohapatra & Gupta 2010; Srivastava 2009), better information processing (Lauer, De Man, Marquez & Ades 2008) and a positive perception of the job, job performance and motivation (Adeyami-Bello 2001).

Adeyami-Bello (2001) is of the opinion that an internal locus of control is accompanied by a lower tendency to dysfunctional behaviour. This is confirmed by research by Goodman, Leggett and Garrett (2007), Lauer et al (2008) and Salaki et al (2009). In a policing context, Aremu et al (2009) have found that there is indeed a link between deviant police behaviour and an external locus of control.

Van Wijk (2008) has found that there is a strong, positive relationship between sense of coherence and internal locus of control, and although Kalimo and Vuori (1990) maintain that the construct of sense of coherence includes certain aspects of the locus of control theory, according to Antonovsky (1987) there is a difference between sense of coherence and locus of control. Sense of coherence regards the resources under the control of other individuals as valuable as well. Locus of control regards such resources as an external orientation, because they indicate an inability to exercise control over the individual's future. For this reason the two constructs will be dealt with separately in this study.

3 Purpose and objectives of the study

Up to now no studies have been undertaken in the SAPS to explain integrity and integrity-violating behaviour. This study will focus on the establishment of an integrity model, where the role that organisational variables, specifically the organisational climate, as well as individual variables (dispositional variables, including sense of coherence and locus of control) play in relation to integrity will be determined.

4 Hypotheses

The above discussion gives rise to the following hypotheses:

- H1:** Integrity in the SAPS is determined by organisational factors, namely interpersonal climate, organisational support, supervision and task characteristics.
- H2:** Integrity is determined by, or at least related to (as the moderator variable), dispositional variables, namely sense of coherence and locus of control.

5 Methods and sampling description

A survey design was chosen for the research design. This specific design is cross-sectional in that a sample of the population or the total population is studied at the same time (Shaughnessy & Zechmeister 1997). Information is gathered to discuss the population at that specific time. This design is suitable when an attempt is being made to determine the links between the variables in a population.

The participants consisted of 1776 staff members stationed at 14 SAPS police stations, nationally. These police stations were selected as part of the government's urban renewal and rural development programmes, and form part of a broader public service initiative. The 14 stations were therefore not selected on the basis of specific police, organisational and/or any other social characteristics. The total population in the 14 presidential police stations was used for this study. Most of the participants held the rank of inspector, and had been promoted in the past five years. The majority of the participants have more than 10 years' service in the SAPS, and more than six years' service at their current police station. The age group that is best represented is 31 to 40 years. The type of work that the participants performed at the police station represents a wide range of occupations, from Client Services, Crime Prevention, Administration

and Detective Services to “other” work, for example manual labour and cleaning services. Most of the participants were black (79.33%), and the official languages that were best represented were Xhosa (16.93%), Venda (15.67%), Zulu (14.22%), Tswana (14.22%) and Afrikaans (13.97%).

The following four questionnaires used in the empirical research will be discussed briefly:

Adapted Integrity Profile 200 (IP 200). The adapted IP 200 consists of four factors, with 26, 23, 9 and 10 items per factor respectively. These factors are *Integrity-Limiting Orientation*, *Moral Conscientiousness and Accountability*, *Organisational/Managerial Integrity*, and the *Lie Scale*. In all the factors, high scores represent negative characteristics and low scores positive characteristics (Grobler 2003, Grobler & Steyn, in press). The four factors have acceptable psychometric properties, including high Cronbach's alpha coefficients (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994), which vary between 0.73 and 0.85, acceptable interim correlations (Clark & Watson 1995), varying between 0.16 and 0.36, with 53% of the variance explained. For the purposes of this study, the Lie Scale was not used in the analysis, because this is mainly concerned with answering the instrument and is not regarded as part of the integrity model (Grobler & Steyn, in press).

Organisational Climate Questionnaire (OCQ) – The OCQ was conceptualised by Grobler (2003) on the basis of Field and Abelson's (1982) Cause and Effect of Organisational Climate Model, with French and Bell's (1984; 1999) systems approach serving as a guideline for formulating the items in the questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of 56 items and four factors. These factors are *Interpersonal Climate*, *Organisational Support*, *Supervision* and *Task Characteristics*. All four of these factors have acceptable psychometric properties, including high Cronbach's alpha coefficients (0.77–0.88) (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994), acceptable interim correlations (0.21–0.42) (Clark & Watson 1995), variance (67% of the variance explained) and communalities (Grobler & Steyn 2010).

Locus of control questionnaire (LOC questionnaire) – The LOC questionnaire (Schepers 1995) is used to measure locus of control. The LOC questionnaire is based on attribution and social learning theory and consists of 88 items which are allocated to three scales (Schepers 1995). These three scales are (i) *External Control* (26 items); *Internal Control* (28 items) and *Autonomy* (34 items). Internal Control and External Control are regarded not as bipolar opposites but as independent constructs (Schepers 1995). Grobler (2003) has conducted a first-order factor analysis on all 88 variables (items) using the SAS FACTOR. The loadings on all three factors were unacceptable (loadings < 0.35), and only two factors were included in the final factor structure. The first factor, Internal Locus of Control, included certain items of the original Autonomy factor (Schepers 1995), while the second factor was External Locus of Control. The correlation of the two factors was –0.09. This weak interfactor correlation is a confirmation of Schepers's (1995) finding that internal and external locus of control are not bipolar opposites, but indeed two independent constructs. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the two factors were reported as 0.83 and 0.70 respectively. This is generally acceptable if the guideline of $\alpha > 0.70$ (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994) is applied, likewise the interim correlations of 0.25 and 0.41 respectively ($0.15 < r < 0.50$, Clark & Watson 1995). The total variance explained is 13.32% and 69.81% of the covariance. An extension of Cleary and Hilton's (1968) utilisation of variance analysis was applied to determine item bias (Van de Vijver & Leung 1997). All the items in the adapted LOC questions were tested for bias. The item score formed the dependent variable while

race group served as the independent variable. Two effects were tested by means of the variance analysis, namely the effect of culture (in terms of race), and the interaction between the scores obtained and culture (race). Both these effects obtained a non-significant score, and it is therefore accepted that the items are not biased (Grobler 2003).

Life Orientation Questionnaire (LOQ) – The LOQ consists of 29 items which are divided into three scales, namely *Comprehensibility* (11 items), *Manageability* (10 items) and *Significance* (8 items). The total of the three LOQ subscales provides an indication and overall image of the respondent's sense of coherence. Antonovsky (1993) indicates that the most recent validity and reliability results in 29 research studies yielded Cronbach's alpha coefficients of between 0.85 and 0.91. Consistently high internal reliabilities were found for various populations in different culture and language groups in Western society. Test–retest reliability studies reported coefficients varying between 0.41 and 0.97. Strijdom (1999) reported a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.71 in a study carried out with police officers in North West ($N = 120$). Item bias on all the items of the LOQ was also tested by Grobler (2003), and he found that none of the items is biased. Although the sense of coherence model, and consequently the LOQ, consists of three components, it is typically operationalised as a unidimensional construct (Eriksson & Lindstrom 2005; Hittner 2007; Klepp, Mastekaasa, Sørensen, Sandanger & Kleiner 2007). Grobler (2003) has subsequently indicated that the psychometric properties of the total score of the LOQs were within the norms for the Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994) and interim correlation (Clark & Watson 1995).

The statistical analysis was done with the aid of the SAS program (SAS Institute 2000). Descriptive statistics (eg arithmetic means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis) were used to analyse the information. Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship between the variables that were normally distributed (skewness score < 1). Spearman's correlation coefficient was used where the skewness score was greater than one. A cut-off point of 0.30 for medium effect (Cohen 1988) was used as the minimum criterion for the practical significance of the correlation coefficient. Canonical analysis was used to determine the relationship between the factors of integrity, organisational climate, locus of control and sense of coherence. The purpose of a canonical analysis is to determine the relationship between sets of multiple dependent and independent variables (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black 1998). Stepwise multiple regression analysis was applied in order to determine the percentage of variance in the dependent variable that is predicted by the independent variables. Effect sizes (Cohen 1988) were used to determine the significance of the findings. In the case of multiple regression the effect size was determined by the following formula (Steyn 1999):

$$f^2 = R^2 / (1-R^2)$$

A cut-off point of 0.10 (medium effect) was set for the practical significance of f^2 , with 0.35 as the large effect (Steyn 1999). Partial correlations were applied to remove the influence of a third variable in order to determine the relationship between two variables. Partial correlations also determined whether the third variable is an independent or a moderating variable. If it is an independent variable it will have a direct influence on the dependent variable, while if it is a moderating variable (intervening variable [De La Rey 1978]), it will have an indirect influence on the relationship between the two other variables (Babbie & Wagenaar 1992).

6 Analysis and results

The intercorrelations between the factors of the measuring instruments (adapted IP 200, OCQ, LOQ and adapted LOC questionnaire) are reported in Table 1.

Table 1
Intercorrelations between the factors of the adapted IP 200, OCQ, LOQ and adapted LOC questionnaires

	Integrity				Organisational climate				Dispositional factors		
	INT ₁	INT ₂	INT ₃	INT ₄	OK ₁	OK ₂	OK ₃	OK ₄	SoC	ILoC	ELOC
INT ₁ ^a	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
INT ₂	0.38*	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
INT ₃	-0.14*	0.29**	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
INT ₄	-0.41*	-0.11**	0.36*	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OK ₁	-0.02*	-0.07**	-0.40*	-0.27*	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
OK ₂	0.01*	-0.01**	-0.46*	-0.28*	0.51*	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
OK ₃	-0.08*	-0.13**	-0.30*	-0.10*	0.40*	0.41*	1.00	-	-	-	-
OK ₄	-0.13**	-0.23**	-0.18**	0.01**	0.08**	0.18**	0.21**	1.00	-	-	-
SoC	-0.33*	-0.35**	-0.07*	0.04*	-0.04*	0.09*	0.13*	0.13**	1.00	-	-
ILoC	-0.26*	-0.29**	-0.05*	-0.11*	-0.01*	0.06*	0.10*	0.17**	0.41*	1.00	-
ELOC	0.28*	0.12**	-0.11*	-0.18*	-0.07*	-0.11*	0.03*	-0.01**	-0.29*	-0.09*	1.00

^a Factor designations: INT₁: Integrity-limiting orientation; INT₂: Moral conscience and accountability; INT₃: Organisational/managerial integrity; INT₄: Lie scale; OK₁: Interpersonal climate; OK₂: Organisational support; OK₃: Supervision; OK₄: Task characteristics; SoC: Sense of coherence; ILoC: Internal locus of control, and ELoC: External locus of control. Where: * Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient and ** Spearman's correlation coefficient

Table 1 reports that, if 0.30 and 0.50 are used as the cut-off points for medium and large effects respectively (Cohen 1988), integrity-limiting orientation correlates with moral conscientiousness and accountability (0.38), the lie scale (-0.41) and sense of coherence (-0.33). Moral conscientiousness and accountability correlate with sense of coherence (-0.35), while organisational/managerial integrity correlates with the lie scale (0.36), interpersonal climate (0.40), organisational support (-0.46) and supervision (-0.30). Interpersonal climate correlates with organisational support (0.51) and supervision (0.40), while organisational support correlates with supervision (0.41).

The results of the stepwise regression analysis with the organisational climate factors (measured by the OCQ (Grobler & Steyn 2010), sense of coherence (measured by the LOQ [Antonovsky 1993]) and locus of control (measured by the adapted LOC questionnaire [Grobler 2003]) as the independent variables, and the integrity variables (integrity-limiting orientation, moral conscience and accountability and organisational/managerial integrity) measured by the adapted IP 200 (Grobler & Steyn, in press) as the dependent variable are shown in Tables 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

Table 2 shows that 22% of the variance in an integrity-limiting orientation is explained by the participants through a lack of supervision, a weak sense of coherence, a low internal and a high external locus of control. The multiple correlation coefficient of 0.47 is practically significant ($f^2 > 0.10$, medium effect) (Steyn 1999).

Table 2
Regression analysis of organisational climate factors, sense of coherence, locus of control, and integrity-limiting orientation

Variance analysis					
$R^2 = 0.22$	<i>Adapted</i> $R^2 = 0.22$	Source of variance	Degree of freedom	Sum of squares	Average squared
R = 0.47		Regression	4	39296.00	9823.98
F = 86.65	$f^2 = 0.29^*$	Residue	1213	137527.00	113.38
Variables in the comparison					
Independent variables	Parameter	Standard error	f-value	P	
Constant variable	67.70	2.92	537.24	< 0.0001	
Supervision	-0.10	0.05	4.99	0.0257	
Sense of coherence	-0.12	0.02	42.60	< 0.0001	
Internal locus of control	-0.27	0.05	32.93	< 0.0001	
External locus of control	0.41	0.04	119.94	< 0.0001	

* Practically significant, medium effect ($f^2 > 0.10$)

Table 3
Regression analysis of organisational climate factors, sense of coherence, locus of control and moral conscience and accountability

Variance analysis					
$R^2 = 0.22$	<i>Adapted</i> $R^2 = 0.22$	Source of variance	Degree of freedom	Sum of squares	Average squared
R = 0.47		Regression	5	30324.00	6064.79
F = 69.02	$f^2 = 0.28^*$	Residue	1212	106497.00	87.87
Variables in the comparison					
Independent variables	Parameter	Standard deviation	f-value	P	
Constant variable	76.84	2.71	803.29	< 0.0001	
Supervision	-0.09	0.04	4.70	0.0304	
Task characteristics	-0.40	0.07	32.23	< 0.0001	
Sense of coherence	-0.11	0.02	47.09	< 0.0001	
Internal locus of control	-0.37	0.04	78.66	< 0.0001	
External locus of control	0.10	0.03	9.75	0.0018	

* Practically significant, medium effect ($f^2 > 0.10$)

Table 3 shows that 22% of the variance in low moral conscientiousness and accountability is predicted by defective or poor supervision, as well as a negative perception of the task characteristics, poor sense of coherence, and a low internal and a high external locus of control. The multiple correlation coefficient of 0.47 is practically significant ($f^2 > 0.10$, medium effect) (Steyn 1999).

Table 4
Regression analysis of organisational climate factors, sense of coherence, locus of control and organisational/managerial integrity

Variance analysis					
$R^2 = 0.34$	<i>Adapted</i> $R^2 = 0.34$	Source of variation	Degree of freedom	Sum of squares	Average squared
R = 0.58		Regression	5	13854.00	2770.76
F = 123.84	$f^2 = 0.51^{**}$	Remaining	1212	27116.00	22.37
Variables in the comparison					
Independent variables	Parameter	Standard deviation	F	P	
Constant variable	28.53	1.49	364.23	< 0.0001	
Interpersonal climate	-0.09	0.01	83.24	< 0.001	
Organisational support	-0.14	0.01	120.39	< 0.0001	
Supervision	-0.05	0.02	4.48	0.0345	
Task characteristics	-0.19	0.04	28.37	< 0.0001	
External locus of control	-0.05	0.02	11.86	0.0006	

** Practically significant, large effect ($f^2 > 0.35$)

Table 4 shows that 34% of the variance in limited organisational/managerial integrity is predicted by a negative interpersonal climate, lack of organisational support, poor supervision, a negative perception of the task characteristics and a low external locus of control. The multiple correlation coefficient of 0.58 is practically significant ($f^2 > 0.35$, large effect) (Steyn 1999).

The results of the analysis of two pairs of canonical correlates appear in Table 5. This table contains the correlations between the variables and the canonical variates, standardised canonical coefficients, variance that is explained by the canonical variates (percentage variance), redundant variance (percentage redundant) and the canonical correlations.

Table 5
Results of the canonical analysis: organisational climate, dispositional variables and integrity

	First canonical variate		Second canonical variate	
	Correlation	Coefficient	Correlation	Coefficient
<i>Organisational climate and dispositional set</i>				
Interpersonal climate	-0.83	-0.50	0.12	0.06
Organisational support	-0.87	-0.53	0.08	0.15
Supervision	-0.55	-0.07	-0.16	-0.11
Task characteristics	-0.35	-0.15	-0.32	-0.18
Sense of coherence	-0.19	-0.12	-0.76	-0.41
Internal locus of control	0.05	0.02	-0.70	-0.46
External locus of control	-0.11	-0.06	0.62	0.44
Percentage variance	0.33		0.28	Total = 0.61
Percentage redundant	0.13		0.23	Total = 0.36
<i>Integrity set</i>				
Integrity-limiting orientation	0.08	0.38	0.80	0.57
Moral conscience and accountability	0.21	-0.19	0.77	0.66
Organisational/Managerial integrity	0.91	0.90	-0.05	-0.14
Percentage variance	0.14		0.49	Total = 0.63
Percentage redundant	0.06		0.21	Total = 0.27
Canonical correlation	0.63		0.57	

The first canonical correlation was 0.63 (40% common variance) and the second, 0.57 (32% common variance). With both canonical correlations included, $F(28, 4353.3) = 47.57$, $p < 0.0001$, and with the first canonical correlation removed, $F(18, 3417.2) = 32.77$, $p < 0.0001$. These two sets of canonical correlates therefore explain a significant relationship between the two sets of variables.

With a cut-off point of 0.30 (Hair et al 1998), interpersonal climate, organisational support, supervision and task characteristics (independent variables from the organisational climate and dispositional sets) show correlations with the set of dependent variables (integrity factors) in the first canonical variate. Organisational/managerial integrity is the variable in the integrity set (dependent variable) that shows a correlation with the set of independent variables. The first set of canonical variates indicates that a negative interpersonal climate (-0.83), a lack of organisational support (-0.87), ineffective supervision (-0.55) and a negative perception of the task characteristics (-0.35) may be associated with limited organisational and/or management integrity (0.91) (the latter factor is an inverse factor, in other words a high score indicates a negative characteristic).

Within the second canonical variate, the organisational climate and dispositional factors (independent variables) that correlate with the dependent variables (integrity factors) are task characteristics, sense of coherence, and internal and external locus of control. From the integrity set, integrity-limiting orientation and moral conscientiousness and accountability correlate with the above-mentioned independent variables in the second canonical variate. The second canonical variate indicates that negative perceptions of the task characteristics (-0.32), low sense of coherence (-0.76), a low internal locus of control (-0.70) and a high external locus of control (0.62) are associated with an integrity-limiting orientation (0.80) and limited moral conscientiousness and accountability (0.77). High scores represent negative characteristics in the last two factors.

In order to remove the influence of the dispositional variables in the relationship between organisational climate and the integrity factors, partial correlation coefficients were calculated. The results appear in Table 6.

Table 6
Partial correlations between organisational climate and integrity

	Integrity-limiting orientation	Moral conscientiousness and accountability	Organisational/managerial integrity
Interpersonal climate	-0.02 [*]	-0.07 ^{**}	-0.40 [*]
	-0.04 ^a	-0.07 ^a	-0.41 ^a
	-0.04 ^b	-0.05 ^b	-0.39 ^b
	-0.01 ^c	-0.02 ^c	-0.46 ^c
	-0.16 ^d	-0.07 ^d	-0.45 ^d
Organisational support	0.01 [*]	-0.01 ^{**}	-0.46 [*]
	0.01 ^a	-0.08 ^a	-0.46 ^a
	0.02 ^b	-0.09 ^b	-0.45 ^b
	0.03 ^c	-0.05 ^c	-0.51 ^c
	0.04 ^d	-0.09 ^d	-0.50 ^d
Supervision	-0.08 [*]	-0.13 ^{**}	-0.30 [*]
	-0.06 ^a	-0.13 ^a	-0.29 ^a
	-0.09 ^b	-0.10 ^b	-0.30 ^b
	-0.05 ^c	-0.12 ^c	-0.32 ^c
	-0.06 ^d	-0.10 ^d	-0.31 ^d
Task characteristics	-0.13 ^{**}	-0.23 ^{**}	-0.18 ^{**}
	-0.07 ^a	-0.20 ^a	-0.22 ^a
	-0.11 ^b	-0.23 ^b	-0.23 ^b
	-0.06 ^c	-0.21 ^c	-0.23 ^c
	-0.08 ^d	-0.16 ^d	-0.19 ^d

Where: * Pearson's product moment correlations coefficients; ** Spearman's correlation coefficients and a; b; c and d are the partial correlation coefficients where the influence of internal locus of control, external locus of control, sense of coherence and all the dispositional variables together is removed.

Table 6 shows that the variable that has the greatest effect on the relationship between organisational climate and integrity is the dispositional variables, taken as a collective. The correlation between integrity-limiting orientation and interpersonal climate increases from -0.02 to -0.16 (12.5%) if the joint effect of the dispositional variables (as the moderating or intervening variable [De La Rey 1978]) is removed. Over 87 percent (87.5%) can therefore be ascribed to the relationship between integrity-limiting orientation and interpersonal climate. Locus of control, sense of coherence and the dispositional variables together are therefore not moderating or intervening variables, as they do not influence the organisational climate or integrity factors.

7 Discussion

The analysis of Pearson's product moment and Spearman's correlation coefficients shows that there is undoubtedly a degree of interdependence between the dispositional, situational and integrity constructs. Integrity-limiting orientation correlates with moral conscientiousness and accountability, lie scale and sense of coherence. Moral conscientiousness and accountability correlate with sense of coherence. Both of these integrity factors can be described as individual facets (Grobler 2003; Integrity Profile 200 2000), which explains why relationships exist mainly with the dispositional factor, sense of coherence. Organisational/management integrity, which is described by Grobler (2003) and Integrity Profile 200 (2000) as a corporate facet, shows a relationship with organisational support and supervision.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis largely confirmed the results of the canonical analysis, in which an integrity-limiting orientation is explained by the lack of or poor supervision, a weak sense of coherence, and a low internal and high external locus of control (explaining 22% of the variance). Low moral conscientiousness and accountability are predicted by a lack of, or poor supervision, as well as a negative perception of the task characteristics, a low sense of coherence, and a low internal and high external locus of control (explaining 22% of the variance). These results differ from those of the canonical analysis in that both the individual integrity facets are predicted by a combination of situational and dispositional factors in the stepwise multiple regression analysis. Thirty-four percent of the variance in limited organisational/managerial integrity is predicted by a negative interpersonal climate, lack of organisational support, poor supervision as well as a negative perception of the task characteristics and a low external locus of control. As in the canonical analysis these corporate facets (Grobler 2003; Integrity Profile 200 2000) are predicted mainly by the situational (organisational climate) factors, although the dispositional factor, low external locus of control, is included through the stepwise regression analysis.

The overall results of this study therefore confirm previous work done by Bayram et al (2009), Erben and Güneşer (2008), Gottschalk (2007) and Huberts et al (2007), which concluded that integrity in a police environment is dependent on organisational and situational variables, especially good management practices and internal control mechanisms. The results also support Adeyami-Bello (2001), Aremu et al (2009), Goodman et al (2007), Lauer et al (2008), Salaki et al (2009) and Strümpfer's (1990) view that integrity is related to a person's locus of control and sense of cohesion. The reason for this is that the individual has the necessary orientation and coping mechanisms to be able to analyse and handle the stress (Adeyami-Bello 2001; Ng & Butts 2009; Srivastava 2009; Strümpfer 1990) and frustrations (Adeyami-Bello 2001; Taylor 2010) in the external environment.

The partial correlations that were calculated to remove the effect of dispositional variables, individually as well as jointly, as intervening variables on the relationship between integrity and organisational climate, showed that the dispositional variables were not moderating or intervening variables. The relationship that the dispositional variables have with the integrity factors is therefore direct and not indirect as in the case of moderating variables.

8 Conclusions

The results of this study have confirmed that the construct of integrity, as well as the causes thereof, is a very complex one. These results verify Schepers's (1995) view that

the causes of general human behaviour can be broadly divided into two categories, namely situational causes and dispositional causes. This study confirms that integrity shows a link with both situational factors (organisational climate) and dispositional factors (locus of control and sense of coherence). The results correspond with the views of Davis-Blake and Pfeffer (1989) and House et al (1996) with regard to the causes of human behaviour in general.

9 Recommendations

The development of all integrity-related initiatives in the SAPS should be a strategy with a multi-dimensional approach if it is to stand any chance whatever of success. This approach should focus on both the individual and the organisation. Integrity should be approached on a holistic level by incorporating both organisational (situational) and dispositional (personal) areas into the strategy. This could be done by addressing the members' sense of coherence, the internal locus of control and the perceived interpersonal climate, organisational support and supervision. An integrity strategy needs to convey information that is consistent, structured, ordered and understandable. Management actions should also be consistent and should be based on the SAPS Code of Ethics. Furthermore, members should be enabled to identify with their roles within the totality of policing with specific reference to community policing, in order to make it more comprehensible.

Secondly, the organisation should ensure that the members have the necessary knowledge, skills, equipment and other resources so that they can develop a sense of adequacy and self-confidence. A scientific selection system should be used to ensure that all recruits have the minimum required knowledge and skills to cope in this demanding environment.

A feeling that the work is meaningful, a positive attitude towards the work and a positive perception of the interpersonal climate and supervision will result when a participative (and consistent) management style is implemented. This participation will strengthen the members' feelings of belonging, which will help to foster a sense of coherence, and create a healthy interpersonal climate.

10 Limitations

This study has some shortcomings which should be taken into account. A cross-sectional design was used, with the result that no causal relationship between the variables could be determined over a period of time. The causal relationship was interpreted at a specific point in time, but was not determined over a period. The measurements rest on self-reporting, which can give rise to method variance, especially since the results were not verified using objective criteria. This study could be duplicated within or outside the SAPS using a sampling strategy which would result in better representation. This would allow the researcher to make more accurate and generalisable deductions.

List of references

- Adeyami-Bello, T. 2001. Validating Rotter's (1966) locus of control scale with a sample of not-for-profit leaders. *Management Research News* 24:25-34.
- Antonovsky, A. 1985. The life cycle, mental health and sense of coherence. *Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Science* 22:273-280.

- Antonovsky, A. 1987. *Unraveling the mystery of health: How people manage stress and stay well*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Antonovsky, A. 1993. The structure and properties of the Sense of Coherence Scale. *Social Science and Medicine* 36:725-733.
- Appelbaum, SH & Hare, A. 1996. Self-efficacy as mediator of goal setting and performance: Some human resource applications. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 11:33-47.
- Aremu, AO, Pakes, F & Johnston, L. 2009. Locus of control and self-efficacy as means of tackling police corruption in Nigeria. *International Journal of Police Science and Management* 11(1):97-107.
- Arslan, C, Dilmaç, B & Hamatra, E. 2009. Coping with stress and trait anxiety in terms of locus of control: A study with Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality* 37(6):791-800.
- Babbie, E & Wagonar, TC. 1992. *Practicing social research*. 6th edition. Belmont, DC: Wadsworth.
- Benson, B. 2010. Police corruption: What is the plan? *Acta Academia* 42(1):188-208.
- Bayram, R, Gursakal, N & Bilgel, N. 2009. Counterproductive work behavior among white-collar employees: A study from Turkey. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 17(2):180-188.
- Clark, L A & Watson, D. 1995. Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment* 7:309-319.
- Cleary, T A & Hilton, T L. 1968. An investigation of item bias. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 28:61-75.
- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical power analysis for behavioral science*. Revised edition. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Congress of the US. 1990. *The use of integrity tests for pre-employment screening*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Davis-Blake, A & Pfeffer, J. 1989. Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organisational research. *Academy of Management Review* 14:385-400.
- D'Amato, A & Zijlstra, FRH. 2008. Psychological climate and individual factors as antecedents of work outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 17(1):33-54.
- De la Rey, RP. 1978. *Statistiese metodes in sielkundige navorsing*. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Erben, GS & Güneşer, AB. 2008. The relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment: Investigating the role of climate regarding ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics* 82:955-968.
- Eriksson, M & Lindstrom, B. 2005. Validity of the Antonovsky's sense of coherence scale: A systematic review. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 60(5):460-466.
- Evans, WP, March, SC & Weigel, DJ. 2009. Promoting adolescent sense of coherence: Testing models of risk, protection and resiliency. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 20:30-43.
- Fick, L. 2001. IP 200: Premises – Assumptions. Unpublished report.
- Field, RHG & Abelson, JG. 1982. Climate: A reconceptualization and proposed model. *Human Relations* 35:181-201.

- French, WL & Bell, CH. 1984. *Organizational development: Behavioral science interventions for organizational improvement*. 3rd edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- French, WL & Bell, CH. 1999. *Organizational development: Behavioral science interventions for organizational improvement*. 6th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Goodman, W, Leggett, J & Garrett, T. 2007. Locus of control in offenders and alleged offenders with learning disabilities. *British journal of Learning Disabilities* 35: 192-197.
- Gottschalk, P. 2007. Organizational culture as determinant of enterprise information systems used in police investigations. *Enterprise Information Systems* 1(4):443-455.
- Gottschalk, P. 2010. Crime-based survey instrument for police integrity measurement. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 33(91):56-68.
- Gouws, LA, Louw, DA, Meyer, WF & Plug, C. 1997. *Verklarende en vertalende sielkunde woordeboek*. 3rd edition. Pretoria: McGraw-Hill.
- Grobler, A. 2003. Die rol van organisasieklimaat en dispositionele veranderlikes op integriteit in die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisiediens (SAPD). Unpublished PhD Thesis: Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education (PU for CHE).
- Grobler, A & Steyn, R (in press). A psychometric evaluation of the Integrity Profile 200 (IP 200) and the adaptation thereof for use in the South African Police Service. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Grobler, A & Steyn, R. 2010. The construction of an Organisational Climate questionnaire for the South African Police Service. Paper delivered at the 1st International Conference on Leadership and Management for Sustainable Development, Pretoria, South Africa, October.
- Hair, FF, Anderson, RE, Tatham, RL & Black, WC. 1998. *Multivariate data analysis*. 5th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hertzog, S. 2000. Deviant organizational messages among suspect police officers in Israel. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 23:416-438.
- Hittner, JB. 2007. Factorial invariance of the 13-item sense of coherence scale across gender. *Journal of Health Psychology* 12(2):273-280.
- House, RJ, Shane, SA & Harrold, DM. 1996. Rumours of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. *Academy of Management Review* 21:203-224.
- Huberts, LGJC, Kaptein, M & Lasthuizen, K. 2007. A study of the impact of three leadership styles on integrity violations committed by police officers. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 30(4):587-607.
- Integrity Profile 200. 2000. Integrity Profile 200: Users' manual & various validity studies. Unpublished technical report.
- Isaksen, S.G., Lauer, K.J., Ekvall, G. & Britz, A. (2001). Perceptions of the best and worst climates for creativity: Preliminary validation evidence for the Situational Outlook Questionnaire. *Creativity Research Journal*, 13:171-184.
- Kalimo, R & Vuori, J. 1990. Work and sense of coherence: Resources for competence and life satisfaction. *Behavioural Medicine* 16:76-89.
- Kaptein, M & Van Reenen, P. 2001. Integrity management in police organizations. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 24:281-300.

- Kinman, G. 2008. Work stressors, health and sense of coherence in UK academic employees. *Educational Psychology* 28(7):823-835.
- Klepp, OM, Mastekaasa, A, Sørensen, T, Sandanger, I & Kleiner, R. 2007. Structure analysis of Antonovsky's sense of coherence from an epidemiological mental health survey with a brief nine-item sense of coherence scale. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research* 19(1):11-22.
- Lauer, S, De Man, AF, Marquez, S & Ades, J. 2008. External locus of control, problem-focused coping and attempted suicide. *North American Journal of Psychology* 10(3):625-632.
- Lawrence, RJ, Choi, CC, Ko, CE, McNeil, PK, Minton, MK, Wright, MA & Kim, K. 2008. Organizational and psychological climate: A review of theory and research. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 17(1):5-32.
- Lee, M & Vaughn, MS. 2010. Organisational factors that contribute to police deadly force liability. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38:193-206.
- Luo, Y. 2004. An organizational perspective on corruption. *Management and Organizational Review* 1(1):119-154.
- Merkys, G, Kalinauskaitė, R & Eitutyte, D. 2007. New test for organizational climate assessment: validation and test-re-test analysis. *Organizacijų Vadyba: Sisteminių Tyrimai* 42:57-68.
- Miller, S. 2010. Integrity systems and professional reporting in police organisations. *Criminal Justice Ethics* 29(3):241-257.
- Mohapatra, M & Gupta, A. 2010. Relationship of emotional intelligence with work values and internal locus of control: A study of managers in a public organization. *Vilakshan, XIMB Journal of Management*, September:1-20.
- Murphy, KR. 1995. Integrity testing, in *Psychology and Policing*, edited by N Brewer & C Wilson. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum:205-228.
- Ng, TWH & Butts, MM. 2009. Effectiveness of organizational efforts to lower turnover intentions: The moderating role of employee locus of control. *Human Resource Management* 48(2):289-310.
- Nunnally, JC & Bernstein, IH. 1994. *Psychometric theory*. 3rd edition. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Ralston, ES & Chadwick, SA. 2010. An empirical exploration of the dimensionality of inter-employee trust in police organizations. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* 33(3):431-451.
- Reber, AS. 1995. *Psychological Dictionary*. London: Penguin.
- Rothmann, S. 2000. Sense of coherence, locus of control, self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Paper delivered at the 28th International Congress of Psychology, Stockholm, Sweden, July.
- Rotter, JB. 1966. Generalised expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs* 80:1-28.
- Salaki, M, Kanellaki, S & Richardson, C. 2009. Is a manipulator's externality paradoxical? The relationship between Machiavellianism, economic opportunities and external locus of control. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 39(911): 2591-2603.
- SAS Institute. (2000). *The SAS system for Windows: Release 8.01*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute.
- Schafer, JA & Martinelli, TJ. 2008. First-line supervisor's perceptions of police integrity: The measurement of police integrity revisited. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 31(2):306-323.

- Schafer, JA. 2010. Effective leaders and leadership in policing: Traits, assessment, development and expansion. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 33(4):644-663.
- Schepers, JM. 1995. *Die lokus van beheer vraelys: Konstruksie en evaluering van 'n nuwe meetinstrument*. Unpublished report. RAU, Johannesburg.
- Sellbom, M, Fischler, GL & Ben-Porath, YS. 2007. Identify the MMPI-2 predictors of police officer integrity and misconduct. *Criminal Justice Behavior* 34(8):985-1004.
- Shaughnessy, J J & Zechmeister, EB. 1997. *Research methods in psychology*. 4th edition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Simons, TL. 1999. Behavioral integrity as a critical ingredient for transformational leadership. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 12:30-45.
- Singh, AP & Dubey, AK. 2011. Role of stress and locus of control in job satisfaction among middle managers. *The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior* X(1):42-56.
- Srivastava, S. 2009. Locus of control as moderator for relationship between organisational role stress and managerial effectiveness. *The Journal of Business Perspective* 13(4):49-61.
- Steyn, HS. 1999. *Praktiese betekenissvolheid: Die gebruik van effekgroottes*. Scientific contributions. Series B: Natural Sciences No 117. Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University.
- Strijdom, G. 1999. *Selfmoordgeneigdheid: 'n Bedryfsielkundige ondersoek binne die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisiediens in die Noordwes-provinsie*. Unpublished Master's dissertation, Potchefstroom University, Potchefstroom.
- Strümpfer, DJW. 1990. Salutogenesis: A new paradigm. *South African Journal of Psychology* 20:265-276.
- Strümpfer, DJW, Danana, N, Gouws, JF & Viviers, MR. 1998. Personality dispositions and job satisfaction. *South African Journal of Psychology* 28:92-100.
- Taylor, M. 2010. Does locus of control predict young adult conflict strategies with superiors? An examination of control orientation and the organizational communication conflict instrument. *North American Journal of Psychology* 12(3): 445-458.
- Treviño-Rodríguez, RN. 2007. Integrity: A systems theory classification. *Journal of Management History* 13(1):74-93.
- Tsai, M & Huang, C. 2008. The relationship among ethical climate types, facets of job satisfaction, and the three components of organizational commitment: A study of nurses in Japan. *Journal of Business Ethics* 80:565-581.
- Van Aswegen, AS & Engelbrecht, AS. 2009. The relationship between transformational leadership, integrity and an ethical climate in organisations. *SA Journal for Human Resource Management* 7(1):221-229.
- Van de Vijver, F & Leung, K. 1997. *Methods and data-analysis for cross-cultural research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Van Wijk, C. 2008. The resilience of naval specialists: their sense of coherence and its relationship with measures of personality. *South African Journal of Psychology* 38(4):737-751.
- Weber, WG, Unterrainer, C & Schmid, BE. 2009. The influence of organizational democracy on employees' social-moral climate and prosocial behavioural orientations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 30:1127-1149.

- Wright, B. 2010. Civilization the "blue code"? An examination of attitudes to misconduct in the police extended family. *International Journal of Police Science and Management* 12(3):339-356.
- Wolfe, SE & Piquero, AR. 2011. Organizational justice and police misconduct. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour* (in press).