THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Police Deviance as Viewed by the Thai Public and Police

Vatt Bankoson

Researcher, Royal Thai Police, Bangkok, Thailand

Abstract:

The research purposes were to 1) explore public views of police deviance 2) investigate police views of police deviance, and 3) realize the difference of police deviance views between the public and police. The methods involved questionnaires gathered from the public and police officers nationwide. The results showed the visions about police deviance viewed by police administration monitoring committees as the public and police officers at a moderate level. As main types, organisational deviance/OrD, occupational deviance/OcD, and abusive authority/AA has highlighted the subsidiary types that multiplicity of organisational structures and biased promotion for relatives, parties or subordinates in OrD, supports for illegal gambling and entertainment complexes and takes of a lot of cases to investigate, but breakdown to summarize them in time in OcD, and use of aggressive speeches, screams and threats to suspects, workmates, subordinates, families and others in AA were among the highest problems. The police deviance views difference between the public and police was statistically significant. The guidelines of resolve and prevention of police deviance were suggested.

Keywords: Police deviance dimension, organisational deviance, occupational deviance, abusive authority, police administration monitoring committee

1. Introduction

Police organisations from metropolitan police departments to rural sheriff stations have a rather local phenomenon with mobile galleries, homeless shelters, and more social service and order maintenance than law enforcement and crime detection and control (Corsianos, 2012). With rising crime rates and a series of police corruption and police scandals, a warm relationship between police officers and citizens has developed into sources of police crime and deviance. Patrol officers and detectives would be offered products, services, freebies, bribes and other gratification to lure the officer's benevolence and cooperation; otherwise, the vibrant stuff have turned a blind eye toward illegal activities committed by citizens. This deviance has led to a distance between the public and police where patrols were part of everyday life (INSPEC2T, 2016).

Young middle-class males were joining a police force to have their job security and salary benefits, their opportunities to help disadvantaged people, their desires to enforce the law, and dare to battle crimes. There was no strong sign for authoritative personality to attract people in police work. Measures of power and authority were among the least important factors to have influenced personnel motivations. Among cultural differences, job security and steady salary were found to be the highest motivating factors (Tarng et al., 2001; Moon & Hwang, 2004; Raganella & White, 2004; Foley et al., 2008; Wu et al., 2009). Along the way to leadership, a guiltless patrol may be dismissed during the first year of probation, from the middle of career path, and near the retirement sessions if binding with deviant temptations.

Police operations can be investigated by police administration monitoring committees as the public, which is selected from public experts in various areas such as good governance, criminal justice, social development and human security, cultural religion, education and training, medical public health, mass communication, tourism promotion, hotel and service management, financial commerce, handicraft and industry, agriculture, and activist agents from non-profit organisations (National Police Policy Board, 2006). The public committee responds to practice guidelines and policies for police development and administration, provide advice and recommendations for police cooperation, receive public complaints about police deviance and public requirements, appoint subcommittees, working groups or advisors to serve a particular assignment especially to examine, monitor, evaluate and promote the performance of police officers and police units, give advice and help support the public relations of police events, and report the operational duties to the National Police Policy Board (2008). It is obviously seen that police administration monitoring committees will strengthen a good relationship and better understanding between the public and police.

Bias to violate rules and regulations, shame on an outlaw face, suppression to do against police operations, destruction within police organisation and the relations between police and the public, as well as silence running across the land, have been in disputes. Among moral problems, deviant regulations are dangerous issues against the subculture of police organisation, occupation, and authority. Deviant policing is very hard, so measuring those moral dilemmas on police routine and public service should be on a study about police deviance (Punch, 2000; Miller, 2003; Son & Rome, 2004).

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Research Structure

Three natures of police deviance can be arranged. Organisational deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995) assigns performance deviance, property deviance, political deviance, and personal aggression. Occupational deviance (Barker & Carter, 1986) answers the groupings of police corruption and misconduct. Police corruption examines criminal acts during career commission benefitting either suspicious officers/stakeholders, whereas police misconduct involves the violations of policies and values. Abusive authority (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1993) embodies police actions with/without motive, intent, and hatred about to injure, insult, intrude upon human dignity, show moods of weakness, and otherwise violate a legal right of others, such as physical, psychological and legal exploitation.

Due to opposite directions of individuals, and extended from minor to severe damages, police organisational deviance can be viewed. Police on duty violate the organisational norms set as a social outline, blur the contexts useful for the workplace and operations, end the regulations necessary for moral management, and destroy the relationships moving persons, groups and organisation. Workplace officers are likely to lack inspiration in observing organisational norms and regulations (Bennett & Robinson, 2000, 2003). Some actions violating the norms are pointed out as minor deviance such as nepotism and some are prepared as serious disorders such as property and aggressive crime. Various terms of organisational deviance were outward as organisation misbehaviour (Vardi & Wiener, 1996), antisocial behaviour (Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly, 1998), incivility behaviour (Cortina et al., 2001), or else counterproductive behaviour (Fox & Spector, 2005).

Performance deviance surges minor damages in organisational work, declining work support such as short work-stay, fake workload, long luncheon, slow effort, and resource waste. These actions irritate negative impacts on police organisational development. With technology, cyberloafing also wastes the times at work (Lim, 2002; Kidwell & Martin, 2005; Shahzad & Mahmood, 2012). Property deviance raises serious damages that security officers take/destroy portable workplace objects without informing superiors, such as damaging equipment, stealing bills, and claiming accounts to get refunds (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Bennett & Robinson, 2003). Political deviance emphasizes awareness in social interaction placing losers at a personal/political disadvantage (Bennett & Robinson, 2003), such as party favoritism, colleague gossiping, non-beneficial competition (Hollinger & Clark, 1982), and also absenteeism and intentional mistakes (Everton et al., 2005). And personal aggression involves hostile acts against personnel and organisations such as sexual harassment, rape, harm and threat towards other partners (Hollinger, 1982).

Powers on the loss of public dignity and trust in hometown policing, behavioural correction, security management, law enforcement and criminal justice allow police occupational deviance (Barker & Carter, 1994). Criminal and noncriminal deviance annoys the activities of police personnel that violate norms, values, and ethics, regarding the situations of which police officers tend to do under the areas of occupation, and yields improper practices (Kappeler et al., 2010).

The issues of job descriptions within unchanging responsibilities happened the occupational deviance. Varied with heavy workloads, police officers attempt an amount of paperwork due to excessive bureaucracy, which prolongs the process of redundant rules, preventing all proceedings from being done promptly. The antisocial police shift factor has unpredictable overtime and overnight working. The official procedure under endless pressures and regular disagreements that prevent job performance and hinder supervisory daily requests require prior attention (Ainsworth, 2002; Garcia et al., 2004; Kirschman, 2007; Noblet et al., 2009; Reiner, 2010; Shane, 2010; Scaramella et al., 2011; Turnbull & Wass, 2012).

Police occupational deviance according to Barker (1994) reveals police corruption and misconduct that disturbs the length of service for immoral manners. That is the reason why police department heads and public safety leaders work together to develop the prime sanctions for dropping police occupational deviance through socially responsible lawsuits (Alston, 2010).

Police corruption must be a waste of rank and position for any personal, expected or unexpected material or spirited payment or benefit. Linked to moral problems, police corruption becomes one of the most possible threats to police organisations. Not only breaking the moral judgment and the institutional image,

police corruption also reinforces the sense of terror and insecurity among the public (Lynch, 2017). Police corruption are provided as corruptive authority (free meals and drinks during foot patrols), opportunistic theft (belongings of victims and injuries), shakedown (money/valuables of criminal seizures), internal payoff (paid off-days and inaction of works), and kickback (money, goods, and services for referring business to stakeholders).

Police misconduct as deprived and illegal actions taken by police officers regards their unauthorised duties, leads to a mistake of morality, and involves bias and unlawful reasons of special weakness shared as a barrier of justice (Prenzler, 2004). If the public seem unsure about the charges of police misconduct, their attitudes will be deep-rooted in their attachment to the passive laws and regulations. Views of misconduct among the disadvantaged show their desires to gain better treatment from police and increase their support for police reforms (Weitzer & Tuch, 2004). The harms against criminal and civil laws by police and other public service agencies involve falsification, alcoholism and laziness, support to vice operations, and assistance to criminals.

Abusive authority (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1993) embraces actions by police officers with/without reason, intent, or hatred to injure, insult, or intrude human dignity, show feelings of inferiority towards others, and violate legal and human rights in acting efficient and effective police operation. Police abusive authority has spawned extreme danger for public trust and confidence, reduced powerful resources, lowered respectful morale, civil disorder, negative public relations, and national conflict (Ashley & Golles, 2000; Cao & Huang; 2000; Burger, 2011; Spector, 2011).

The areas of abusive power involve police abusive authority: physical abuse that makes a slight attack, psychological abuse that hurts people with mocks, and legal abuse that use laws to threaten others. An excessive amount to force tensions against the public regards the use of force and violence. Police officers that have general, inexperienced and long-term personality have suddenly showed disorderly, selfish, bad-tempered, and abusive tendencies. Sexual abuse mostly ensues between superiors and subordinates that have serious personal problems, especially in separation, divorce, and marriage loss issues. The aggression of abusive authority stands among human rights abuse that has the lack of accountability and repeated impossibility to protect people (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1993; Barker, 1994; Scrivner, 1994; Human Rights Watch, 1998; Reno et al., 1999; Amnesty International, 2013).

2.2. Analysis of Deviance Dimension

Police work has warned bias in making issues, decisions and actions. Young policemen have been reported to beat urban drug users (Hayashi et al., 2013). A motorbike patrol blasts mood towards the public who post the online hate expressions. Police let suppression in attacking suspects by giving tortures without leaving marks. Many severe pains would be increased and more actions abused to push lawbreakers to surrender. Victims of deviance did not show any obvious wounds but shocking internal swelling (Thai Rath Online, 2015; Kaewkerd, 2017). A police interrogator has detained a court defendant in a correctional area without legal rights to further keeping in a rehabilitation process. A provincial officer has disrupted criminal justice rights when stunning the exact wrongdoer but having another victim in prison. Police have also intruded the rights of a drug-alleged migrant worker against his working life when a metropolitan inspector sent an oral testimony of the alien worker to the given examiner. Allegedly, both interrogator and examiner have no plaintiff reports of the said ear-hurt worker to the authorised crime case owner (Office of Police Commission, 2010; Police Disciplines Division, 2010; Office of Ombudsman, 2018).

Figure 1: Police Deviance Dimension No.1

The researcher has developed police deviance dimension No.1 (See Figure 1), demonstrated as organisational deviance (OrD), occupational deviance (OcD) and abusive authority (AA) and spread it into another status in various details. To bead police deviance in organisation, occupation and authority as main types, the researcher has displayed police deviance dimension No.2 (See Figure 2), to be an illustration of police deviance as a whole (Roebuck and Barker, 1974; Robinson and Bennett, 1995, 1997; Roberg and Kuykendall, 1993).

Figure 2: Police Deviance Dimension No.2

OrD has involved performance deviance, property deviance, and political deviance. OcD has spanned corruptive authority (taking free stuff as meals, drinks, etc. or money during patrols), opportunistic theft (grabbing things in accidents or crime scenes), shakedown (seizure of money or valuables of criminals), internal payoff (getting paid off-days despite inaction of works), kickback (receiving goods, money or percentage for referring business to entrepreneurs/stakeholders), protective illegal activities (support to vice operations such as prostitution, arms smuggling, human trafficking, etc.), fix (assistance to criminals), flaking/padding (falsification of evidences), and alcoholism and laziness. And AA has entailed physical and psychological abuse, use of force and violence, legal abuse, sexual abuse and human rights abuse. Shared with examples of complaints from large police stations, the researcher has synthesized a new paradigm.

Figure 3: Police Deviance Dimension No.3 – Organisational Deviance

Police deviance dimension have emerged in three settings in which the public have been worried about and criminal courts have made a decision on these problems. The subsidiary types in OrD, OcD and AA have been poured into various parts. The first main type (See Figure 3) is about OrD. Political deviance is separated into the multiplicity of organisational structures which is the bias of high-ends administration that extends other career paths longer. In case, a police officer must stay in many ranks and positions to get a higher salary. Or else, politicians and superiors give biased promotion for policing relatives, parties and subordinates. Performance deviance is divided into a lack of attentive operations during works such as using mobile phones, playing online games or Internet; waste of energy and materials such as making wrong paper photocopy without two-sided copying or without using recycled paper; no extra knowledge and technology desired for

works such as no knowledge about basic laws for the public, communicative English for international tourists, or even no additional study of basic computer; and laziness in providing public services such as going for a long luncheon, neglect of long queues for the people who contact government offices, and end of services despite official times. And property deviance is parted into careless use of official items such as driving cars and motorcycles, or using radio transmitters extremely until damage with selling bids or returning solution; takes of government assets for personal use such as bringing Tables, chairs and computers at personal households or using fuel at personal transportations; and wrong claims of official benefits such as making a draw of allowances, transportations and accommodations regardless of legal rights.

Figure 4: Police Deviance Dimension
No.3 – Occupational Deviance

The second main type of police deviance (See Figure 4) is about OcD. Flaking/padding is separated into no registration of new or donated official items such as giving computers, printers, laptops, mobile phones and fax machines without issuing registration and painting shiny codes of numbers on the articles; or else, distortion of bidding documents in official events such as holding auctions, procurements and renovations with false documents. Corruptive authority is divided into takings of freebies such as getting money, meals, drinks, services, etc., during operational works or patrols. Shakedown is parted into arrests of traffic act perpetrators with grabs of money for their own fines, a release of suspects without issuing receipts and no daily records, and takes of suspect's properties before sending him into prison, without making logbooks, and without returning the belongings to the accused when released. Kickback is detached into takes of benefits beyond the law terms during events such as handling auctions, procurements and renovations with money from participants. Opportunistic theft is branched into takings of victim's or injury's properties in the crime scenes without returning them to the owners. Internal payoff is diverged into receipts of guard duty's payment and without a changing statement. Alcoholism is split into drinking of liquor in offices or while working on duty. Protective illegal activities are shared into supports for entrepreneurs running illegal gambling and entertainment complexes. Fix is segregated into supports for the accused to escape the criminal case with the orders of politicians or high-end executives. And laziness is separated into takes of a lot of cases to investigate, but breakdown to summarise them in time.

Figure 5: Police Deviance Dimension
No.3 – Abusive Authority

The third main type of police deviance (See Figure 5) is about AA. Physical and psychological abuse is separated into the use of aggressive speeches, screams and threats to suspects, workmates, subordinates, families and others, and also head blow, face slap, ear beat, or any physical torture to suspects, workmates, families and others. Use of force and violence is removed into physical attacks to hurt, bruise and sore, head drowning or electricity shockwave to the accused and others. Legal abuse is disunited into a decision to dismiss a criminal charge because of scarce evidence, and also use of laws in the wrong way such as making false charges and wrong fines. Sexual abuse is marked into the abuse of suspects, workmates, subordinates and others, and also sexual affairs with suspects, workmates and others. Human rights abuse is partitioned into quarantine and detention of suspects in police stations for a long time beyond the law limits, and also persuasion, provocation and mobilisation to public masses to cause terror and disunity within society.

2.3. Previous Study

Police officers have showed an important role in a law enforcement agency. Their duties are required to deter criminal activities, handle community policing (Blanes i Vidal & Mastrobuoni, 2018), respond to rapid calls for service, make immediate arrests (Mastrobuoni, 2015; Blanes i Vidal & Kirchmaier, 2018), issue speeding tickets (Quintanar, 2017), investigate crime cases (MacDonald, Klick & Grunwald, 2015; Heaton et al., 2016), and go to a witness testimony in criminal justice (Thompson, 2012). Police officers are essentially good, thorough and devoted personnel who serve the public and community and protect public lives and properties (United Nations, 2004; Thomas et al., 2015). However, devious actions endanger public trust for police to intervene in a serious situation (Yildiz, 2001) and destroy images of organisation, occupation and authority (Heib, 2013). Police are responsible for their actions and likewise breakdowns to act (Schafer, 2010). Police criminal injustice mostly victimised the desire of those segments of society, given the motives driving police problems such as unlawful stops, searches, arrests, planting of evidence, false reports, and perjured testimony (Goldschmidt, 2008).

Police deviance dismisses the invention of workplace culture when the efficiency and effectiveness of police occupation and the information of police authority for public expectation have revealed a much more disgrace. The public have suffered a pattern of police-authorized power (ICRC, 2015) enforcing more political and personal aggression, within law enforcement, correction, and criminal justice, by damage and detention of crime victims against security management (Gonzalez, 2014). Negative powers of police deviance such as temporary suspension and permanent dismissal from security forces have reduced the number and performance of police officers serving their surroundings (Power, 2015).

Police force and violence has been a blaming indicator at the sense of citizen distrust (Cao & Huang, 2000; Trochmann & Gover, 2016). Head officials relating policing abused their power and privileges, manipulated information while engaging in varying treatment of internal and external districts, put their interests above those of their personnel and the public, and missed to solve improper mistakes or accept social responsibility for moral disappointments (Johnson, 2003). To prevent future efforts of police deviance, views of the public and police towards police deviance should be of highrise importance.

3. Methodology

Police deviance suggests some moral problems in the police operation, public service, and moral judgment. To draw the understandings of police deviance helps to promote police morale, since police operate the approved duties to serve the public and simultaneously to preserve their integrity. The outcome of the research can be implied for police decision-makers to a guideline for prevention and resolve of moral problems.

In this study, 500 police administration monitoring committees as the public and 500 police officers selected in stratified random sampling from 50 police stations nationwide were invited to answer questionnaires. The reason for selecting police administration monitoring committees because they are public experts in numerous zones that examine, monitor, evaluate and promote the performance of police officers and police organisations and for selecting police officers nationwide because they work in police stations to reduce crimes in environments and protect public lives and properties. The survey instrument was developed by analysing previous studies, reviewing public complaints on police misbehaviours, and then interviewing police heads in Bangkok Metropolitan stations. The draft questionnaires took about 30 minutes in 2 groups to be done with the researcher explaining the details to the respondents and checking the thoroughness of questionnaires before gathering the data. The inquiries entail three parts: Part One – 8 items of general information, Part Two – 30 items of police deviance issues, and Part Three – 5 items of open-ended questions.

The questionnaire items were validated by types of validity and reliability. The researcher shaped questionnaires on moral problems, approved by a philosophical doctor in law and criminal justice at Royal Thai Police, and then tested for content validity of the suitability of language usage and index of item-objective

congruence (IOC) in questionnaires by five experts in law enforcement, criminal justice, crime prevention and detection, sociology, and police administration.

To detect the main and subsidiary types of police deviance, IOC (Rovinelli and Hambleton, 1977: 49-60) has been used. After the manipulation of expert decisions, one of the three values, +1, 0, and -1, was acknowledged. The value +1 shows that the expert settles the idea relevant to the question. The value 0 shows that the expert hesitantly approves the idea relevant to the question. The value -1 shows that the expert visibly endorses the idea irrelevant to the question. After making the summary of five experts, 30 items were > 0.5 , then the researcher enhanced those questions to a more brief and strong language to reach the expert remarks. After gaining the questions with IOC > 0.5 , the researcher made reliability with two pilot groups of 15 police administration monitoring committees as the public and 15 police officers, of which those were not the general sampling, to determine the innovative potential of research materials. Alpha coefficient of internal consistency (Cronbach, 1951) was used to ensure the validity of and to show the amount of error in each question. As the estimate of reliability increases, the element of an item of error scores will be decreasing. The closer Cronbach's alpha coefficient is to 1.0, the greater the internal consistency of the items is interpreted.

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient (α)	Internal Consistency
≥ 0.9	Excellent
≥ 0.8	Good
≥ 0.7	Suitable
≥ 0.6	Ambiguous
≥ 0.5	Poor
< 0.5	unsuitable

Table 1: Rules of Thumb for Validating Reliability Coefficient

With the Rules of Thumb (See Table 1), proposed by George and Mallery (2003: 231), the reliability coefficient of all 30 item scores measured from the pilot groups equals 0.98, which designates an excellent internal consistency of research instruments.

Deviance Levels	Verbal Reading	Interval Scale
5	Extreme	4.51 – 5.00
4	High	3.51 – 4.00
3	Serious	2.51 – 3.00
2	Moderate	1.51 – 2.00
1	Low	1.00 – 1.50
0	Unsure	0

Table 2: Interpretations of Five Point Scale

Interpretations of Five Point Scale (Likert, 1932) (See Table 2) was used to regulate the mean score levels of police deviance as viewed by police administration monitoring committees as the public and police officers.

4. Results

The results of questionnaires have showed that the data were collected and returned 100% thoroughly. Police administration monitoring committees as the public and police officers answered all 30 items and viewed police deviance in exact diverse thoughts.

Main Types of Police Deviance	Views			
	The Public (n = 500)		Police Officers (n = 500)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Organisational Deviance	2.50	.77	2.52	.85
Occupational Deviance	2.06	.82	1.92	.84
Abusive Authority	1.70	.79	1.53	.74
Total	2.08	.72	1.99	.73

Table 3: Public and Police Views towards the Main Types of Police Deviance

Police deviance (See Table 3) viewed by the public was at a moderate level ($M = 2.08$, $SD = 0.72$). Considering the main types for the public, organisational deviance was the highest problem ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 0.77$), pursued by occupational deviance ($M = 2.06$, $SD = 0.82$) and abusive authority as the lowest problem ($M = 1.70$, $SD = 0.79$). In variation, police deviance, viewed by police officers was at a moderate level ($M = 1.99$, $SD = 0.73$). Considering the main types for the police, organisational deviance was the highest problem ($M = 2.52$, $SD = 0.86$), pursued by occupational deviance ($M = 1.92$, $SD = 0.84$) and abusive authority as the lowest problem ($M = 1.53$, $SD = 0.74$).

Subsidiary Types of Organisational Deviance (OrD)	Views			
	The Public (n = 500)		Police Officers (n = 500)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Multiplicity of organisational structures: rank, position, salary, etc.	3.10	1.11	3.18	1.17
2. Lack of attentive operations during works: mobile, game, Internet, etc.	2.53	.99	2.54	1.10
3. Waste of energy and materials: wrong photocopy, no two-sided copying, no recycled paper, etc.	2.43	1.05	2.44	1.08
4. No extra knowledge and technology desired for works: laws for the public, English for tourists, basic computer, etc.	2.71	1.09	2.75	1.09
5. Laziness in providing public services: long luncheon, neglect of long queues, end of services, etc.	2.20	1.02	2.11	1.01
6. Careless use of official items: cars, motorcycles, radio transmitters, etc. until damage with selling bids or returning solution.	2.31	1.05	2.30	1.13
7. Takes of government assets for personal use: tables, chairs, computers, fuel, etc.	2.00	1.02	2.01	1.18
8. Wrong claims of official benefits: allowances, transportations, accommodations, etc.	2.25	1.09	2.18	1.20
9. Biased promotion for relatives, parties or subordinates by the orders of politicians and superiors.	2.93	1.33	3.21	1.50
Total	2.50	.77	2.52	.85

Table 4: Public and Police Views towards the Subsidiary Types of Organisational Deviance

Police organisational deviance (See Table 4) viewed by the public was at a moderate level ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 0.77$). Considering the subsidiary types for the public, multiplicity of police organisational structures was the highest problem ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.11$), pursued by biased promotion for relatives, parties or subordinates by the orders of politicians and superiors ($M = 2.93$, $SD = 1.33$) and takes of government assets for personal use as the lowest problem ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.02$). In variation, police organisational deviance, viewed by police officers was at the serious level ($M = 2.52$, $SD = 0.85$). Considering the subsidiary types for the police, biased promotion for relatives, parties or subordinates by the orders of politicians and superiors was the highest problem ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 1.50$), pursued by multiplicity of police organisational structures ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 1.17$) and takes of government assets for personal use as the lowest problem ($M = 2.01$, $SD = 1.18$).

Subsidiary Types of Occupational Deviance (OcD)	Views			
	The Public (n = 500)		Police Officers (n = 500)	
	M	SD	M	SD
10. No registration of official items: computers, printers, laptops, mobile phones, fax machines, etc.	2.05	1.03	2.10	1.12
11. Takings of freebies: money, meals, drinks, services, etc. during patrols.	2.31	1.10	2.06	1.13
12. Arrests of traffic act perpetrators with grabs for their own fines, a suspect release without issuing receipts and no daily records.	2.22	1.17	1.96	1.11
13. Takes of benefits beyond the law terms during events: auctions, procurements, renovations, etc.	1.97	1.00	1.88	1.05
14. Takings of victim's or injury's properties in the crime scenes without returning them to the owners.	1.77	.98	1.64	.93
15. Takes of suspect's properties before sending him into prison, without logbooks, and without returning the belongings to the accused when released.	1.83	.98	1.69	.95
16. Receipts of guard duty's payment and without a changing statement.	2.05	1.08	2.08	1.15
17. Distortion of bidding documents in official events: auctions, procurements, renovations, etc.	1.73	.93	1.62	.89
18. Drinking of liquor in offices or while on duty.	1.90	1.01	1.69	.92
19. Supports for illegal gambling and entertainment complexes.	2.35	1.12	2.07	1.15
20. Supports for the accused to escape the case with the orders of politicians or high-end executives.	2.29	1.20	1.98	1.18
21. Takes of a lot of cases to investigate, but breakdown to summarise them in time.	2.32	1.06	2.30	1.18
Total	2.06	.82	1.92	.84

Table 5: Public and Police Views towards the Subsidiary Types of Occupational Deviance

Police occupational deviance (See Table 5) viewed by the public was at a moderate level ($M = 2.06$, $SD = 0.82$). Considering the subsidiary types for the public, supports for illegal gambling and entertainment complexes were the highest problem ($M = 2.35$, $SD = 1.12$), pursued by takes of a lot of cases to investigate, but breakdown to summarise them in time ($M = 2.32$, $SD = 1.06$) and distortion of bidding documents in official events as the lowest problem ($M = 1.73$, $SD = 0.93$). In variation, police occupational deviance, viewed by police officers was at a moderate level ($M = 1.92$, $SD = 0.84$). Considering the subsidiary types for the police, takes of a lot of cases to investigate, but breakdown to summarise them in time were the highest problems ($M = 2.30$, $SD = 1.18$), pursued by no registration of official items ($M = 2.10$, $SD = 1.12$) and distortion of bidding documents in official events as the lowest problem ($M = 1.62$, $SD = 0.89$).

Subsidiary Types of Abusive Authority (AA)	Views			
	The Public (n = 500)		Police Officers (n = 500)	
	M	SD	M	SD
22. Use of aggressive speeches, screams and threats to suspects, workmates, subordinates, families and others.	2.16	1.12	1.92	1.02
23. Head blow, face slap, ear beat, or any physical torture to suspects, workmates, families and others.	1.68	.96	1.52	.86
24. Physical attacks to hurt, bruise and sore, head drowning or electricity shockwave to the accused and others.	1.60	.91	1.43	.79
25. Decision to dismiss a criminal charge because of scarce evidence.	1.90	1.04	1.72	.97
26. Use of laws in the wrong way: false charges, wrong fines, etc.	1.81	1.02	1.58	.90
27. Abuse of suspects, workmates, subordinates and others.	1.52	.87	1.41	.81
28. Sexual affairs with suspects, workmates and others.	1.52	.90	1.40	.79
29. Quarantine and detention of suspects in police stations for a long time beyond the law limits.	1.59	.88	1.43	.81
30. Persuasion, provocation and mobilisation to public masses to cause terror and disunity within society.	1.48	.78	1.39	.77
Total	1.70	.79	1.53	.74

Table 6: Public and Police Views towards the Subsidiary Types of Abusive Authority

Police abusive authority (See Table 6) viewed by the public was at a moderate level ($M = 1.70$, $SD = 0.79$). Considering the subsidiary types for the public, use of aggressive speeches, screams and threats to suspects, workmates, subordinates, families and others was the highest problem ($M = 2.16$, $SD = 1.12$), pursued by a decision to dismiss a criminal charge because of scarce evidence ($M = 1.90$, $SD = 1.04$) and persuasion, provocation and mobilisation to public masses to cause terror and disunity within society as the lowest problem ($M = 1.48$, $SD = 0.78$). In variation, police abusive authority, viewed by police officers was at a moderate level ($M = 1.53$, $SD = 0.74$). Considering the subsidiary types for the police, use of aggressive speeches, screams and threats to suspects, workmates, subordinates, families and others was the highest problems ($M = 1.92$, $SD = 1.02$), pursued by a decision to dismiss a criminal charge because of scarce evidence ($M = 1.72$, $SD = 0.97$) and persuasion, provocation and mobilisation to public masses to cause terror and disunity within society as the lowest problem ($M = 1.39$, $SD = 0.77$).

Police Deviance Views	n	M	SD	F	p
The Public	500	2.08	.72	2.753	*0.028
Police Officers	500	1.99	.73		
Total	1000	2.03	.73		

Table 7: Difference of Police Deviance Views between the Public and Police Officers

* $p < 0.05$

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) as (See Table 7) showed that the difference of police deviance views between the public and police officers was at statistical significance. The public and police officers viewed police deviance as a whole at a moderate level ($M = 2.08$, $SD = 0.72$; $M = 1.99$, $SD = 0.73$) within a significant difference making to 0.028 ($p < 0.05$) in which the obtained probability is lower than the assigned probability.

Police Organisational Deviance Views	n	M	SD	F	p
The Public	500	2.50	.77	2.820	*0.071
Police Officers	500	2.52	.85		
Total	1000	2.51	.83		

Table 8: Difference of Police Organisational Deviance Views between the Public and Police Officers
* $p < 0.05$

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) (See Table 8) showed that the difference of police organisational deviance views as one of the main types of police deviance between the public and police officers was not at statistical significance. The public viewed police organisational deviance at a moderate level and police officers viewed it at the serious level ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 0.77$; $M = 2.52$, $SD = 0.85$) without a significant difference making to 0.071 ($p > 0.05$) in which the obtained probability is greater than the assigned probability.

Police Occupational Deviance Views	n	M	SD	F	p
The Public	500	2.06	.82	6.002	**0.003
Police Officers	500	1.92	.84		
Total	1000	1.99	.83		

Table 9: Difference of Police Occupational Deviance Views between the Public and Police Officers
** $p < 0.01$

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) (See Table 9) showed that the difference of police occupational deviance views as one of the main types of police deviance between the public and police officers was at statistical significance. The public and police officers viewed police occupational deviance at a moderate level ($M = 2.06$, $SD = 0.82$; $M = 1.92$, $SD = 0.84$) within a significant difference making to 003.0 ($p < 0.01$) in which the obtained probability is lower than the assigned probability.

Police Abusive Authority Views	n	M	SD	F	p
The Public Roman	500	1.70	.79	6.062	***0.0001
Police Officers	500	1.53	.74		
Total	1000	1.61	.76		

Table 10: Difference of Police Abusive Authority Views between the Public and Police Officers
*** $p < 0.001$

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) (See Table 10) showed that the difference of police abusive authority views as one of the main types of police deviance between the public and police officers was at statistical significance. The public and police officers viewed police abusive authority at a moderate level ($M = 1.70$, $SD = 0.79$; $M = 1.53$, $SD = 0.74$) within a significant difference making to 0.0001 ($p < 0.001$) in which the obtained probability is lower than the assigned probability.

4. Discussions and Suggestions

Police deviance, as viewed by the public and police officers was at a moderate level. The public have strong psychometric views towards police actions such as courtesy, honesty, respect toward people, hard work, fairness, well-training, and sound communication, with public trust on investigation against complaints as well as balanced investigation, and neighborhood-conditioning assessment towards police services such as traffic law enforcement, narcotics and drug enforcement, gang issues and graffiti, prostitution, mental health consumers, calls for service, police visibility, crime prevention efforts and police duty. Moreover, the effects of community-oriented policing programmes that police departments provide to the public make an adhesive relationship between the public and police especially diffuse and specific support (Easton, 1965) of which diffuse support established the general and passionate support of a government agency giving to the public in terms of loyal and affectionate programmes, and specific support depended on individual judgments with a particular policy to represent personal satisfaction with a particular service rather than loyalty and affection. These decisions provide the finding of above studies (Frank et al., 2005; Ren et al., 2005; Skogan, 2009; Mazerolle et al., 2012; Zhao and Ren, 2015).

Along with the main types, OrD, OcD and AA as viewed by the public, and OcD and AA as viewed by police officers was at a moderate level, but OrD, as viewed by police officers was at the serious level. Police officers may probably perform actions and inactions in security management and crime suppression. The actions triggered by the use of power, and breakdown to act by public pressures may have mixed properties. OrD, OcD and AA may arise from varied several police agencies that have solid, authorised powers but unpleasant attitudes over public lives and properties. Otherwise, it seems very difficult for police officers to distinguish between moral standards and strong regulations. Police individuals may perhaps charge wrongdoers from breaking traffic laws but may not make a swift judgment over unpredicted deadly incidents. It is not always a simple issue to differentiate between public interests and religious beliefs. Police may possibly take a suspect's age and gender into consideration, but not race or culture among religious members. These decisions support the finding of preceding studies (Loader, 2000; Mazerolle and Ransley, 2004; Stenning, 2003; Bronitt and Stenning, 2011).

Multiplicity of organisational structures and biased promotion were among the highest problems in OrD. The multiplicity of organisational structures refers to political deviance as awareness in social interaction placing official losers at a personal disadvantage (Bennett and Robinson, 2003) such as rank, position and salary having a long and winding step to proceed. For example, a police major can mature to a police lieutenant colonel within 3 years but cannot advance to be a police colonel because an inspector must be promoted into a deputy superintendent prior to a superintendent due to rank and position limitation. Biased promotion raises party favoritism as non-beneficial competition (Hollinger and Clark, 1982), since the relatives, parties and subordinates of politicians and superiors may likely get the most benefits for all transactions. In other words, progress in police career path seems to be much motivated by the preference of in-group politicians and high-ends executives. Police heads and members of parliament may co-take and make the negative effects upon police selection, promotion, and appreciation in police organisation. Personal bias seems to be more stimuli over moral judgments of police officers and other legal professionals such as legislators, judges, prosecutors, and public defenders. These decisions support the finding of earlier studies (Mutlu, 2000; Gonzalez, 2014; Smith et al., 2015).

Supports for illegal gambling and entertainment complexes and takes of a lot of cases to investigate, but breakdown to summarise them in time were among the highest problems in OcD. Supports for illegal gambling and entertainment complexes state protective illegal activities that support to vice operations. Seductive entrepreneurs managing massage parlors, inns, saunas, and discotheques may think that profitable operation cannot go more peacefully unless providing after-hours, drugs, alcoholism, gambling, pornography, and prostitution to prospective customers and giving beneficial addition to law enforcement officers. But takes of a lot of cases to investigate discuss police misconduct leading to a mistake of morality and involving unlawful reasons of an unusual weakness shared as a wall of justice. If police investigators had a lot of moral judgment and legitimacy, no matter a great number of case assignments remain, they can make it in time. These decisions support the finding of prior studies (Prenzler, 2004; Weitzer and Tuch, 2004; Porter and Warrender, 2009; Vargas-Hernández, 2011; Müller, 2012; Newburn, 2015).

Use of aggressive speeches, screams and threats to suspects, workmates, subordinates, families and others and a decision to dismiss a criminal charge because of scarce evidence were among the highest problems in AA. Use of aggressive speeches, screams and threats to others derived from negative impacts of psychological abuse. Narcissism seems to be a variable associated with psychological aggression whose levels of shame, anger and worry could be pushed over the perpetration of psychological abuse toward others. But anger may perhaps be a more defensive tactic to avoid meeting negative self-evaluation; moreover, the increased use of higher anger in individuals would be a possible way to move from a negative evaluation of themselves. Police officers always pled not guilty in alleged verbal threats to the public because of their high self-esteem, self-assessment and inability to identify themselves and describe their passions at specific times. These decisions support the finding of previous documents (Blanchard, 2001; Harper et al., 2005; Brown et al., 2010; Taylor et al., 2011; Lykhina, 2013).

Decision to dismiss a criminal charge because of scarce evidence derives from legal abuse related to police officers violating criminal statutes, or civil rights of typically accused offenders to maintain an organisational goal (Kappeler et al. 1994). Witness intimidation by offenders can make a terrible atmosphere in the legal system towards victims and witnesses of crimes whose fear of punishments might discourage themselves from reporting obvious crimes, giving insufficient evidence to police investigation. Police may not investigate a crime, unable to identify a suspect, and without arrest or charge of the suspect with a crime. The crime case may settle in court, but the charges may be dismissed and the defendant may receive a non-imprisonment sentence. Moreover, defects in the charging document must be raised before trial. Complaints are subject to dismissal if they do not conform to legal requirements, issued in an improper manner. Alternatively, the judge might be persuaded to lay the appellant for a while, then dismiss it depending on the

client's negative behaviour. Abuse within a criminal justice system may involve sharing of confidential court reports with criminals, prompting non-cooperation by witnesses during criminal trials and leading to termination of cases. Those making disorder and sharing secret news might be police officers. These decisions support the finding of overhead studies (Dedel, 2006; Fisher and Leaven, 2010; Daly and Sarre, 2017)

The variance of police deviance views between the public and police officers was at statistical significance. Although the views of the public and police are quite diverse, police duties and public service may possibly not separate from each other. Police officers may likely observe rules and regulations to serve policy in organisation, practice etiquette codes essential to moral judgment in maintaining professionalism, and use potential justice to protect peace and security for the public. Meanwhile, the public may actually make some seamless interactions with police officers to investigate, monitor and evaluate police administrations at workplaces or stations. These decisions are symmetrical with the finding of erstwhile studies (Mitchell and Ambrose, 2007; Porter and Warrender, 2009; Banutai et al., 2011).

It is advisable that publishing police ideals through digital media to make public relations of police culture shining and running exact programmes such as anti-organisational deviance, anti-occupational deviance and anti-abusive authority training may support moral standardization. Best practices for work performance, authorised property and policy management should be on promotion. The public should monitor, investigate and assess the administration of high-end executives and at the same time the operation of bottom-up officers; thus, police should help support all public welfare activities such as needy family assistance, additional nutrition help, medical benefits, childcare, utility support and the like by working with public sectors and other government agencies to develop cultural landscapes and regional cooperation. Making matched pairs, small groups and large assemblies in recreational activities among public sectors, other government agencies and the police reduce anxiety and tension while backing to resume regular duties, for the unity between police, public and all sectors will be held in major levels among community, provincial and regional police.

5. References

- i. Ainsworth, P. B. (2002). *Psychology and policing*. Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing.
- ii. Alston, R. E. (2010). *The relationship between police occupational deviance and length of service in a large police agency*. Doctoral dissertation at Walden University. Available: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/769914015?accountid=15637>
- iii. Amnesty International. (2013). *Police reform in Kenya: A drop in the ocean*. London: Amnesty International Publications.
- iv. Ashley, S. D., & Golles, L. (2000). *The effect of police officer confidence on officer injuries and excessive force complaints*. Monroe, MI: CIRMAT.
- v. Banutai, E., Šifrer, J., & Meško, G. (2011). *Deviance and police organisational culture in Slovenia*. In G. Meško, A. Sotlar & J. Winterdyk (Eds.), *Policing in central and eastern Europe – Social control of unconventional deviance: Conference proceedings* (pp. 379-400). Ljubljana, Slovenia: University of Maribor Press.
- vi. Barker, T., & Carter, D. L. (1994). *Police Deviance*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.
- vii. Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349-360.
- viii. Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The Past, present and future of workplace deviance research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (pp. 247-281). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- ix. Blanchard, B. D. (2001). *Extremes of narcissism and self-esteem and the differential experience and expression of anger and use of conflict tactics in male perpetrators*. Dissertation Abstracts International Section B: Sciences and Engineering, 62(5-B), 2476.
- x. Blanes i Vidal, J., & Kirchmaier, T. (2018). The effect of police response: Time on crime clearance rates. *Review of Economic Studies*, 85(2), 855-891.
- xi. Blanes i Vidal, J., & Mastrobuoni, G. (2018). *Police patrols and crime: IZA discussion paper No. 11393*. Bonn, Germany: IZA – Institute of Labor Economics.
- xii. Bronitt, S. H., & Stenning, P. C. (2011). Understanding discretion in modern policing. *Criminal Law Journal*, 35(6), 319-332.
- xiii. Brown, J. E., James, K., & Taylor, A. (2010). Caught in the rejection-abuse cycle: Are we really treating perpetrators of domestic abuse effectively? *Journal of Family Therapy*, 32(3), 280-307.
- xiv. Burger, J. (2011). To protect and serve: Restoring public confidence in the SAPS. *South African Crime Quarterly*, 36(1), 13-22.

- xv. Cao, L., & Huang, B. (2000). Determinants of citizen complaints against police abuse of power. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28(1), 203-213.
- xvi. Carter, D. L. (1990). Drug-related corruption of police officers: A contemporary typology. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 18(1), 85-98.
- xvii. Corsianos, M. (2012). *The complexities of police corruption-gender, identity, and misconduct*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- xviii. Cortina, L., Magley, V., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(1), 64-80.
- xix. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(1), 297-334.
- xx. Daly, K., & Sarre, R. (2017). Criminal justice system: Aims and processes. In D. Palmer, W. de Lint and D. Dalton (Eds.), *Crime and justice: A guide to criminology* (pp. 1-19). Sydney: Lawbook.
- xxi. Dedel, K. (2006). *Witness intimidation – Problem-oriented guides for police: Problem specific guides series No. 42*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- xxii. Easton, D. (1965). *A systems analysis of political life*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- xxiii. Evans, J. D. (1996). *Straightforward statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- xxiv. Everton, W. J., Jolton, J. A., & Mastrangelo, P. M. (2005). Be nice and fair or else: Understanding reasons for employees' deviant behaviors. *Journal of Management Development*, 26(2), 117-131.
- xxv. Fisher, S. Z., & Leaven, A. (2010). *Complaints and Indictments*. Available: https://www.suffolk.edu/-/media/suffolk/documents/law/faculty/mcp/ch4complaintsandindictments_pdf.txt.pdf?la=en&hash=A3E7D2F9D8411B68B977B2382596F3FBE55858F1
- xxvi. Foley, P. F., Guarneri, C., & Kelly, M. E. (2008). Reasons for choosing a police career: Changes over two decades. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 10(1), 2-8.
- xxvii. Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (2005). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(1), 915-913.
- xxviii. Frank, J., Smith, B. W., & Novak, K. J. (2005). Exploring the basis of citizens' attitudes toward the police. *Police Quarterly*, 8(1), 206-228.
- xxix. Fryer, R. G. (2016). *An empirical analysis of racial differences in police use of force: Working paper No. 22399*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- xxx. Garcia, L., Nesbary, D. K., & Gu, J. (2004). Perceptual variations of stressors among police officers during an era of decreasing crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20(1), 33-50.
- xxxi. George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- xxxii. Goldschmidt, J. (2008). The necessity of dishonesty: Police deviance, 'making the case', and the public good. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*, 18(2), 113-135.
- xxxiii. Gonzalez, Y. M. (2014). *State building on the ground: Police reform and participatory security in Latin America*. Doctoral dissertation at Princeton University. Available: https://dataspace.princeton.edu/jspui/bitstream/88435/dsp016w924f049/1/Gonzalez_princeton_0181D_11166.pdf
- xxxiv. Harper, F. W. K., Austin, A. G., Cercone, J. J., & Arias, I. (2005). The role of shame, anger, and affect regulation in men's perpetration of psychological abuse in dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(12), 648-1662.
- xxxv. Harris, C. J. (2009). Police use of improper force: A systematic review of the evidence. *Victims and Offenders*, 4(2), 25-41.
- xxxvi. Hayashi, K., Ti, L., Csete, J., Kaplan, K., Suwannawong, P., Wood, E., & Kerr, T. (2013). Reports of police beating and associated harms among people who inject drugs in Bangkok, Thailand: A serial cross-sectional study. *BioMed Central Public Health*, 13(1), 733-741.
- xxxvii. Heaton, P., Hunt, P., MacDonald, J., & Saunders, J. (2016). The short-and-long-run effects of private law enforcement: Evidence from university police. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 59(4), 889-912.
- xxxviii. Heib, S. N. (2013). *Police officers as perpetrators of crimes against women and children*. Santa Rosa, CA: Women's Justice Center.
- xxxix. Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1982). Formal and informal social controls of employee deviance. *Sociological Quarterly*, 23(3), 333-343.
- xl. Human Rights Watch. (1998). *Shielded from justice: Police brutality and accountability in the United States*. New York: Library of Congress.

- xli. Ikunda, A. (2009). Factors influencing dismissal of criminal cases in Kenyan courts: A case study of Mavoko Law Courts, Machakos. Master's thesis at University of Nairobi.
- xlii. Available: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/b643/4b7a2bfee54ee50f42f6e0b2dec306cf5c17.pdf>
- xliii. INSPEC2T. (2016). Inspiring citizens participation for enhanced community policing actions: Report on best practices in community policing and gap analysis. Available: <http://inspec2t-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Deliverable-1.1-Report-on-best-practices-in-community-policing-gap-analysis.pdf>
- xliv. International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). (2015). Violence and the use of force. Geneva, Switzerland: ICRC.
- xlvi. Johnson, B. R, De Li, S., & Larson, D. B. (2000). A systematic review of the religiosity and delinquency literature. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 16(1), 32-52.
- xlvi. Johnson, C. (2003). Enron's ethical collapse: Lessons for leadership educators. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 2(1), 45-56.
- xlvi. Kaewkerd, K. (2017, February 5). What if arrested and assaulted by police? The Posttoday. Available: <https://www.posttoday.com/social/think/479498>
- xlvi. Kappeler, V. E., Sluder, R. D., & Alpert, G. P. (2010). Breeding deviant conformity: The ideology and culture of police. In R. G. Dunham and G. P. Alpert (Eds.), *Critical issues in policing* (6th ed., pp. 265-291). Long Grove, IL: Waveland.
- xlix. Kidwell, R. E., & Martin, C. L. (2005). The prevalence (and ambiguity) of deviant behavior at work. In R. E. Kidwell and C. L. Martin (Eds.), *Managing Organizational Deviance* (pp. 1-21). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
 - i. Kirschman, E. (2007). *I love a cop: What police families need to know*. New York: Guildford.
 - ii. Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140), 5-55.
 - iii. Lim, V. K. G. (2002). The IT way of loafing on the job: Cyberloafing, neutralizing and organizational justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 675-694.
 - liii. Loader, I. (2000). Plural policing and democratic governance. *Social and Legal Studies*, 9(3), 323-345.
 - lii. Lykhina, A. (2013). Women's lived experiences of emotional and psychological abuse in heterosexual relationships: Behaviours, effects, awareness and support. Doctoral dissertation at RMIT University. Available: <https://researchbank.rmit.edu.au/eserv/rmit:160466/Lykhina.pdf>
 - lv. Lynch, O. (2019). Characteristics of administrative corruption in panama: Activities carried out in the fight against corruption, results and perspectives. Available: <http://old.clad.org/documentos/otros-documentos/caracteristicas-de-la-corrupcion-administrativa-en-panama-actividades-realizadas-en-la-lucha-contra-la-corrupcion-resultados-y-perspectiva?searchterm=Lynch>
 - lvi. MacDonald, J. M., Klick, J., & Grunwald, B. (2016). The effect of private police on crime: Evidence from a geographic regression discontinuity design. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 179(3), 831-846.
 - lvii. lvi. Mastrobuoni, G. (2015). Police disruption and performance – Evidence from recurrent redeployments within a city: IZA discussion paper No. 8799. Bonn, Germany: IZA – Institute of Labor Economics.
 - lviii. Mazerolle, L., & Ransley, J. (2004). Third party policing: Prospects, challenges and implications for regulators. In R. Johnstone and R. Sarre, *Regulation: Enforcement and compliance* (pp. 61-76). Canberra, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology.
 - lix. Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E., & Manning, M. (2013). *Legitimacy in policing: A systematic review*. Oslo, Norway: The Campbell Corporation.
 - lx. McAlary, M. (1996). *Good cop, Bad cop*. New York: Pocket Books.
 - lxi. Miller, J. (2003). *Police corruption in England and Wales: An assessment of current evidence*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
 - lxii. lxi. Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1159-1168.
 - lxiii. Mirza, C. S. (2013). Picking up the slack: Team member situation awareness and production deviance. Doctoral dissertation at University of Houston. Available: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1445002220/48C666CDF8A40D3PQ/5?accountid=15637>
 - lxiv. Moon, B., & Hwang, E. G. (2004). The reasons for choosing a career in policing among South Korean police cadets. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(3), 223-229.
 - lxv. Müller, M. M. (2012). Addressing an ambivalent relationship: Policing and the urban poor in Mexico City. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 44(2), 319-345.
 - lxvi. Mutlu, K. (2000). Problems of nepotism and favouritism in the police organization in Turkey. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 23(3), 381-389.

- lxvii. National Police Policy Board. (2006). Regulation for police administration monitoring committee. Ratchakitcha, 123(31), 8-22.
- lxviii. lxvii. National Police Policy Board. (2008). Regulation for police administration monitoring committee No.3. Ratchakitcha, 125(159), 1-5.
- lxix. Newburn, T. (2015). Literature review: Police integrity and corruption. London, UK: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary.
- lxx. Noblet, A. J., Rodwell, J. J., & Allisey, A. F. (2009). Police stress: The role of the psychological contract and perceptions of fairness. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 32(4), 613-630.
- lxxi. Office of Ombudsman. (2018). Examples of Complaints. Available: https://www.ombudsman.go.th/10/eng/sample_complaints.asp
- lxxii. Office of Police Commission. (2010). Rules for serious offenses against disciplines. Bangkok: Police Press.
- lxxiii. Police Disciplines Division. (2010). Disciplinary Action Guide: Degrees of punishment and some specific cases. Bangkok: Police Press.
- lxxiv. Polinsky, A. M., & Shavell, S. (2001). Corruption and optimal law enforcement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 81(1), 1-24.
- lxxv. Porter, L. E., & Warrender, C. (2009). A multivariate model of police deviance: Examining the nature of corruption, crime and misconduct. *Policing and Society*, 19(1), 77-99.
- lxxvi. Power, S. B. (2015). Consideration of impulsive-trait personality for police selection. Doctoral dissertation at Fielding Graduate University. Available: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1718550861?accountid=15637>
- lxxvii. lxxvi. Prenzler, T. (2004). Stakeholder perspectives on police complaints and disciplines: Towards a civilian control model. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 37(1), 85-113.
- lxxviii. Punch, M. (2000). Police corruption and its prevention. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 8(3), 301-324.
- lxxix. Quintanar, S. M. (2017). Man vs. machine: An investigation of speeding ticket disparities based on gender and race. *Journal of Applied Economics*, 20(1), 1-28.
- lxxx. Raganella, A. J., & White, M. D. (2004). Race, gender, and motivation for becoming a police officer: Implications for building a representative police department. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(6), 501-513.
- lxxxi. Reiner, R. (2010). The politics of the police. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- lxxxii. Ren, L., Cao, L., Lovrich, N., & Gaffney, M. (2005). Linking confidence in the police with the performance of the police: Community policing can make a difference. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(1), 55-66.
- lxxxiii. Reno, J., Fisher, R. C., Robinson, L., Brennan, N., Travis, J., & Chaiken, J. M. (1999). Use of force by police: Overview of national and local data. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- lxxxiv. Roberg, R. R., & Kuykendall, J. L. (1993). Police and society. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- lxxxv. lxxxiv. Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 555-572.
- lxxxvi. lxxxv. Robinson, S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(6), 658-672.
- lxxxvii. lxxxvi. Roebuck, J. B., & Barker, T. (1974). A typology of police corruption. *Social Problems*, 21(1), 23-37.
- lxxxviii. Rovinelli, R. J., & Hambleton, R. K. (1977). On the use of content specialists in the assessment of criterion referenced test item validity. *Dutch Journal of Educational Research*, 2(1), 49-60.
- lxxxix. Scaramella, G. L., Cox, S. M., & McCamey, W. (2011). Introduction to policing. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- xc. Schafer, J. A. (2010). The ineffective police leader: Acts of commission and omission. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 737-746.
- xc. Scrivner, E. M. (1994). Controlling police use of excessive force: The role of the police psychologist. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- xcii. Shahzad, A., & Mahmood, Z. (2012). The mediating – moderating model of organizational cynicism and workplace deviant behavior: Evidence from banking sector in Pakistan. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 12(5), 580-588.
- xciii. Shane, J. M. (2010). Organizational stressors and police performance. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 807-818.
- xciv. Shavell, S. (2002). Law versus morality as regulators of conduct. *American Law and Economics Review*, 4(2), 227-257.

- xcv. Skogan, W. G. (2009). Concern about crime and confidence in the police: Reassurance or accountability? *Police Quarterly*, 12(3), 301-308.
- xcvi. Smith, M. R., & Alpert, G. P. (2007). Explaining police bias: A theory of social conditioning and illusory correlation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(10), 1262-1283.
- xcvii. Smith, R. J., Levinson, J. D., & Robinson, Zoë. (2015). Implicit white favoritism in the criminal justice system. *Alabama Law Review*, 66(4), 871-923.
- xcviii. Spector, B. I. (2011). *Negotiating peace and confronting corruption: Challenges for postconflict societies*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- xcix. Stenning, P. C. (2003). Policing the cultural kaleidoscope: Recent Canadian experience. *Police and Society*, 7(3), 13-47.
 - c. Tarng, M. Y., Hsieh, C. H., & Deng, T. J. (2001). Personal background and reasons for choosing a career in policing: An empirical study of police students in Taiwan. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(1), 45-56.
 - ci. Taylor, B., Alpert, G., Kubu, B., Woods, D., & Dunham, R. G. (2011). Changes in officer use of force over time: A descriptive analysis of a national survey. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 34(2), 211-232.
 - cii. Thai Rath Online. (2015, September 18). Sorry! A police lance corporal who posted public insults online had known that he was intolerable for the people scolding a police profession. Available: <https://www.thairath.co.th/content/526229>
 - ciii. Thomas, R., Patil, S, Saucier, R., & Crago, A. L. (2015). *To protect and serve: How police, sex workers, and people who use drugs are joining forces to improve health and human rights*. New York, NY: Open Society Foundations.
 - civ. Thompson, S. G. (2012). Judicial gatekeeping of police-generated witness testimony. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 102(2), 329-395.
 - cv. Trochmann, M. B., & Gover, A. (2016). Measuring the impact of police representativeness on communities. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 39(4), 773-790.
 - cvi. Turnbull, P., & Wass, V. (2012). *Time for justice? Long working hours and the well-being of police inspectors*. Cardiff, UK: Cardiff University.
 - cvii. United Nations. (2004). *Human rights standards and practice for the police: Expanded pocket book on human rights for the police*. Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.
 - cviii. Vardi, Y., & Wiener, Y. (1996). Misbehavior in organizations: A motivational framework. *Organizational Science*, 7(2), 151-165.
 - cix. Vargas-Hernández, J. G. (2011). The multiple faces of corruption: Typology, forms and levels. *Contemporary Legal and Economic Issues*, 3(1), 269-290.
 - cx. Waterman-Smith, E. J. (2017). *Perceptions of justice and motivations for becoming a police officer: Differences across recruits and law enforcement officers*. Master's thesis at Kennesaw State University. Available: https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=mscj_etd
 - cx. Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2004). Race and perceptions of police misconduct. *Social Problems*, 51(3), 305-325.
 - cxii. Wu, Y., Sun, I. Y., & Cretacci, M. A. (2009). A study of cadets' motivation to become police officers in China. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 1(3), 377-392.
 - cxiii. Yildiz, M. (2001). *Culture and subculture in the Turkish police force*. Doctoral dissertation at University of Leicester. Available: <https://lra.le.ac.uk/bitstream/2381/30121/1/U144983.pdf>
 - cxiv. Zhao, J. S., & Ren, L. (2015). Exploring the dimensions of public attitudes toward the police. *Police Quarterly*, 18(1), 3-26.