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ABSTRACT

Research on the ethical conduct of police officers has proliferated in recent years. While much of the valuable research in this area has focused on policy issues and responses to police ethical violations, the present work attempts to empirically measure the ethical ideology of police officers. This study uses the Forsyth Ethical Positions Questionnaire (EPQ), ethical dilemma vignettes, and selected officer characteristics to measure officer ethical ideology within a large police department. Discussion centers on the general findings, police officer ethical ideology scores, bivariate results, and vignette findings.
INTRODUCTION

The purposes of this study are (1) to obtain basic demographic and officer information, (2) to determine ethical positions (ideologies) of police officers, (3) to determine bivariate relationships between demographic/officer information and ethical ideology, and (4) to discuss officer responses to hypothetical ethical dilemmas. This was accomplished by administering an extensive questionnaire to police officers in a large midwestern police department. The following discussion centers on the supporting literature in this area, the methods or procedures employed in this study, and results.

THE EPQ AND POLICE ETHICAL IDEOLOGY

This research explores the ethical positions of police officers working for a large county police department. The Ethical Positions Questionnaire (EPQ) is designed to measure ethical ideology or orientation. The validity of the EPQ is well-documented (Forsyth, 1992, 1990, 1985, 1981, 1980; Byers & Powers, 1997a, 1997b). Ethical orientation is determined by a respondent’s scores in the areas of “Ethical Relativism” (the degree to which individuals believe moral questions should be decided by universal moral rules) and “Ethical Idealism” (the degree to which individuals believe that good consequences can always be achieved through right actions) as measured by the EPQ. Based on scores on each of these measures, there are four possible ethical orientations for which a person may be dominant (Forsyth, 1980; Byers and Powers, 1997a, p. 166-167; 1997b). These are as follows:

1. Situationists tend to reject moral "rules," yet also ask if the action yielded the best possible outcome in the given situation. They avoid adherence to universal moral principles but still insist that one should produce positive consequences that benefit all involved.
2. Subjectivists also reject moral rules but base their moral judgments on personal feelings about the action and the setting rather than the outcome of the action. They feel that all people should act to promote their own self-interest, rather than focus on producing positive outcomes for others. Because each person must determine the weights and values of an obtained outcome, subjectivists will differ dramatically in their moral conclusions.

3. Absolutists feel that moral actions should conform to universal principles that inherently yield positive consequences. They believe that one should strive to produce positive consequences while maintaining strict adherence to general moral principles.

4. Exceptionists feel that conformity to moral rules is desirable, but exceptions to these rules are often possible. They are not idealist in their appreciation of moral absolutes; they do not believe that harm can be avoided, that innocent people can always be protected or that risking others’ welfare is always wrong. They prefer to rely on moral principles as guidelines, but they also admit that judgments should be made by balancing the positive consequences of an action against the negative consequences.

There is currently a paucity of information regarding the ethical ideologies and decision-making strategies of police officers. Considering the many factors which distinguish those in the criminal justice field from those in the general population, research focusing on the ethical ideologies and decision-making tactics of criminal justice practitioners is needed (Byers & Powers, 1997a, 1997b).
LITERATURE REVIEW

Criminal Justice Ethics Literature

Many people are aware of the stereotype of the "dirty cop," which is perpetuated by television, books, and movies. This stereotype assumes that police officers are oblivious to ethics and that they are incapable of making the right decision when faced with an ethical dilemma. Much research has, in fact, been generated on ethics and ethical decision-making within the criminal justice system (Byers & Powers, 1997a, 1997b; Kleinig, 1996; Pollock & Becker, 1995; Oldenquist, 1993; Williams, 1992; Kleinig, 1990; Pollock-Byrne, 1990). However, researchers have failed to correlate officers' ethical ideologies with their responses to actual ethical dilemmas. This project hopes to shed light on officers' ethical ideologies. The concern of future research within this area has been noted in previous EPQ research (Byers & Powers, 1997a, 1997b).

Donahue & Felts (1993) attempted to analyze the most effective elements of an ethical code in their critical perspective of police ethics. They asserted that it is impossible to teach ethics; it is a facet of the job that police officers must learn on the street. Citing Habermas, they posit that the most effective type of ethics code for law enforcement is a symbolic-interactive system.

In order to establish this type of code, communication between officers and police management or administration must be direct, without the intervention of an arbitrator or any other third parties. There must also be role reciprocity, the opposite of the current hierarchical system in most police departments. Officers and management must be on the same level. Finally, both sides, police officers and administration, must agree to the same ethical norms. The optimal ethics code will be reached by a consensus of all law enforcement officials, not simply handed down by administration or management.
Michael Davis, in an article in support of establishing a law enforcement code of ethics, asserts that law enforcement officials need an ethical code of conduct in order to become fully professionalized like the fields of law, psychology, and medicine (1991). He believes that other methods of professionalization, such as education, training, better pay, and proper equipment, are not effective in promoting ethical norms. Hubert Williams (1992) also asserts that police officers need their own code of ethics. However, while Davis believes that a police code of ethics will lead to the greater professionalization of law enforcement, Williams' reasoning is that the nature of the job requires an ethical code. In order to deal with violent criminals and also ensure that the public feels safe, some standards must be established for police to follow.

Davis' ideal code of ethics for law enforcement includes moral rules, not moral principles or ideals, as many ethical codes today include. He defines moral rules as "requirements (or prohibitions) one is supposed to obey all the time" (15), as opposed to moral principles or ideals, which become progressively vaguer, harder to follow, and harder to enforce. His ideal ethical code of conduct is to be enforced by convention, which he defines as "a practice in which the participation of each is valuable only insofar as others participate as well" (21). This means that the primary reason officers will follow the ethical code is because they, as a group, have decided that it is to their benefit to adhere to the code. In accordance with Donahue and Felts (1993), Davis is saying that the ideal ethical code would be one agreed upon by the police officers who have to follow it.

In a study addressing police officers' ethical orientations, Stan K. Shernock (1990) examined the effect of the police subculture on the ethical orientations of police officers. He hypothesized that there is an interaction between the value placed by other police officers on ethical
conduct, other officers' attitudes about the general unethical conduct of their peers, and officers' attitudes about questionable ethical practices that lead to morally acceptable ends.

Shenock surveyed police officers at small- to medium-sized departments in New England. Patrol officers (n=177) were asked to answer questions regarding the comparative value placed on ethical conduct, in relation to other values important to police work; they were also asked to respond to measures of their tolerance of other officers' misconduct and measures relating to their willingness to violate their ethical code in pursuit of a morally good end (the idea that "the ends justify the means").

Shenock found that an officer's comparative value of ethical conduct was not related to either an officer's tolerance of the misconduct of other officers or the viewpoint that the ends justify the means. He also found that an officer's scores on the "suspicion of the public" and "subcultural alienation from the public" scales were positively and significantly correlated to both the officer's tolerance of the misconduct of other officers and the view that the ends justify the means but not to the comparative value that the officer placed on ethical conduct.

Other Relevant Ethics Literature

Law enforcement, however, is not the only field in which a set of ethics or an ethical code has become necessary. Many professions have employed a code of ethics to more carefully dictate the purpose and guidelines of their field. The business profession has increasingly focused on ethical dilemmas and the need for some form of ethical precepts in their line of work; this need has been especially noted in the fields of management, marketing and consulting (McSwain & White, 1987; Treise et al., 1994; Allen, 1995). Several studies have been done, as well, which highlight the importance of an understanding of ethics and morals and their impact on society in general.
Most recent research on morals and ethics has centered on people's attributions of morality, or how we come to believe that someone is moral or immoral. Glenn D. Reeder and John M. Spores, in their 1983 study on the subject of moral attribution, sought to explain how situational demands and observer beliefs would affect the attribution of morality to the subject of the stimulus scenario. A situational demand is defined as a facet of the situation that would be likely to produce a certain type of behavior, moral or immoral behavior in this study. Observer beliefs are beliefs about how a stimulus person will react in a certain situation, either morally or immorally.

In their first experiment, intended to measure honesty as the situational variable, Reeder & Spores gave participants one of two different scenarios depicting a male character, each with one combination of behavior traits (moral or immoral) and situational demands (moral or immoral). After reading the scenario, participants were asked to rate the person's morality, how often they believe the character tells a lie, and the honesty of the average male college student.

They found that when participants read a scenario where the character acted immorally their attributions of morality were less influenced by situational demands than when they read a scenario in which the character acted morally. Thus, the type of situation in which a person is involved has an effect on the attribution of morality by an outside observer. This experiment also found that a relationship may exist between different aspects of morality. Results showed that observers believed that someone who did not return $20 was more likely to tell lies, indicating that participants believed that a person who would do one immoral thing is more likely to do another.

In their second experiment, intended to measure marital fidelity as the situational variable, participants were given one of two different scenarios depicting a female character, with scenarios varying as to whether they were cost or reward situations (i.e., whether a person would lose or gain something). They were asked to rate the person's morality, how likely she would be to lie, how
likely she would be to steal, to what extent both personality and situation influenced her behavior, and how faithful she was in marriage.

These results showed that the situational demands in the vignette had no effect on the attributions of the observers when the woman in the vignette behaved immorally. In results similar to those of the first experiment, the researchers found that people who are immoral in one aspect of their lives are more likely to be perceived as immoral in other situations as well.

Researchers have also investigated the subject of whether the attribution of morality or immorality can change or if the perceived morality of another remains constant. Reeder & Coover (1986) designed a study to examine changing impressions of morality. Their goal in this study was to determine if an observer's initial impressions of a character's morality would change, based on further information that was inconsistent with the character's first behavior.

Participants in this study read about either one, two, or three initial behaviors of a character. These behaviors were either very moral or very immoral. Participants were then asked to rate the character's morality. After the morality rating, participants were shown a final, opposite behavior of the same character and were again asked to rate the character's morality.

They found that a second immoral behavior, being inconsistent with the first behavior, does change the attribution of morality; however, such an inconsistent moral behavior does not. A possible reason for this dichotomy involved the scaling of the behaviors in the moderate initial impression condition.

All of the research reported thus far has focused on attributions of morality to other people. However, researchers have investigated other aspects of ethics and morality as well, including their application in the "real world". Callan's 1992 work addressed the prediction of ethical values in
businesspeople. He also discussed ways in which predicting these values could be helpful, such as in establishing better ethical training for employees.

Callan administered self-report surveys asking participants about their demographic information, their perceptions of the amount of power and autonomy in their jobs, and their knowledge and use of the ethical code at their place of employment. Respondents also answered questions designed to reveal their general attitudes about ethics in the workplace, as well as some questions about the ethics training needs in their workplace.

The best demographic predictor of high ethical values was found to be the managerial level of the employee. For example, top management were more likely to be against giving advantages to friends within the company and were less tolerant of unethical conduct. People at higher levels of power and who had more autonomy in their jobs were also against favoring their friends at work.

Awareness and use of an ethical code in the workplace were both found to be poor predictors of high ethical values. The most commonly cited training needs varied depending on managerial level.

**EPQ Literature Review**

In Forsyth's (1980) groundbreaking work, he identifies four ethical perspectives: Situationists, absolutists, subjectivists, and Exceptionists. In order to identify an individual’s ethical ideology, he developed the EPQ. This instrument asks questions about both general moral systems and specific instances requiring a moral judgment (i.e. about lying and harming others). Individuals fall into one of Forsyth's four categories, based on their responses.

Another study by Forsyth (1981) investigated the impact that a person's ethical ideology had on their moral judgment. Participants completed Forsyth's EPQ and then read vignettes describing
an event in which the character had varying degrees of responsibility and which also varied in outcome. The participants then responded to questions relating to the character's morality.

Forsyth’s study revealed that greater responsibility on the part of the main character for a negative outcome resulted in being judged more harshly by observers, especially by absolutists. In general, the moral judgments made by observers depended both on the amount of responsibility of the character and the consequences of their action (positive or negative); but the degree of relationship depended, for the most part, on the observer's ethical ideology.

Again studying ethical ideologies, Forsyth & Nye (1990) examined the links between ethical ideology, a person’s moral choice, and their post-transgression reactions. Participants in this study were first given the EPQ. They were then told that they were participating in a study about IQ testing. They observed a confederate taking a fake IQ test and were then told that they had to break the false bad news of a low IQ to the test-taker. In one condition, this was called "lying" and in another condition it was called "giving feedback". Participants were also told, in the "positive for self" condition, that they would receive three dollars for misleading the test-taker; in the "positive for other" condition, they were told that the test-taker may be motivated to improve his/her grades by hearing the news. Participants who agreed to mislead the test-taker were labeled "liars" and those who refused were labeled "nonliars".

Fewer participants were willing to lie when offered money for a "lie", as opposed to being offered money for "giving feedback" or either "lying" or "giving feedback" in order to help the test-taker. Situationists and absolutists (those categories high in idealism) were, surprisingly, most likely to lie.

Byers & Powers (1997a) then utilized Forsyth’s EPQ to determine the ethical ideologies of students at a mid-sized, Midwestern university. The ethical ideologies of criminal justice students
(n=154) were compared with those of students in the general university population (n=652). No differences were found between the ethical perspectives of criminal justice majors and students in the general population. However, male criminal justice majors were found to exhibit lower variance within their scores on both ethical idealism and ethical relativism than female criminal justice majors and both genders in the general student population.

In their second study, Byers & Powers (1997b) again determined, using Forsyth's EPQ, the ethical ideologies of students at a mid-sized Midwestern university. However, their goal in this study was to examine the link between ethical ideology, loyalty to a peer group, and lying. They found that, while ethical ideology may not absolutely dictate a subject's response to the loyalty-truthfulness dilemmas, they did have some influence. Those who fell into the categories of Absolutists and Situationists tended to favor being disloyal, but remaining truthful. Subjectivists favored being loyal and untruthful. Exceptionists showed no significant correlation.

**METHODOLOGY**

The research protocol for this study was approved by the Ball State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human subjects. Once approval was received, data collection was undertaken.

The sample size was thirty-three officers (n=33) which represents a 62% response rate. Voluntary participants were drawn from all active officers at a large county police department. Demographic variables measured included age, gender, number of years of service, race, and disciplinary action taken against the officer, officer ethical ideology as measured by the EPQ, and officer responses to hypothetical ethical dilemmas.
Subjects were invited to participate during departmental “roll call” periods on four different days. Subjects were read a script detailing the purpose of the study and the instructions for completing the questionnaire, as well as a confidentiality statement and a voluntary-participation statement. Surveys were distributed to officers and they were allowed to take the questionnaire with them on patrol. Those officers willing to participate were asked to return the anonymous completed questionnaire at the end of their shift by placing the instrument in a sealed box (ballot box style) in the department.

HYPOTHESES

For the purposes of this research, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis One

- $H_0 = \text{Amount of officer discipline does not impact ethical ideology}$
- $H_a = \text{Amount of officer discipline does impact ethical ideology}$

Hypothesis Two

- $H_0 = \text{An officer's age does not impact ethical ideology}$
- $H_a = \text{An officer's age does impact ethical ideology}$

Hypothesis Three

- $H_0 = \text{An officer's rank does not impact ethical ideology}$
- $H_a = \text{An officer's rank does impact ethical ideology}$

Hypothesis Four

- $H_0 = \text{An officer's time in his/her current position does not impact ethical ideology}$
Hypothesis Five

- $H_0 = \text{An officer’s number of previous criminal justice experience does not impact ethical ideology}$
- $H_a = \text{An officer’s number of previous criminal justice experience does impact ethical ideology}$

Hypothesis Six

- $H_0 = \text{An officer’s length of time in the department does not impact ethical ideology}$
- $H_a = \text{An officer’s length of time in the department does impact ethical ideology}$

DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS. First, descriptive statistics for subjects were computed. Second, analysis centered on determining subject Ethical Position (as measure by the EPQ) categorizations. Third, analyses are conducted testing hypotheses concerning the relationships between selected independent variables and subject EPQ.

Before formal analysis could be conducted, additional work needed to be completed on the data set. First, two descriptive variables, race and sex, could not be used in the bivariate analysis given that there were too few minorities and women in the data pool. Second, certain subjects did not answer all EPQ questions which resulted in having to count 5 subjects as missing data for the EPQ results and bivariate analysis using the EPQ. Therefore, the EPQ descriptive results and findings from bivariate analyses using the EPQ resulted in 28 total subjects. Third, certain independent variables were recoded in order to make these variables more manageable for purposes
of analysis. For instance, age was recoded to create interval level grouped categories. Length of
time in the department was recoded to create two categories: twelve or fewer years and thirteen
years or more. Length of time in the subject's current position was recoded similarly: five or fewer
years and more than five years. Finally, previous criminal justice positions was recoded as follows:
one or fewer and two or more.

FINDINGS

This section is divided into the tripartite of descriptive subject data, descriptive EPQ results,
and bivariate hypothesis testing. Each of these areas are addressed in turn.

Descriptive Subject Results

Descriptive data shedding light on the nature and characteristics of the sample include
gender, age, length of time with the department (Tenure), length of time in the subject’s current
position in the department (Current Tenure), the number of previous criminal justice positions held,
respondent rank, and whether or not the respondent has had disciplinary action in his/her current
position.

Table 1 presents this data. Sex, rank, and disciplinary action are presented as percentages
and the other variables are displayed with appropriate means. Based on the data in Table 1, the
sample data only contained 15.2% female. The average age of subjects was slightly over 38. The
average length of service was 150.7 months or 12.5 years. The average length of time in the
subject’s current position was 93.4 months or 7.8 years. On average, the subjects possessed 1.8
previous criminal justice positions prior to their current service. Most subjects were Deputies
(63.6%). Nearly two-thirds of the subjects, or 63.6%, reported having been subjected to some type
of disciplinary action within the respondent's current position. The vast majority of subjects responded to this question even though it was optional.

**TABLE 1**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUBJECT DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Age           | 38.6 |
| Tenure (in months) | 150.7 |
| Current Tenure (in months) | 93.4 |
| Previous Positions | 1.8 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EPQ Descriptive Results

The following data, in Table 2, shows the categorical breakdown of EPQ scores among the four possibilities. In order to obtain this information, additional analyses had to be made to the data in order to construct scores on the EPQ. Depending on how a subject responded to the EPQ scale items, responses were recoded in order to categorize each subject into one of the four “Ethical Ideologies.”

TABLE 2

EPQ RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situationists</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivists</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutists</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionists</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data in Table 2, it is clear that the plurality of subjects fell into the Exceptionist category with Situationists being the second most common. Subjectivist and Absolutist percentages were tied and were fewer in frequency.

DISCUSSION OF DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS

Based on the strong preference for the Exceptionist category, most of the respondents believed that conformity is desirable, exceptions are often possible, they do not maintain that harm
to others can be avoided, that innocent people can always be protected, and that risking the welfare of others is not always wrong or possible. While the Exceptionist would prefer to rely on moral principles to guide behavior and outcomes, judgments must often be made to balance the positive outcomes of a situation against any negative consequences. It was somewhat surprising to find that Situationists were the second most common category. Situationists tend to reject moral rules while simultaneously believing that the action taken in a situation should yield the best possible outcome in the given setting. The latter part of this position would be expected but not the first part of rejecting moral principles. What is consistent with the law enforcement profession, and common to Situationists, is the idea that one should try to produce positive consequences that benefit all involved. One might see a connection between this principle and the important law enforcement role of conflict resolution.

It should not be surprising that fewer respondents fell into the Absolutists and Subjectivists categories. Subjectivists believe that people should promote their own self-interests. Police officers would not necessarily be trained to promote the self-interests of others. Rather, one would presume that the “greater good” would be more important. Absolutists adhere strictly to moral principles. However, and as officers know, it is desirable, yet unrealistic, to always adhere to universal principles of morality as codified in criminal law due to the tremendous “gray area” of police interpretation of law and morality and the inevitable presence of police discretion.

Bivariate Hypothesis Testing

Crosstabulations and chi square analyses were performed on ethical ideology as it related to each of the independent variables. Tables 3 through 8 describe these relationships.
Table 3: Ethical Ideology, by Officer Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Ideology</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situationists</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivists</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutists</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionists</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a discussion of the results from Table 3 that examines the impact that the independent variable of Officer Discipline has on the dependent variable of Ethical Ideology. The chi square statistic is 2.885 which is not significant (p = .823). Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that discipline is not related to ethical ideology. In short, there is no cause and effect relationship that would suggest that an officer having had official discipline would impact ethical ideology.
Table 4: Ethical Ideology, by Officer Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Ideology</th>
<th>Deputy</th>
<th>Sergeant</th>
<th>Detective</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situationists</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivists</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutists</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionists</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon review of Table 4, we see that an officer's rank does impact ethical ideology. The chi square statistic in this table is 13.279 which exceeds the critical value of 11.389. Therefore, the relationship found in the bivariate analysis is significant ($p < .25$) and the null hypothesis is rejected. In considering Table 4, we can see that those officers in the rank of deputy are more likely to be Exceptionists (36.8%); those in the rank of sergeant are equally likely to be Situationists, Absolutists, and Exceptionists (33.3%); those in the rank of detective are more likely to Subjectivists (100%); and those civilians surveyed were more likely to be Subjectivists also (100%).
Table 5: Ethical Ideology, by Officer Years in Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Ideology</th>
<th>12 or less</th>
<th>13 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situationists</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivists</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutists</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionists</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In viewing Table 5, we can see that the amount of time an officer has been employed with the department does impact ethical ideology. The chi square statistic in this table is 9.589 which exceeds the critical value of 7.81. Therefore, the relationship found in the bivariate analysis is significant ($p < .05$) and the null hypothesis is rejected. Through an assessment of Table 5, we can see that those officers who have been in the department for 12 years or less are more likely to be subjectivists (33.3%) and Exceptionists (46.7%). On the other hand, those officers who have been in the department for 13 years or more are more likely to be Situationists (46.2%) and absolutists (30.8%).
Table 6: Ethical Ideology, by Previous CJ Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Ideology</th>
<th>1 or Fewer</th>
<th>2 or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situationists</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivists</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutists</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionists</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An inspection of Table 6 reveals that an officer's previous criminal justice experience does have an impact on ethical ideology. The chi square statistic in this table is 6.908, exceeding the critical value of 6.25. Therefore, the relationship found in the bivariate analysis is significant ($p < .10$) and the null hypothesis is rejected. Through an assessment of Table 6, we can see that those officers with one or fewer previous criminal justice positions tended to be Situationists (46.2%), while those officers with two or more previous criminal justice positions tended to be Exceptionists (46.7%).
Table 7: Ethical Ideology, by Officer Time in Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Ideology</th>
<th>Officer Time in Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Years or Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situationists</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivists</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutists</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionists</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 examines the relationship between an officer's time in their current position and ethical ideology. We can see that time in current position does impact an officer's ethical ideology. The chi square value for this table is 7.486, which exceeds the critical value of 6.25. Therefore, the relationship found in the bivariate analysis is significant (p < .10) and we reject the null hypothesis.

When considering Table 7, we can see that most officers who have been in their current position for five years or less tend to be Subjectivists (31.3%) and Exceptionists (37.5%). Officers who have been in their current position for more than five years, however, are much more likely to be Situationists (50%).
Table 8: Ethical Ideology, by Officer Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Ideology</th>
<th>39 or Older</th>
<th>36 or Younger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situationists</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivists</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutists</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionists</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When reviewing Table 8, the impact of the independent variable of Age on the dependent variable of Ethical Ideology, we can see that there is no relationship between the two variables. The chi square statistic is 2.286, which is not significant (p = .515). Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that age does not impact ethical ideology. Simply put, there is no cause and effect relationship to suggest that an officer's age would influence ethical ideology.

DISCUSSION OF BIVARIATE RESULTS

The bivariate analyses of ethical ideology and the demographic variables yielded some interesting information. Four of the null hypotheses were rejected, while two of them failed to be
rejected. This discussion will address the possible reasons for the relationships, or lack thereof, between the variables analyzed in Tables 3 through 8.

Table 3 shows the relationship between ethical ideology and an officer’s previous discipline. A relationship was not found between the two variables. As noted by Shernock (1991) and others, there is a police subculture to which many officers feel the need to belong. This often includes a "bad boy" image that officers may try to imitate. Perhaps officer discipline does not impact ethical ideology because officers simply do not care about the fact that they are punished for breaking a rule. Some officers may even be rewarded by other members of the force for their transgressions.

Learning from the discipline they receive requires that officers be able to change their ethical ideologies. It is possible that ethical ideologies are relatively stable and difficult to change, once established. Reeder & Coover (1986) noted that people’s moral attributions are changeable in some situations. However, no such research has been generated for ethical ideologies. If ethical ideologies prove resistant to change, it would follow that ethical ideology and amount of previous discipline are unrelated. More research is needed on this topic, however, in order to validate such a conclusion.

Another possibility for the lack of relationship between discipline and ethical ideology is that officers do not see the action leading to their discipline as being unethical. Perceptions of ethical wrongdoing are very subjective and people often try to rationalize their unethical actions. Some officers may believe that an action is unethical for others but not for themselves, thus it would not affect their ethical ideology.

Finally, assuming ethical ideologies are changeable, perhaps the types of discipline that officers receive are not harsh enough to have an impact. A reprimand or letter of caution may not be enough to make officers rethink their entire ethical viewpoint. Perhaps only the most severe
discipline, such as dismissal or time off without pay, would cause an officer to do so. It is impossible to positively tell, however, as this study did not code the type of discipline and officer received.

Table 4 shows an analysis of ethical ideology and officer rank. There did appear to be a relationship between these two variables. Civilians and detectives were more likely to be Subjectivists, while sergeants were equally likely to be Absolutists and Exceptionists, and deputies were more likely to be Exceptionists and Situationists.

One possible explanation for the civilians' ethical ideology of Subjectivist lies in their job requirements. Civilians are not sworn officers like detectives, deputies or sergeants; they can, therefore, not perform the same duties, such as carrying a gun or enforcing the law. Perhaps civilians lack an allegiance to the same code of ethics as sworn officers, making them more likely to rely on their individual ethical perspectives, a trait of Subjectivists.

Detectives, also, perform slightly different duties than deputies, or "beat cops". They are less often facing criminals on the street and more often working behind a desk. This could isolate them from the influences that shape a deputy's ethical ideology. In the department studied, detectives are often the only one of their rank in a given section. This may cause additional isolation from the peer influence of other officers that deputies routinely experience, either through partners or calls which require another officer as backup, again forming the Subjectivist ideology.

Sergeants were equally likely to be Absolutists and Exceptionists. These ideologies may be further correlated with time in position, but this study did not perform such a statistical test. The reasoning behind such a correlation would be that these officers may experience different mindsets related to how long they have been a sergeant. Those sergeants who are Absolutists may see themselves as supervisors, those who must enforce the code of ethics embraced by the department.
They would, therefore, stick closely to the rules of moral conduct their department has set out. Those sergeants who have not been in their position as long, however, may still be thinking like deputies. They may still be influenced by their time on the street, where not everything was black and white.

Deputies, who were more likely to be Exceptionists, may think like the above-mentioned sergeants. These officers would recognize that there are laws to guide our behavior, but that they are not absolutes; there are sometimes exceptions, hence the title Exceptionist. Deputies were also very high in the Situationist category. Perhaps these deputies are the rookies. They have not yet acclimated to the formal code of ethics that other deputies follow, instead judging each situation on its own merits.

Table 5, an examination of ethical ideology as it relates to an officer's time with the department, reveals that most officers who have been with the department for more than 13 years tend to be Situationists, while most officers who have been with the department for 12 years or less tend to be Exceptionists.

Perhaps one reason for the difference between these two groups is that officers who have been with the department longer are more cynical with regard to ethical codes. They may have come to realize that they will not be punished for rejecting the moral code of the department in favor of their own judgment in a particular situation. This may be the result of a past failure on the part of the department's code, or because they feel their long experience has earned them the right to some discretion.

On the other hand, perhaps those newer officers, those who have been with the department for 12 years or less, may be Exceptionists because they have not developed that "gut instinct" that more experienced officers have. They still need a set of guidelines, which are provided by the
Exceptionists allow for slight deviations from the code on occasion. Perhaps this is due to the influence of the more experienced officers, who may encourage newer officers to break away from the code as they themselves do.

In Table 6, we see the results of an analysis of ethical ideology and amount of previous criminal justice positions an officer has held. Those officers with one or no previous positions were more likely to be Situationists, while those with two or more previous positions were more likely to be Exceptionists.

Officers with fewer former positions are generally less experienced. Perhaps these officers may not be familiar with a formal code of ethics, due to their small number of past jobs in criminal justice agencies. They may not understand the code of ethics in their agency, or they may not accept it, and choose to individually evaluate each situation as it occurs. Another factor for these officers may be time constraints. Employees with less previous experience may think that they have the leisure to consider each separate ethical dilemma, not understanding that protecting one's self and others requires quick reactions and that, as a result, they may have to forgo a critical examination of each moral issue.

Officers with more previous criminal justice positions are usually more experienced. They may have learned that a set of guidelines is necessary because of the disparate attitudes towards ethics that exist within law enforcement. They may realize that each officer creating his or her own ethics would result in chaos and a lack of cohesiveness within the department. They may also be aware of the aforementioned time constraints in ethical decision-making on the job. Finally, more experience also allows them a more mature sense of discretion. They may be better able to recognize special circumstances and exceptions than less experienced officers, who need to examine each incident before making a moral choice.
In Table 7, we see the results of the analysis of ethical ideology and an officer's time in their current position. Officers with more than five years in their current position tend overwhelmingly to be Situationists, while those with five or less years in their current position tend to be Exceptionists or subjectivists. These findings are troublesome, given the results reported in Table 6. They revealed an opposite relationship with regard to another measure of experience, the number of previous criminal justice positions held.

Those officers with five or more years in their current position may be Situationists because they have become disenchanted with the code of ethics in their department, over the course of their time there. They may have decided that it did not coincide with their own code of ethics and that they therefore need to evaluate each case individually. These officers may have also become so comfortable in their current position that they feel as if they do not have to follow a departmental code of ethics or a set of universal moral rules.

Officers with five years or less in the job may be Exceptionists for reasons opposite of those stated above. That is, they may not have been in their current position long enough to become disenchanted with the departmental code of ethics. Additionally, they may feel like they have not been in their current position long enough to judge individual situations for themselves, except on a limited, exceptional basis. This may be a result of lack of trust in their discretionary skills, due to less experience with the job, or a result of an unfamiliarity with the code, as noted earlier.

Table 8, depicting the results of pairing ethical ideology and officer age, revealed that there is no relationship between these two variables. Perhaps one reason for this is the fact that type of position, rather than age, is what affects ethical ideology. There is a large range of ages within each positional category. Perhaps these officers choose an ethical ideology along the lines of the
requirements of their position, instead of by age. The common goals they have with officers of different ages may best be reached by holding a similar ethical ideology.

Another reason could be that other personality characteristics not studied here determine ethical ideology and that those characteristics do not fall into age categories. There may be some older officers and some younger officers with each personality characteristic, causing a diffusion of ethical ideology throughout the age ranges. As aforementioned, more research into ethical ideology is needed in order to determine what additional personality characteristics may influence an officer's ethical decision-making.

ETHICAL DILEMMA VIGNETTE FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In addition to the aforementioned, subjects were asked to respond to several vignettes that presented hypothetical ethical dilemmas germane to law enforcement practice. There were three vignettes, adapted from Pollock & Becker (1995), in each of the following categories: loyalty, duty, honesty, and discretion. Respondents were offered 7 options via a Likert scale. The following presents the results of this effort.

Loyalty. This section describes the findings from the three loyalty vignettes presented to subjects for response.

Loyalty Vignette 1: This vignette (vignette 4) dealt with use of force issues. In the vignette, one partner used more force than the other thought was necessary. Officers were then asked if they would lie to protect their fellow officer. The responses were recorded on a Likert-type scale, with responses of "not lie" and "lie" anchored at 1 and 7, respectively. Nearly eighty-eight percent (87.9%) of officers responding to this vignette said that they would not lie to cover for the other
officer’s excessive use of force. The only other answer (at 2 on the scale) garnered 9.1% of the responses. Three percent of the officers declined to respond to this vignette.

Loyalty Vignette 2: The second loyalty vignette (vignette 8) dealt with covering for an officer who is assumed to have taken merchandise from the scene of a jewelry store robbery. When asked what the second officer should do, the possible responses ranged from 1 (turn her in) to 7 (say nothing). Almost seventy-three percent (72.7%) of the responding officers said they would turn the first officer in. About eighteen percent (18.2%) responded at the second position on the scale, while 3% responded at both the third and fourth positions on the scale. Three percent of the officers declined to respond to this vignette.

Loyalty Vignette 3: The final loyalty vignette (vignette 10) asked officers about witnessing another officer hit a parked car and drive off. When asked if they should tell the car’s owner, officers could respond from 1 (tell owner what happened) to 7 (lie about what happened). Nearly eighty-two percent (81.8%) of the responding officers said that they would tell the car’s owner what had happened. About twelve percent (12.1%) answered at the second position on the scale, and 3% answered at the third position on the scale. Again, 3% of the officers surveyed declined to answer.

Duty. This section describes the findings from the three duty vignettes presented to subjects for response.

Duty Vignette 1: In this vignette (vignette 2), an officer sees an accident occur right before it is time for the officer’s shift to end. When asked what the officer should do, respondents were given a scale with answers anchored at 1 (work the accident) and 7 (avoid the accident scene). Almost seventy percent (69.7%) of the officers surveyed said they would work the accident, while 18.2% responded at 2 on the scale, 9.1% answered at 4, and 3% responded at 3 on the Likert scale.
Duty Vignette 2: The second duty vignette (vignette 5) dealt with responding to a call that the officer believes to be a false alarm. In this vignette, the officer can see that nothing is occurring in the building where the disturbance call is located. When asked what the officer in this situation should do, responses could range from 1 (investigate the call) to 7 (do not investigate). Nearly eighty-eight percent (87.9%) of officers responding to this vignette said they would investigate the call. About six percent (6.1%) responded at 2 on the scale, 3% said they would not investigate the call, and 3% did not answer.

Duty Vignette 3: The final duty vignette (vignette 11) describes a situation in which an injured person needs CPR, but is known to be a criminal and a drug addict. When asked what the officer should do, respondents could choose answers ranging from 1 (administer CPR) to 7 (don't administer CPR). Almost seventy-three percent (72.7%) of the officers said that they would administer CPR. About nine percent (9.1%) answered at both 2 and 4 on the scale, while 3% answered at both 3 and 6, and another 3% said they would not administer CPR at all.

Honesty. This section describes the findings from the three honesty vignettes presented to subjects for response.

Honesty Vignette 1: The first honesty vignette (vignette 3) asked respondents what the officer in the vignette should do when they find $20,000 in the pocket of a dead drug dealer. Answers could range from 1 (turn the money in) to 7 (keep the money). All of the respondents replied that they would turn the money in.

Honesty Vignette 2: This vignette (vignette 6) dealt with an auto accident involving an officer. When asked what the officer should do, responses on the scale were anchored at 1 (admit
blame) and 7 (claim she was cut off). Ninety-seven percent of the respondents said that she should admit blame. Three percent of the officers surveyed refused to answer this item.

Honesty Vignette 3: The final honesty vignette (vignette 9) asked respondents what an officer should do when they see a known crack dealer on the corner, but have no probable cause to search him. Responses could range from 1 (do not search the dealer) to 7 (make up probable cause and search the dealer). Nearly fifty-five percent (54.5%) of the respondents say they would not search the dealer. About twelve percent (12.1%) responded at 4 on the scale, while 9.1% responded at both 2 and 3, and 6.1% responded at 5 on the scale.

Discretion. This section describes the findings from the three discretion vignettes presented to subjects for response.

Discretion Vignette 1: In the first discretion vignette (vignette 1), participants were asked to respond to a situation in which an officer breaks up a barroom fight and realizes that one combatant is an off-duty officer. The second officer refuses to comply. Respondents were asked if they would arrest the unruly, intoxicated off-duty cop, with possible answers ranging from 1 (Arrest Officer B) to 7 (Ignore the situation). Approximately thirty-six percent (36.4%) said they would arrest the other officer, 27.3% answered at 3 on the scale, 24.2% answered at 2 on the scale, and 12.1% answered at the midpoint of 4.

Discretion Vignette 2: This vignette (vignette 7) dealt with a speeding officer from another agency, who is later found to be intoxicated. The response scale was in Likert scale format, with answers of Arrest Officer B and Let Officer B go anchored at 1 and 7, respectively. Forty-five and a half percent of the officers surveyed said they would arrest the other officer. About twenty-one
percent answered at the midpoint of 4, while 18.2% answered at 2 and 12.1% answered at 3 on the scale, with 3% of the officers declining to answer this item.

Discretion Vignette 3: The final discretion vignette involved discretion in arresting on a parole violation. Respondents were asked what they would do when faced with a parole violator who had a good job lined up. The responses ranged from 1 (arrest him) to 7 (Do not arrest him). The vast majority of officers (87.9%) said they would arrest the parole violator, while 3% of the officers answered both at 2 and 3 on the scale. About six percent (6.1%) of the officers declined to answer this item.

The officers' responses to the vignettes studied did not yield much variance. Most of the officers responded that they would take what was perceived as the ethical course of action -- arrest the person, refuse to lie, etc. Officers may actually feel this way, but there may also be other reasons for their responses. Perhaps officers responded with what they thought reflected best on their ethical decision-making abilities instead of with what they would actually do in a given situation.

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Overall Results

From the descriptive EPQ results we can conclude that most of the officers surveyed tended to follow the ethical ideology of Exceptionist, although the three other ethical ideologies were also strongly represented. The bivariate analyses allow us to conclude that discipline and age do not have an impact on an officer's ethical ideology, while an officer's rank, the amount of time an
officer has been at the department, the amount of time an officer has been in his or her position, and an officer's previous criminal justice positions do influence the officer's ethical ideology.

**Study Strengths**

The study of the ethical ideologies of police officers is a new aspect of police ethics and police psychology, one which, although it has been studied extensively in the general population (e.g., Forsyth 1980, 1981, etc.), has not been investigated in a police population prior to this study. Therefore, although exploratory in nature, this study sheds light on a subject that many researchers have failed to examine: police ethical ideology. This type of research holds many potential applications for police forces, especially regarding ethics training, and should therefore be continued.

The methodology employed in this study gave the researchers unprecedented access to a police agency for this type of research. As noted by Shernock (1990), he and other researchers have often had difficulty in eliciting responses from officers. However, the problems experienced by other researchers in garnering police attitudes were not experienced during the administration of this survey. Because of the accessibility of the attitudes of the officers participating in this study, groundbreaking work has been done in police ethics.

The findings in this study give new insight into the cognitive and behavioral worlds of police officers. Although only preliminary, the findings may be representative of a larger pattern in law enforcement. If this is so, it will give police administrators and managers a better idea of the way that officers think and how they behave regarding ethics. By understanding the ethical ideologies of officers on their force, administrators can better understand how to operate their departments most effectively.
Studies of this nature provide other researchers with strong baseline data for further research in the area of police ethical ideology. Research on ethics in policing, let alone the ethical ideologies of law enforcement officials, is rare. It is to be hoped that this study will both bring greater awareness of this research topic and generate additional research in support of the hypotheses stated here.

Finally, future research will be free to concentrate on topics not addressed, or addressed only minimally, in this and other ethics research. Such issues include the consequences for police department policies brought to light by this research, the training issues that research on ethical ideologies generates, and further research on police ethical ideologies themselves.

Study Limitations

As with all studies, this research contains some inherent flaws. Whether design issues, methodological problems, or unclear results, these flaws must be examined. As aforementioned, this study was merely an exploratory study, meant to open the field to further research in this area. It is to be hoped that other, similar studies, basing their ideas on what is presented here, will be able to correct and better prepare for some of the problems noted here.

In any study, one of the researcher's main concerns is sample size. Our sample size of 33 officers is, by any measure, very small. The problem with small samples is that one can not be sure that they reflect a trend in the general population. The larger a sample size, the more closely it will approximate the attitudes of the general population from which it was drawn. Perhaps future researchers will be able to conduct studies with a larger sample of officers, thereby validating the findings reported here.
Related to the problem of small sample size are the small cell values yielded in the bivariate analyses, specifically the chi square analyses. These small values made it difficult to gain an accurate picture of the number of officers in each condition, and it may have adversely affected the results of the chi square analyses. It is possible that, with a larger sample size, the cell values could increase and more or stronger relationships between variables could emerge.

When reflecting on the EPQ results mentioned above, it is not clear whether respondents answered the questionnaire with a civilian or law enforcement officer mindset. We must assume, however, that officers responded to the ethical position questions with a police officer's mindset; their responses to the vignettes would suggest a law enforcement point of view.

The final limitation of this study lies in the vignettes themselves. Adapted form Pollock & Becker (1995), these vignettes seemed ideal to measure the real-world ethical responses of officers to morally ambiguous situations. However, while Pollock & Becker might find them effective teaching tools with regard to ethics, in this study we did not find them to be an effective measure of ethical decision-making in law enforcement officers. The lack of variability in officer's answers created a problem of skewness in the findings. This suggests the need for an alternative approach to measuring real-world ethical decision-making among police officers.

**Suggestions for Future Researchers**

With regard to the limitations of this study, there are several suggestions which could be helpful to future researchers. First, a larger sample size is imperative to the success of future studies. A larger sample size would increase the probability that the patterns shown in the study are an accurate reflection of those in the general police population. In addition, the cell values for the
bivariate analyses would be larger, possibly yielding more and stronger relationships between ethical ideology and the numerous demographic variables.

The testing methodology might also be altered. By giving specific instructions to answer the EPQ in the mindset of a police officer, the confounding civilian mindset may be eliminated. Also, perhaps an alternate method of measuring real-world law enforcement decision-making could be substituted for Pollock & Becker's ethics vignettes. This new measure should be designed to yield results more variable than those which the current vignettes produced.

Finally, an interesting approach to measuring police officer's ethical ideologies would be to examine them cross-culturally. There are bound to be differences between the findings in the United States and those in other countries. New and innovative ethics policy and training issues might be discovered in a cross-cultural comparison.
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