9
CHAPTER

Deviance and Corruption

Introduction

Deviance is an action or behavior that violates the generally accepted norms of a group, organization, or society (Adler, 2005). Many societies' and organizations' policies, practices, and laws are developed from this normative foundation. Policies (and sometimes laws) are written because entities, ranging in size from organizations to countries, codify acts of deviance. Deviance can and does occur in all workplaces and throughout all professions. When public officials violate organizational rules and/or break the law these acts are also called malfeasance, misfeasance, and nonfeasance. Yet the scholarly literature typically prefers to use the term deviance.

Many criminal justice agencies have codes of ethics or standards of conduct that are taught to recruits and reinforced by veterans of the organization. One term closely related to deviance is corruption, also known as graft. According to McCarthy (1996), this practice includes "the intentional violation of organizational norms (i.e., rules and regulations) by public employees for personal material gain" (p. 231). This behavioral category subsumes theft, smuggling contraband, embezzlement, and misuse of authority (p. 232). Corruption, however, is not a synonym for deviance, although it is a subset of this practice.

Police deviance occurs when law enforcement officers behave in a manner that is "inconsistent with the officer's legal authority, organizational authority, and standards of ethical conduct" (Barker and Carter, 1986, pp. 2–3).

Police deviance includes but is not limited to:

- discrimination
- misconduct
- intimidation
- sexual harassment
- corruption
- excessive force
- use of restricted weapons
- illegal surveillance

131

This chapter reviews how widespread deviance is in police departments in the United States. It will also present a typology of police deviance, introduce the research methods that scholars use to conduct studies on police corruption, and examine the causes and effects of deviance (particularly the controls on corruption).[1]

How Widespread Is the Problem?

It is hard to determine how much deviance exists in specific police departments, which makes it almost impossible to gauge the pervasiveness of deviance across the country. One thing keen observers can be sure of is that because of the numerous policies, procedures, and rules that exist in police agencies, most officers have at one point or another in their career violated at least one regulation.

> Many of the violations are minor in nature—for example, officers not wearing their hats when required to do so. . . . [E]ven the more serious deviations are widespread and frequent occurrences. Examples would be some form of unnecessary verbal or physical abuse, misrepresenting or leaving out facts in police reports, committing perjury when testifying in court, or violating important organizational policies, such as those governing high-speed pursuits. . . . In fact, such behavior is so common in many agencies that it has become the 'way of doing business' and is no longer considered serious enough to warrant a formal organizational response. (Roberg and Kuykendall, 1993, p. 186)

Typology of Police Deviance

In general, police deviance can be divided into two types: occupational deviance, which involves "criminal and noncriminal [behavior] committed during the course of normal work activities or committed under the guise of the police officer's authority" (Barker and Carter, 1986, pp. 4–7), and abuse of authority, which involves the violation of the trust placed in police officers.

Occupational deviance usually falls under the categories of corruption and misconduct. The abuse of authority includes "any action by a police officer without regard to motive, intent, or malice that tends to injure, insult, trespass upon human dignity, manifest feelings of inferiority, and/or violate an inherent legal right of a member of the police constituency in the course of performing 'police work' (e.g., physical, psychological and legal abuse)" (Roberg and Kuykendall, 1993, p. 186). There are two subcategories of occupational deviance: police misconduct and police corruption. Police misconduct involves violations of organizational policies, procedures, rules, and other standards, whereas police corruption covers any criminal act in the commission of one's job, which benefits either the officer in question or someone else.

Police Gratuities

One of the most frequent problems commonly confused with corruption is the solicitation or acceptance of gratuities by police officers. A gratuity is something of minor value—a cup of coffee, for example, or other gift or small reward—offered as a "token of appreciation" in return for non-enforcement of a criminal law. Accepting gratuities "is a common practice in many police departments, but this practice is considered to be unethical by" influential police organizations, such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police (Roberg and Kuykendall, 1993, p. 187). Even though a police agency may have a written policy against the acceptance of gratuities, a disproportionate number of its rank and file ignore this rule.

There are both positive and negative issues involved in accepting gratuities. On the positive side, for example, business owners may believe that a police presence minimizes the possibility of victimization by shoplifters or juveniles. The gratuities also may reflect business owners' and managers' appreciation for police officers. The general public also may not be aware of the problematic nature of giving police gratuities. Refusal of an offer may sometimes be interpreted as an insult.

On the negative side, gratuities may compromise a police officer's ability to "operate in a democracy in a balanced and fair fashion" (Roberg and Kuykendall, 1993, p. 188). In other words, police officers may be in danger of granting preferential treatment to those who give gratuities and thus apply the law unequally. Acceptance of gratuities may even result in "police officers thinking of themselves as 'special' in the sense that they deserve benefits that others do not" (p. 188). Critics of the acceptance of gratuities also think that this "may lead to more serious forms of corruption" (p. 188).

Regardless of one's personal opinion, one must take into consideration that deviance is situational, meaning that in one police department, a behavior can be interpreted as normative, while in another it is perceived as deviant. This relativity is especially pronounced in the use of profanity, sleeping (i.e., "cooping") on the job, and engaging in personal business (i.e., going to the bank) while on duty.

Corruption

As stated earlier, "police corruption, the second subcategory of occupational deviancy, involves overt criminal activity by police officers. This includes committing crimes like theft or robbery, selling drugs, or taking money or something of value to not enforce the law" (Roberg and Kuykendall, 1993, p. 190). These types of actions are known among police officers as "going on the pad, collecting a steady note, or collecting the rent" (Barker, 1977). Police officers may receive money or other items of value, both legal and illegal, in exchange for not citing or arresting an individual for prostitution, illegal gambling, or drug possession or dealing.

Situations for corruption have existed for a long time. As Fogelson (1977) commented, during the political era, "the police did not suppress vice; they

licensed it" (p. 32). Throughout the country, "they permitted gamblers, prostitutes, and saloon keepers to do business under certain well understood conditions. These entrepreneurs were required to make regular payoffs to the police" (Roberg and Kuykendall, 1993, p. 192). Some jurisdictions, like New York City, have a long history of police corruption. Over the history of the NYPD, at least nine major corruption investigations have been exposed and investigated.[2]

What is the difference between corruption and bribery? In short, bribery involves the acceptance or solicitation of bribes and gratuities (which usually involve money or some sort of economic benefit, gift, or favor) in exchange for past, current, or future actions that will benefit the individual or organization that gives the bribe.

Types of Police Corruption

Corruption is a broad and varied issue. Examples include: corruption of authority (e.g., through the offering of free meals and drinks—especially alcohol—services, or discounts); kickbacks (money, goods, and services); opportunistic threats (victims, burglary, or unlocked buildings); shakedowns of criminals; protection of illegal activities (vice operators, business people); traffic citation fixes; misdemeanor or felony charge fixes; direct criminal activities (burglary, robbery); and internal payoffs (off-days, work assignments). Some experts have rank-ordered the seriousness of different kinds of corruption (Caplan and Murphy, 1991).

In general, corrupt officers can be divided into two types. On the one hand, so-called "grass eaters" are officers who engage in minor (i.e., low-level) corruption. These kinds of actions are usually reactive and are generally not frowned upon by other officers. On the other hand, "meat eaters" are police officers who actively engage in crimes, including burglary and drug dealing, on a regular basis. These officers are proactive in their endeavors. Police departments commonly protect reactive grafters but not proactive grafters. Meat eaters are usually ostracized by other officers.

Many police officers may accept low-level bribes, which they call "clean graft," but they usually refuse to take drugs or money from drug dealers, which they consider "dirty graft." Clean graft includes taking money found on the street or valuables left behind in public places by drunken, distracted, or belligerent middle- or high-class individuals. For example, an honest citizen who has found a wallet, flags down a police officer, reports the discovery, and turns over the wallet to the police officer. The police officer looks through the wallet, finds $100, and decides to pocket a $20 bill before logging the property in with the department. Dirty graft involves actively taking items of value from drug dealers, cop killers, and other serious criminals.

Causes

The problem of deviance and corruption is plagued with numerous misperceptions. Nevertheless, two basic perspectives exist to explain the causes of corruption: popular and scholarly.

Popular Conceptions

Police chiefs and their directors of public information traditionally suggest that deviance and corruption are the result of the "bad or rotten apples" in their ranks. "The 'rotten or bad apples' are either weak individuals who have slipped through the elaborate screening process of most police departments and succumbed to the temptations inherent in police work, or deviant individuals who continue their deviant practices in an environment which provides them ample opportunity" (Barker, 1977, p. 354). Despite the logic that seems to support this conclusion, this explanation can be easily discounted.

The bad or rotten apple explanation suggests that despite the elaborate screening mechanisms that police departments use, one or more corrupt police officers may, nonetheless, be hired. On the other hand, political and community activists and some pundits offer a "bad barrel" explanation. This is the claim that the entire police department is deviant or corrupt. In most cases, this perspective is a vast overgeneralization.

Scholarly/Expert Conceptions

Over the past five decades, numerous dominant causal explanations for police corruption have been offered: irresistible opportunities for corruption presented to police officers; low pay rates; cynicism surrounding the pay and promotion mechanism; socialization and reinforcement; extent of corruption in the community and broader society; tolerance among citizens and the police; and inadequate leadership (Baker, 1977; Roberg and Kuykendall, 1993; White, 2007).

Opportunity

First, police officers "are constantly exposed to situations in which the decisions they make can have a positive or negative impact on an individual's freedom and well-being. Citizens may try to influence this discretion by offering … any item of value that will result in a favorable decision" (Roberg and Kuykendall, 1993, p. 192). Because of the way that policing is designed, including a lack of direct supervision and the clientele police must deal with on a daily basis, multiple opportunities for corruption may present themselves during any given week (Barker, 1977).

In the area of so called "victimless crimes" (e.g., gambling, prostitution, drug use and dealing), police officers are placed in an untenable position. They have a great deal of discretionary power to invoke a criminal sanction

(Barker, 1977). Because the police regulate vice activities, they face numerous opportunities to collect graft on a regular basis.

If, for example, officers respond to a burglary at a store or a residence, they might take items of value that do not belong to them. They may rationalize that the goods are insured, and the rightful owner will be reimbursed for the loss (Barker, 1977). Occasionally, officers will lie on the stand (i.e., commit perjury while testifying in court) during a criminal trial in exchange for some sort of benefit. Some police officers believe in a sense of entitlement. They argue that because they work hard or because they put their lives on the line, they should receive extra perks from their job situations.

Pay Rates and Cynicism Surrounding Remuneration and Upward Career Mobility

Another cause for corruption may be the belief of some police officers that they are not paid enough (Barker, 1977). They may believe that the risks they take deserve more compensation than what they are paid, and thus, they may feel entitled to more money than their standard pay and benefits. Additionally, the career advancement model in most police departments may serve as a cause for corruption, White (2007) suggests:

> Opportunities for advancement in police department . . . is limited, yet the only way to get a significant pay increase is through promotion. . . . Structural elements of the promotion process can also frustrate officers. . . . The lack of opportunity for promotion clearly limits officers . . . who are unhappy with their pay may be tempted to seek illegitimate means to add to their salary, particularly if they believe that their performance has not been evaluated fairly. (p. 245)

Socialization and Reinforcement

Police officers share both their history and their identity. By interacting with other officers and being exposed to similar situations (e.g., boredom, fear, excitement), officers can form deep and often hidden emotional bonds. Through this process, similar norms and values are transmitted and shared (Barker, 1977).

Many officers may view the world as a "we versus they" environment (Becker, 1963). "Police tend to see the world as being composed of insiders and outsiders—police and persons who are not police officers are considered outsiders and are viewed with suspicion" (Kappeler, Sluder, and Alpert, 1994, p. 60).

Despite individual convictions, the work group of police officers remains a powerful influence on each officer (Barker, 1977). In the police academy context, the building of communal officer identity begins, an identity that is further developed once work on the force starts. Shortly after graduating from the academy, through a combined process of working on the streets

plus interactions with senior police personnel, officers soon become cynical and a have a higher proclivity to engage in deviance. Specifically, this cynicism may pave the way to corruption.

Extent of Corruption in Society

The community and political environment are influential in establishing attitudes toward corrupt activities. When corruption is found in other government agencies, among judges, prosecutors, and politicians, and in the business world, it contributes to the ability of the police officer to rationalize his or her own behavior (Newfield and Barret, 1988; Roberg and Kuykendall, 1993).

Tolerance by Citizens and the Police Department

This rationalization can lead to tolerance of abuses, as Roberg and Kuykendall (1993) write:

> In police departments, there are often many standards of behavior for officers to follow. In fact, there are so many standards that it is difficult to adhere to all of them. . . . Many officers even come to believe that if they are to be good police officers, they have to violate some of the standards they are supposed to follow. (p. 194)

Inadequate Leadership

An environment in which many officers either accept the existence of corruption or participate in corrupt activities calls into question the quality of leadership. Roberg and Kuykendall (1993) note that:

> Even nondeviant officers are both tolerant and tolerated because few will break the code of silence among officers. This belief can even carry over to the chief executive and managers in the organization, particularly if they have, or are, participating in the deviant behavior themselves. In addition, executives and managers may be 'blamed' and lose their jobs if the deviancy is exposed, even if they are not involved. (p. 194)

In the aftermath of the 1972 Commission to Investigate Alleged Police Corruption (also known as the Knapp Commission), the frequency and pervasiveness of corruption in our nations' police departments have decreased.

In the end, a variety of reasons may motivate police officers to engage in corrupt acts. Officers may lose respect for their superior officers, and they may see corruption in other parts of the criminal justice system (including among judges and prosecutors). They may abuse drugs and alcohol, which can impair their judgment. Meanwhile, the pressures to perform well in their duties are high. All too frequently, their contributions to the mission of the police department are not appreciated. Thus, officers may end up believing that engaging in corruption is an acceptable decision.

Solution: Controlling Police Corruption[3]

Police corruption has numerous effects, including an attrition of public trust, the possibility that corruption will seep into other government organizations, the lessening of police moral, and the loosening of controls. Most of the arguments about controlling police deviance, including corruption, have their origins in the study of large bureaucratic organizations. Additionally, those mechanisms established to control various police practices, such as illegal surveillance and police violence, are broadly applicable to the bigger problem of police corruption. Nevertheless, formidable obstacles mitigate the implementation of the control mechanisms, most significantly the lack of sufficient resources, information, discretion, and sanctions (Sherman, 1978). In addition, in many police departments, officers' behaviors/actions concerning what is considered corrupt changes over time. Furthermore, the networks that engage in corruption continuously shift their activities, whenever they sense they are under the watchful eye of Internal Affairs officers or the news media.

Admittedly, allegations of corruption have existed since the establishment of the first police department. Some of these episodes have led to high-profile corruption scandals. Better controls on police officers and their departments have been advocated by members of the public, government officials, and honest police officers and administrators. Prominent anticorruption policies and practices have been implemented in most big city police departments. Some of these recommendations are proactive, while others are reactive.

One should not forget that police officers are under constant scrutiny. This new level of supervision has been fueled by the introduction of police vehicles with dashboard video capability, cell phones, and Internet-based technology. Most cell phones now come equipped with photographic and video capabilities. It is now much easier for citizens to record conversations between themselves and police officers, which can be used as evidence in departmental or legal proceedings. A combination of internal and external controls can be effective in the control of police deviance and corruption.

Improved Pay Scales for Officers

Of primary importance, paying police officers a respectable and living wage is an important step in minimizing corruption. As previously mentioned, during the early history of policing, police departments did not pay officers well, but income was not the reason why individuals chose that occupation. The appeal of policing lay in the opportunity to benefit from the gratuities and corruption that were presented to officers. During the "professional era" (1920–1960), this practice changed. Through the creation of police unions and the introduction of other civil service reforms, police officers were given better pay and benefits. Still, some law enforcement officers, regardless of the level of their incomes, will always want more or think they deserve more than they are earning.

Teaching Ethics to Police Officers

Teaching ethics to police officers, either as part of the training academy or as in-service workshops, has been advocated by many police professionals and scholars. Courses on ethics are frequently taught in police training academies. Police commissioners boast about the number of hours or the complexity of the assignments tied to these courses. The scholarly journal *Criminal Justice Ethics* helps to further develop the field of police ethics by publishing articles on the subject. The downside to this approach is that ethics education too often just helps police officers to better rationalize their deviance or corrupt actions.

Routine Transfers of Police Officers

Routinely transferring police officers who are likely to fall into the temptation of corruption (particularly those on vice and drug details) to different assignments or beats is a method used by some law enforcement organizations to decrease corruption. The downside to this practice is that it may destroy the human capital expertise that has been accumulated by specific officers. In order to decrease this loss, police departments only change a handful of police officers in specialized details each rotation. Nevertheless, on many occasions, corrupt networks persist even though individual officers are transferred. Even after rotations, some officers may seek out new means to extract an illegal benefit from their new assignments.

Internal Affairs Bureaus/Departments

Sometimes also called the Office of Professional Standards or Responsibility, Internal Affairs departments or bureaus (IAD/IAB) exist to enact a measure of accountability and quality control over police officers and their actions. Information comes to the departments through civilian review boards, public complaints, and the criminal investigations of officers. Violations pertain to written policies, procedures, and criminal laws. Most Internal Affairs efforts have been reactive, but in recent years, larger police departments have tried to make these offices more proactive using early warning systems and integrity tests. Internal Affairs officers are often distrusted by outsiders and police officers alike. In various communities, citizens have come to believe that Internal Affairs was simply hiding or excusing the misconduct of the police officers. On the other hand, some officers have also felt that Internal Affairs is composed of officers who are seeking a degree of revenge for past grievances (White, 2007). (See Exhibit 9.1.)

The existence of IAB units is important, but this presupposes that they can fulfill their mandate. The creation of properly functioning Internal Affairs departments has lessened the frequency of hiring and continuing the employment of corrupt police officers. These units are limited only by the resources they have at their disposal and by the relationship the administrators have with the chief or commissioner of police.

Exhibit 9.1 *Prince of the City*

This movie, based on the Richard Daley book with the same title (1978), chronicles the activities of Robert (Bob) Leuci, who during the 1970s was part of the Special Investigations Unit of the NYPD. Leuci's unit had a stellar track record of arrests and convictions of drug users and dealers. During the process, however, Leuci was known to take both drugs and money for personal use and to give drugs as incentives to his informants. In order to accomplish his unit's goals, Leuci established an elaborate web of informers. He rationalized his actions as the cost of doing business. As a police officer, he argued that many people treat police officers as the lowest rung on the socioeconomic ladder, and moving up the police ladder commanded a certain amount of respect. Under scrutiny, Leuci agreed to participate in a federal investigation and wore a wire on his former associates. This led to additional convictions. The subject of Bob Leuci's rise and fall was made into a movie directed by Sidney Lumet.

Accreditation

Accreditation is another solution that can help alleviate deviance and corruption, as well as with other officer transgressions (Mastrofski, 1986). In 1979, the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) was formed. Over the years, CALEA has developed a system of standards that police and other law enforcement agencies are expected to adopt in order to meet the requirements of this organization. CALEA membership is voluntary, and the approval process can require a considerable amount of agency resources to complete. The accreditation process takes place over three stages. An agency applies to be certified and then fills out a self-questionnaire. Upon completion, a CALEA team comes to the department to assess compliance issues and the accuracy of the information provided on the application form. Then the assessment team writes a report. If departmental deficiencies are found, the police department must make the appropriate changes. Accreditation lasts for five years, after which time the agency must apply for reaccreditation. There are distinctive advantages to accreditation. According to McCabe and Fajardo (2001), accredited agencies were more likely to require regular drug tests of their officers, place higher educational requirements on recruits, and provide more training to recruits.

Integrity Officers

Integrity officers are frequently used by large police organizations. In New York City, in the wake of the Knapp Commission recommendations, each

---

Exhibit 9.2   Frank Serpico

Frank Serpico is a retired NYPD detective who was instrumental in providing information about incidents of police corruption to the Knapp Commission. Serpico revealed information about the corruption to the *New York Times.* His story was the focus of a bestselling book written by Peter Maas (1973), a Hollywood movie starring Al Pacino (1973), and an A&E-televised *Biography* episode (2000). Serpico grew up in a working-class Italian family in which police officers were respected. During the 1960s, corruption was rampant at all ranks throughout the NYPD. In his testimony, Serpico suggested that police corruption is part of the police socialization process. Rookie police officers learn early on how to break the rules and cut corners in order to survive in the police organization. Because Serpico did not accept graft, he was ostracized by his fellow officers. As a result of officer apprehension, Serpico was shot while on a drug bust. He survived and shortly after testifying in front of the Knapp Commission, he moved to Switzerland out of fear of police-related retaliation. He has since returned to the United States.

---

precinct is required to employ an Integrity Officer (IO) who is accountable to the Internal Affairs Division in headquarters. The IOs, who are placed strategically in the district houses rather than headquarters, serve as the eyes and ears of Internal Affairs units and are responsible for investigating allegations of possible corruption and police deviance. These officers, often ostracized by their colleagues, pass on valuable information to their superiors. Attempts have recently been made to shift the role and work of IA from being mostly reactive to being proactive. (See Exhibit 9.2.)

Corruption Investigations/Commissions

Widespread and "gut-wrenching" corruption investigations are often initiated in the wake of the disclosure of severe police wrongdoing. This reaction is usually the work of an outside body or Internal Affairs. In order to properly conduct an investigation, sufficient resources need to be allocated to it. If these resources are not available in police or municipal budgets, then the state or even the federal government should step in to provide sufficient personnel to complete the investigation. Unfortunately, with each new investigation, typically only a handful of officers are identified and sanctioned.

Hiring Police Administrators from Outside of Departments

Finally, hiring police administrators, particularly police chiefs and commissioners, from outside of a specific department has become a routine

practice. Since the Knapp Commission, many mayors, city managers, and police boards seek to hire new chiefs from other police departments. This practice typically lacks approval from the rank and file and those higher up in the chain of command who hoped they would one day be promoted to this position. The new head of the organization, however, has few loyalties in the department and can be in the best position to make drastic departmental changes, including the dismissal of corrupt administrators.

Obviously, stemming the tide of any unpleasant practice requires a multipronged effort. The use of the previously reviewed practices should go a long way to minimize the occurrence of police corruption. It is to be hoped that these approaches may also have ripple effects on other forms of police deviance and crime.

Conclusion

Police deviancy and corruption is an everyday problem for most police departments. Law Enforcement officers have an extremely important duty to serve and protect society. They hold the public's trust, but the legitimacy of that trust can erode quickly if an officer or group engages in corruption. When evidence of corruption emerges, police departments must make bold steps to fairly investigate and eradicate it as soon as possible. Anything short of this will perpetuate fear and distrust among the public.

Notes

1. Some authors (e.g., Stevens, 2009) suggest that police deviance and corruption (along with police misconduct) is best seen as part of the wrongful acts perpetrated by police officers.

2. In 1895 (by the Lexow Committee); in 1900 (by the Mazet Committee); in 1913 (as a result of the Curran investigations); in 1932 (by the Seabury Committee); in 1942 (as a result of the Amen investigation); in 1952 (by the Brooklyn Grand Jury); in the 1970s by the Knapp Commission (as a result of the Serpico revelations); in the late 1970s (by the "Prince of the City" investigations); in 1986 (in the Buddy Boys investigation); and in 1993 (by the Mollen Commission) (McAlary, 1987).

3. This section builds on Ross (2004). Other authors (e.g., Stevens, 2009) have created similar lists. Stevens, for example, under internal monitoring, singles out supervision, close supervision, performance evaluations, early warning/intervention systems, internal affairs and professional standards. Under external monitoring, he includes: monitoring committees, the courts (especially through Supreme Court cases), and civil liability.

Glossary

Bad barrel explanation: The claim that an entire police department is deviant or corrupt.

Bad or rotten apple explanation: A situation in which only one or a small number of police officers in a police department are deviant or corrupt.

Bribe: Money, items, or services given to a public official with the explicit understanding that the public official will assist the individual in receiving favorable treatment by the government. Favorable treatment can also include failing to enforce the law.

Clean graft: Bribes, gratuities, and corruption that are not frowned upon by fellow police officers and by the administration.

Corruption: Any criminal act engaged in by a police officer in the commission of his or her job as a police officer that results in some sort of gain.

Deviance: An action or behavior that violates generally accepted norms in a group, organization, or society.

Dirty graft: Bribes, gratuities, and corruption that is frowned upon by fellow police officers and by the administration.

Frank Serpico: NYPD officer who during the 1960s and early 1970s attempted to stop corruption. His complaints were largely ignored by his superiors.

Graft: Illegally obtained money or benefits a police officer receives through corrupt practices.

Grass eater: A police officer who engages in minor, unplanned corruption.

Gratuity: In law enforcement circles, this involves receiving something of minor value (often referred to as a token of appreciation) for non-enforcement of a criminal law.

Illegal surveillance: This involves eavesdropping without out a warrant or collecting information in violation of an individual's right to privacy.

Integrity Officer (IO): An officer who works for the Internal Affairs Bureau/Division (IAB/IAD). He or she is strategically placed in the district houses rather than at headquarters in order to serve as the eyes and ears of IAB / IAD. This officer detects and reports on instances of police corruption or other breaches of ethical conduct. This position was first introduced in the NYPD after the revelations of Frank Serpico to the Knapp Commission. Recently, there have been attempts to shift the role and work of IA from being mostly reactive to being proactive.

Knapp Commission: The federal commission established to investigate the allegations of Officer Frank Serpico of corruption in the NYPD.

Meat eater: A police officer who engages in serious corruption (e.g., protecting drug dealers or smugglers, armed robbery) that is planned or proactive.

On the take: A colloquial expression indicating that an officer is corrupt and receives regular payments from illegal sources.

Police deviance: Activities that are inconsistent with an officer's legal authority, organizational authority, and standards of ethical conduct.

Chapter Questions

Part One: Multiple Choice Questions

1. The acceptance of gratuities by police officers involves/is
   a. receiving something of value
   b. a common practice
   c. considered by respected policing organizations to be unethical
   d. some of the above
   e. all of the above

2. Why is there disapproval of gratuities given to police officers?
   a. It causes unnecessary competition among police officers.
   b. It forces police to be super-cops instead of being a police unit.
   c. It could lead to corruption.
   d. There is not enough to go around.
   e. none of the above

3. An officer who is considered a "grass eater"
   a. engages in minor corruption
   b. is respected by others officers
   c. is frowned upon by other officers
   d. some of the above
   e. all of the above

4. What is a meat eater?
   a. a police officer who engages in illegal behavior to cover up evidence
   b. a police officer who engages in major police corruption
   c. a police officer who solicits money or services
   d. a proactive crime fighter
   e. a police officer who consistently uses aggressive violence in effecting an arrest

5. The owner of a local Dunkin Donuts store offers a police officer two donuts and a large coffee. The officer accepts. This occurs despite a police department policy that under no circumstances shall officers take gratuities. How would a police expert interpret this action?
   a. The officer is exercising his constitutional rights.
   b. This action would be considered police misconduct.
   c. There is no wrongdoing.
   d. This would be considered police corruption.
   e. It creates an obligation.

6. Which commission investigated the alleged corruption in the NYPD that was brought to public attention by Frank Serpico?
   a. Garrison
   b. Knapp
   c. Mollen
   d. Pretty Boy
   e. Warren

7. Who was Knapp?
   a. one of Serpico's partners
   b. former Commissioner of the NYPD
   c. police chief
   d. former mayor of New York City
   e. leader of famous corruption investigation

8. In which city did the Knapp Commission take place?
   a. New York
   b. Austin, Texas
   c. Albany, New York
   d. Sacramento, California
   e. Washington, D.C.

9. What is one type of police corruption?
   a. coming into work late
   b. being a grass eater
   c. being a meat eater
   d. both b and c
   e. none of the above

10. Police officers who investigate police officer misconduct in an organized unit represent what kind of control?
    a. external
    b. formal
    c. informal
    d. internal
    e. none of the above

11. The NYPD was "relatively successful" in stemming corruption through what practice?
    a. utilization of the citizen's complaint bureau
    b. recruiting police chiefs from outside the force
    c. the revelations of Frank Serpico
    d. reports of investigative journalists
    e. none of the above

12. Which of the following is NOT a drawback to gratuities?
    a. They compromise officers' ability to operate fairly.
    b. Officers think they are special and deserve special favors.
    c. Giving gratuities is costly to shop owners.
    d. Acceptance of gratuities may lead to corruption.
    e. none of the above

13. Which of the following is an action or behavior that violates generally accepted norms?
    a. misconduct
    b. rotten apple
    c. deviance
    d. corruption
    e. none of the above

14. Which of the following is NOT police jargon for participating in corruption?
    a. going on the pad
    b. collecting the rent
    c. on the down low
    d. collecting a steady note
    e. none of the above

15. Which of the following is a cause of corruption?
    a. poor pay rates
    b. inadequate leadership
    c. the opportunity structure
    d. socialization and reinforcement
    e. all of the above

16. Why might it be difficult to determine how widespread police corruption is?
    a. The corruption might be considered normative behavior.
    b. Most of it is hidden.
    c. Empirical research is not comprehensive.
    d. Police departments are not reliable sources for this kind of information.
    e. all of the above

17. What is a minor temporary gift given to and accepted by an officer that is not in itself illegal but is seen as inappropriate?
    a. bribe
    b. graft
    c. gratuity
    d. corruption
    e. misdemeanor

18. Which of the following is the term used for a situation when an entire police department is seen as corrupt?
    a. bad apple
    b. grass eater
    c. bad barrel
    d. meat eater
    e. none of the above

Part Two: Short Answer Questions

1. What is the difference between police deviance and corruption?

2. What is the difference between the bad apple and bad barrel explanations?

3. What is an Integrity Officer?

4. What is the difference between a gratuity given to a waitress and a gratuity given to a police officer?

5. How did Frank Serpico deal with the knowledge that corruption took place in the NYPD?

6. What are four causes of police corruption?

7. What are four effects of police corruption?

8. What are two types of corrupt police officers?

9. What is the difference between clean and dirty graft?

Part Three: Essay Questions

1. Discuss the following statement: The corruption of police officers would cease to exist if police departments would only properly screen candidates before offering them spots in the police training academy.

2. How would you effectively educate the public about the problems of police corruption?

3. What is the best way to reduce the amount of corruption in police departments in the United States?

4. Some commentators have argued that as long as police officers occupy positions of power, we will never be able to eliminate police corruption. Do you agree with this statement? If so, why? If not, why?