

# Police Officers' Pride in Ghanaian Criminal Justice Institutions: Does Perception of Corruption Play a Role?

Moses Agaawena Amagnya

agaawenamoses@yahoo.co.uk

De Montfort University

---

## Research Article

**Keywords:** police officers, pride, criminal justice institution, criminal justice system, justice officials, Ghana, attitudes toward corruption

**Posted Date:** October 13th, 2026

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-10998072/v1>

**License:**   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

**Additional Declarations:** No competing interests reported.

---

## Abstract

This study explores police officers' ascription of pride to criminal justice institutions (CJIs) and whether officers' ascription of pride is impacted by perceptions of corruption. Pride in CJIs as a concept has implications for law enforcement and the administration of justice. It influences officials' attitudes toward institutions and other officials, which impacts on trust and collaboration. Also, criminal justice officials (CJOs) who are not proud of CJIs may act unprofessionally, perform their jobs poorly, and perpetrate injustice. Considering the role pride in CJIs plays in law enforcement and the administration of justice, continual research is needed to comprehend the views of CJOs. This study uses a survey to explore police officers' level of pride in Ghanaian CJIs and whether perceptions of corruption play a role in officers' ascription of pride. Through descriptive and inferential statistical analyses, the results show partiality in officers' ascription of pride to the police compared to other CJIs. Also, officers' ascription of pride is influenced by perceived corruption among justice actors and attitudes toward corruption in the larger society. The results imply that, to improve pride in CJIs, authorities must confront corruption within the criminal justice system (CJS). Also, appropriate educational campaigns to sensitise citizens about corruption and its impact should be implemented to address attitudes toward corruption in Ghanaian society.

## Introduction

This study explores police officers' pride in CJIs and whether ascription of pride to CJIs is affected by officers' perceptions of corruption. Pride is theorised as perceiving an institution as legitimate, ethical, and delivering on its mandate. Pride in an institution – the emotional investment employees have in an institution's mission, values and reputation (Sanders et al., 2018) – has some impact on officials' attitudes toward institutions. Research shows that pride in its varied dimensions impacts officials' commitment to their organisation and service to customers, creativity, morale, and work performance (Gouthier and Rhein, 2011, Alias and Bahron, 2019). Also, the level of officials' pride in institutions enhances professionalism, organisational identities and image, devotion, achievement, and job satisfaction (Williams and DeSteno, 2008, Gouthier and Rhein, 2011, Fredrickson, 2013, Alias and Bahron, 2019). Evidence similarly shows that pride in institutions is linked to organisational justice that officials experience or perceive as well as perceptions of corruption in the CJS and CJIs (Farmer et al., 2003, Crow et al., 2012).

Studies relying on cross-sectional and self-report data have explored organisational pride among CJOs and its impact on them as well as the administration of justice (Brunetto and Farr-Wharton, 2003, Gouthier and Rhein, 2011, Welander et al., 2017, Sanders et al., 2018, Alias and Bahron, 2019). Most studies report that CJOs' level of pride has significant impact on law enforcement and the administration of justice. A major limitation of such studies is that they often focus on single institutions, which does not provide a holistic and comprehensive view of the issues. Addressing the highlighted gap, this study employs the survey research approach to explore police officers' level of pride in CJIs and the impact officers' perceptions of corruption have on their ascription of pride. The study addresses the following research questions: (1) Does police officers' ascription of pride to CJIs differ? (2) Do police officers perception and attitudes toward corruption influence their ascription of pride to CJIs? (3) How can police officers ascription of pride to CJIs be improved?

Police officers' level of pride in CJIs and justice administration is an important issue to research for several reasons. First, officials' level of pride in institutions influences whether they regard institutions as legitimate and officials' commitment to an organisation's mission and goals (Ling et al., 2024). Also, pride in institutions allows officials to persist in the face of adversity and make personal efforts to exert control over challenging situations (Tracy and Robins, 2004). Organisational pride<sup>1</sup> is a vital strategic competitive asset for the performance of institutions, a distinguishing feature in competition, and a key driver of positive workplace behaviour (Katzenbach, 2003, Haslam, 2004, Ling et al., 2024). Social identity theorists note that institutions can benefit from positive word-of-mouth, brand loyalty, and customer acquisition when there is organisational pride among officials and customers<sup>2</sup> (Haslam, 2004). Researching police officers' pride in CJIs can help to promote organisational pride among customers through police officers' positive behaviours towards the public (Alias and Bahron, 2019). Again, exploring police officers' pride in CJIs can help to gauge their sentiments toward CJI, which can impact collaboration between the police and various CJIs, as well as how police officers relate and interact with members of the public.

## Context of the Study: Ghana

Ghana is one of the few African countries with a thriving democracy and serves as a role model to other African countries (Charles, 2023, Kuyini Mohammed, 2023). Since the inception of Ghana's current constitution in 1993 (Government of Ghana, 1992), various institutions (e.g., Police Service, Judiciary, and Prisons Service) and laws have been created to address criminal justice matters. However, CJIs and CJOs do not fully observe principles of due process, fairness, and the protection of human rights (Freedom House, 2018, Amagnya, 2022). Tankebe (2019) notes that some Ghanaian CJOs consider legislation and procedures regulating their powers and conduct as a burden and a waste of time. Reports of police brutality against citizens resulting in the death of innocent citizens and subsequent dissatisfaction,

protests and hostilities between some citizens and security agencies are regularly reported in the media (Gadugah, 2009, Amagnya, 2011, Joyonline, 2017, Donkor, 2021, BBC, 2023, Club Mate, 2023, Ghanaweb, 2023, Mensah, 2023, TV3, N.D.).

There are also media reports of growing public concerns about crime and insecurity in Ghana, with crime rate analyses producing conflicting results (see Tankebe and Boakye, 2019, Dziwornu, 2021, Appiahene-Gyamfi, 2022). The fear of crime and insecurity concerns are not always linked to actual crime rates or victimisation (Lorenc et al., 2014). Also, concerns about CJOs not effectively discharging their duties and holding offenders accountable are widespread (Amagnya, 2023b, Amagnya, 2023c). There are reports of inmate bullying, poor supervision and rehabilitation of prisoners, taking of bribes from inmates' families, and trading of illegal items in prisons (Amnesty International, 2012, Akoensi and Tankebe, 2020). Also, evidence shows that CJOs often intentionally create bottlenecks during encounters with citizens to frustrate and extract bribes (Amagnya, 2020, Amagnya, 2022, Amagnya, 2023a). A recent survey shows that half of Ghanaians who interacted with the police paid bribes compared to one-fifth who interacted with the courts (UNODC, 2022). Overall, officials in Ghana largely get away with impunity due to low accountability systems and officials' ability to influence justice or accountability processes after wrongdoing (Amagnya, 2022, Amagnya and Karstedt, 2025).

Non-adherence to due processes leads to a belief that CJIs and CJOs are unprofessional, ineffective, and illegitimate, which can cause cynicism toward the law and CJIs (Akinlabi, 2017, Amagnya, 2022). Also, perceived increase in violent crimes, brutalising citizens, corruption, and inhumane treatment of prisoners can create a lack of pride in CJIs and legal processes for addressing grievances (Afrobarometer, 2020b, Afrobarometer, 2020a, Afrobarometer, 2022, Gyamfi, 2022). A lack of pride in CJSs and CJIs can result in non-cooperation with institutions or officials and self-administration of justice by citizens – vigilantism and mob justice (Tankebe, 2011, Akinlabi, 2017). So, it is essential to explore police officers' pride in CJIs and the impact perceptions of corruption have on the ascription of pride. Such a study will allow CJIs to appreciate sentiments within the CJS and develop reforms to improve their legitimacy.

## Pride in Criminal Justice Systems and Institutions

Pride is a feeling of deep pleasure or satisfaction derived from one's own achievements, the achievements of those with whom one is closely associated, or qualities and possessions that are widely admired (Oxford English Dictionary, 2025). Pride emanates from a feeling of delight, pleasure or satisfaction in one's personal or institutional capability or achievements, which may arise in the context of high-involvement decisions or settings (Lea and Webley, 1997, Welander et al., 2017). Pride is credited to the need for self and social identity and is conceived as an aspect of self-consciousness or an ego-focused and competitive emotion which entails the involvement of an individual in dealing with inner conflicts in pursuit of inner identity, glory, and self-esteem (Lewis, 2000, Brown and Marshall, 2001, Tangney, 2005). Pride is ignited by a recognition that is achieved through social admiration or approval and an emotion that is derived from self-appraisals or appraisals by others based on a belief in one's personal or institutional competence and behaviour (Zammuner, 1996, Tracy and Robins, 2004, Oveis et al., 2010, Alias and Bahron, 2019). There are several typologies of pride including hubristic/excessive pride (i.e., regarding self as superior), authentic or positive pride (i.e., self-conscious emotion characterised by self-worth, dignity, and satisfaction in your achievement), individual pride (i.e., pride based on personal achievement), and group pride (i.e., pride derived from collective identity) (Lewis, 2000, Tangney, 2005, Tracy and Robins, 2007).

For this study, pride is theorised as the perception of CJIs and CJS being legitimate, ethical, and effective in delivering on their mandates (Niederhoffer, 1967, Rafky, 1975, Graves, 1996, Sanders et al., 2018). Pride is approached in this study from the dimension of organisational pride, which is an important factor in the success of institutions or businesses with a positive effect on commitment to better customer service (Williams and DeSteno, 2008, Gouthier and Rhein, 2011, Fredrickson, 2013). Organisational pride refers to an admiration for or loyalty to an organisation that motivates and encourages employees to work to the best. It brings into perspective the relationship between affective constructs that can be leveraged to improve job satisfaction, performance and organisational image, especially in public sector entities such as the police (Alias and Bahron, 2019). This study measures organisational pride by focusing on police officers' pride in CJIs and stakeholders operating in Ghana's CJS.

Even though the concept of pride has been a subject of sociological and criminological interest and debate for decades, few studies have explored criminal justice actors' pride in CJIs. Evidence shows that police officers take pride in their role in the CJS, especially when they feel valued, supported, and empowered to serve the public (Misner, 1975). Exploring the concept of corruption in the lower levels of the Afghan Police Force, Singh (2019) found that the police officers have no sense of pride and do not believe in their mandate or solidarity of their police force for the greater good of the country. Alias and Bahron (2019) explored pride among officers in the Malaysian Royal Police Force through a review of the literature on organisational pride. They classified organisational pride into four distinct constructs: (i) introspective pride, (ii) vicarious pride, (iii) contagious pride, and (iv) conspicuous pride. They found that emotional organisational pride, attitudinal organisational pride, commitment to customer service, and creativity were well-being factors associated with pride. Brunetto and Farr-Wharton (2003) found high level of pride among lower-ranked Australian police officers, which was affected by 'management and

organisational support', 'appraisal processes', 'ambiguity about ethical issues', 'informal communication mode', and 'bi-directional communication processes'.

Lack of pride is a by-product of anomie in one's social structure and can result from a lack of attachment to society or societal goals, occupational stagnation, poor job conditions, loss of respect for the law and public, and distrust of stakeholders like the media (Niederhoffer, 1967, Graves, 1996, Hickman, 2008, Nix et al., 2020). Also, denying police officers their conditions of service undermines their confidence in the command structure as well as their morale and level of pride (Knapp Commission, 1972). In contrast, fair treatment activates officers' sense of belonging, group pride and legitimacy, and sense of duty in relation to group norms and values (Bradford et al., 2014). Equally, respect from the public and police administration are drivers of officers' level of pride in their jobs and institutions (Bennett and Schmitt (2016). Indeed, when police officers perceive that the public does not respect them or believe in their legitimacy, it impacts officers' level of pride in CJIs. Other studies found that officials with high human values easily develop pride in organisations that often lead to higher work outcomes (Welander et al., 2017, Ling et al., 2024). Such results suggest that for institutions to enhance work outcomes, they need to recruit individuals with strong human values in addition to promoting organisational pride.

There is evidence that police officers who take pride in their jobs or institutions become vested in protecting the reputation of their organisations (Bayley and Perito, 2011). Also, sense of pride in a job or institution helps officers to cope with difficulties in their jobs, develop a strong sense of dedication to their roles, and undertake further learning to improve their skills and capabilities (Murray, 1990). Being proud of one's organisation can lead to internalising the organisational goals, which is key to organisational commitment that is associated with strong predictive validity, positive job satisfaction, improved morale, higher organisational performance, and prevention of stress and turnover (Brunetto and Farr-Wharton, 2003, Alias and Bahron, 2019). Pride is also associated with cynicism – a loss of faith in people or institutions (Langworthy, 1987), which can contribute to alienation, job dissatisfaction, acceptance of deviant norms and/or engagement in misconduct like corruption, aggressive policing, and abuse of authority (Niederhoffer, 1967, Rafky, 1975, Graves, 1996, Caplan, 2003, Hickman, 2008, Amagnya, 2020). Exploring cynicism among police constables, Bennett and Schmitt (2016) found that constables in Barbados took pride in their organisation compared to those in Trinidad and Jamaica.

## **Link between Corruption and Police Officers' Attitudes and Behaviours**

Research shows that there is a link between corruption and police officers' attitudes like level of pride. Studies report that dealing effectively with corruption raises officers' level of pride, which in turn acts as an insulator against misconduct, including corruption (Misner, 1975, Fitzgerald Commission, 1989, Newburn, 1999). Evidence shows that attitudes of police officers (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993) are influenced by issues relating to corruption like cultural, institutional, economic, contextual, and societal level factors (Boateng et al., 2019, Amagnya, 2023c, Amagnya, 2024, Amagnya and Karstedt, 2025). For instance, exploring police corruption in Nigeria, Oluwaniyi (2011) found that economic factors like greed and 'get-rich-quickly' syndrome influence police officers' corruption attitudes. Also, economic factors relating to corruption like low salaries, financial responsibilities, and greed influence officials' attitudes and perceptions (Bayley and Perito, 2011, see Amagnya, 2020). A major weakness of prior studies is not being holistic because they usually treat economic variables discretely. The current study addresses this limitation by combining various economic issues to generate an economic variable. It is hypothesised that officers' perception of economic factors as a cause of corruption will negatively affect their ascription of pride to CJIs (H1).

Research shows that institutional action or inaction against misconduct like corruption has the likelihood to influence officials' perceptions and attitudes toward institutions. For instance, Bayley and Perito (2011), Karstedt (2010), and Karstedt and LaFree (2006) found that people's perceptions and attitudes toward institutions are associated with institutional factors like oversight, governmental capacity, strength of civil society, independent media, and stability of elites. Also, research shows that perceptions of organisational justice affect officials' pride and commitment to their organisations (Farmer et al., 2003, Crow et al., 2012). Kutnjak Ivković (2005) concludes that an organisational environment plays a crucial role in forming police officers' perceptions and evaluations of institutions. Examining police officers' attitudes toward corruption, Lee et al. (2013) found that supervisors' tolerance of misconduct and departmental deviant subculture influence officers' attitudes to institutions. Based on the impact institutional or organisational issues can have on officials' attitudes and perceptions, this study hypothesises that police officers' perceptions of institutional (in)action on corruption will negatively influence their ascription of pride to CJIs (H2).

Cultural factors are also well-known to influence people's perceptions and attitudes toward institutions. Evidence shows that the cultural environment of organisations impacts employees' attitudes and behaviour across different continents and countries (Klockars et al., 2004, Kutnjak Ivković and Sauerman, 2016, Kutnjak Ivković et al., 2020). Karstedt and LaFree (2006) found that cultural factors significantly influence people's attitudes and perceptions of institutions. A culture of corruption where corruption becomes systemically embedded in countries or state institutions (Lodge 2009, p. 404; Yadav 2011, p. 133) is a key cultural issue that influences people's perceptions and attitudes toward institutions. Presence of a culture of corruption in a country or institution skews perceptions of what is right and wrong: a

culture of corruption in institutions can entice officers to engage in corrupt activities and/or support corruption in their organisations (Singh, 2022, Amagnya, 2023c). Based on the preceding discussion, this study hypothesises that officers' perceptions of the existence of a culture of corruption will negatively influence their ascription of pride to CJIs (H3).

## Methods

### Data, Setting and Population

Survey data was collected from Ghanaian police officers between July 2017 and February 2018. Although the data was collected in 2017 and 2018, apart from presidential and parliamentary elections in 2020 and 2024, no substantial contextual factors has occurred that have any impact on the findings. Questionnaires were administered in Greater Accra, Ashanti, and Upper East regions, which represent southern, middle, and northern Ghana, as well as rural and urban dynamics (Amagnya, 2020, Ghana Statistical Service, 2022). While the Upper East is a rural and less developed region in northern Ghana, Greater Accra and Ashanti are developed urban regions in southern and middle Ghana respectively (Amagnya, 2020, Amagnya and Karstedt, 2025). Various regions with different historical, cultural, and economic backgrounds and context are useful for determining differences. Police officers were chosen as the respondents because they work at the entry point to the CJS, are located everywhere in Ghana, and interact with citizens regularly. As a result, police officers are more likely to appreciate how citizens feel about CJIs compared to other CJOs like judges, court administrators, prosecutors, and private lawyers due to their roles and operations.

The Ghana Police Service (GPS), headquartered in Accra, is structured into regional commands, which are subdivided into divisions made up of districts with police stations nested within the districts. This study covered 27% of police regions in Ghana (i.e., three out of the eleven police regions). At the time of the study, Accra Regional Command has 14 divisions, 42 districts, and 110 stations; Ashanti has 14 divisions, 41 districts, and 158 stations; and Upper East has three divisions, 11 districts, and 20 stations (Ghana Police Service, 2017). There were about 33,000 police officers in Ghana with approximately 28% in the selected regions: 3,773 in Accra, 4,207 in Ashanti, and 1,256 in Upper East (Ghana Police Service, 2017). On average, a police district in Accra has 92 officers, 102 officers for Ashanti, and 105 officers for Upper East. The average number of officers per a police station was 27 for Ashanti, 30 for Upper East, and 34 for Accra. Ashanti has fewer officers per station due to having more police stations and a larger land area (24,389 km<sup>2</sup>) compared to Upper East (8,842 km<sup>2</sup>) and Accra (3,245 km<sup>2</sup>).

### Access, Recruitment, Sampling and Sample

Prior to data collection, ethical approval and permission were obtained from [blinded for review] University and the GPS. After the GPS granted the permission and informed all regional commands, the author visited the headquarters of each selected region and obtained a list of police divisions, districts, and stations. A total of fourteen divisions made up of five in Accra, six in Ashanti, and three in Upper East were selected from the regional lists. Then, 28 police districts comprising eleven in Ashanti, nine in Accra, and eight in Upper East were selected across the 14 divisions. The selection of the divisions and districts was based on accessibility through commercial transport. To uphold ethical standards, the author visited the selected divisions and districts during regular working hours. At each division and district, the available superior officer gathered all officers present at the office and introduced the author to them. The author then explained the study's purpose, the voluntary and anonymous nature of participation, and the procedures for completing the survey to the police officers. The officers present during the visits were afforded the opportunity to ask questions, seek any clarification, and raise any concerns that need to be addressed.

After explanations and addressing questions and concerns, questionnaires were distributed by the author to all police officers present. In addition, questionnaires were also left with the headquarters of the divisions and districts to be distributed to outstations and police officers not present during the visits. Particular care was taken to ensure that it was not easy to detect the identity of officers who completed the questionnaires, thus safeguarding anonymity throughout the process. Specifically, officers were instructed to put questionnaires into envelopes that were provided to them prior to placing the envelopes into a designated box located in the secretariat of divisions and districts. All participants provided informed consent by signing consent forms before completing the questionnaire, which took an average of 25 minutes. The author revisited the designated offices after two weeks to retrieve the questionnaires that participants had returned. However, to accommodate late submissions after the initial two-week timeframe, an additional round of survey collection was carried out in all areas at the end of the fieldwork. In total, 900 questionnaires were distributed. A 780 surveys were returned by participants and after scrutiny, 616 were adequately completed and used in the analysis, representing a response rate of 68%.

### Dependent variable

Five dependent variables were used to measure police officers' pride in CJIs and justice administration. The dependent variables were measured by asking police officers to indicate how proud they are of the police, judiciary, prosecution service/A-G, legal profession, and justice administration. The response options for each institution range from (1) 'not at all proud' to (5) 'very proud' (see Table 3 for descriptive statistics of the variables).

## Independent variables

To generate the independent variables for this study, officers were asked to indicate their level of disagreement or agreement with some causes of corruption that are generated from the corruption literature. The responses for each item range from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. In addition to the causes of corruption, officers were asked to rate the frequency of corrupt practices among key justice actors – namely, police officers, judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and suspects. The response options for this category range from (1) *Never* to (5) *Very Often*. Through a principal component analysis, the items were categorised into four scales: economic factor, institutional (in)action, attitudes toward corruption, and corruption by justice actors.

### Economic Factor

This scale comprised four items that measure economic conditions that can persuade officials to engage in corruption. The scale scores range from 4 to 20, where a higher score indicates an agreement that economic factor causes corruption and vice versa.

*Institutional (In)action*: This scale comprised ten items that assess actions or inactions of the police or police officers that allows or encourages corruption. The scale scores range from 10 to 50: a higher score depicts an agreement that institutional (in)action causes corruption.

### Attitudes Toward Corruption

This scale comprised six items that focus on attitudes toward corruption in the country. The scale scores range from 6 to 30, with higher scores depicting an agreement that societal attitudes toward corruption causes corruption. See Appendix A for the various scales and their Cronbach's alpha as well as the Factor Loadings of items.

### Corruption by Justice Actors

This scale comprised of 14 items such as 'Judges give light sentences to family members/friends of CJOs or influential persons', 'Prosecutors do not prosecute some cases because of bribery', 'Lawyers offer money to CJOs on behalf of their clients for favourable decisions', and 'Suspects use their relationships with influential persons to stop cases against them' (see Appendix A for a full list of statements). The scale scores range from 14 to 70 with a mean of 37.43 ( $SD = 12.52$ ). Higher scores indicate a higher perception that corruption among justice actors is frequent. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale is 0.93, which is above the conventional threshold of 0.70 and demonstrate high internal consistency and reliability among the items (Taber, 2018, Hussey et al., 2025).

## Control Variables

Also, individual and contextual factors like gender, age, rank, education, years of service, income, department, and area of work can impact ascription of pride to CJIs (Boateng et al., 2019, Amagnya, 2023c, Amagnya, 2024). As a result, some questions focus on characteristics of police officers (e.g., gender, age, education, etc.) and work environment (e.g., region of study, department of work, area of work) were included in the survey and used as control variables. While age and years of service are continuous variables, income (GH₵1500 or less = 0, Above GH₵1500 = 1), gender (female = 0, Male = 1), education (basic to high school = 0, above high school = 1), and area of work (rural = 0, urban = 1) are categorical variables. Rank (constable/corporal = 1, sergeant = 2, inspector and above = 3), region (Greater Accra = 1, Ashanti = 2, Upper East = 3), religion (No Religion = 1, Christian = 2, Muslim = 3) and department (Motto Traffic and Transport Unit (MTTU) = 1, Criminal Investigation Department (CID) = 2, General Policing and Administration (GPA) = 3) were measured with three categories. In the regression analyses, Inspector and above, Greater Accra, No Religion, and MTTU were used as reference categories.

## Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, correlation, paired-sample t-tests, and regression analyses were conducted using the IBM SPSS (Version 31). The descriptive statistics provide frequencies of officers' ascription of pride in various CJIs and justice administration. Correlation analysis was conducted to establish the relationship between the key variables and whether there is multicollinearity concerns. Paired-sample t-tests were conducted to ascertain whether police officers' ascription of pride in CJIs significantly differs between the police and other

institutions. Ordinal logistic regression was conducted for each dependent variable to assess the impact, strength, and significance of the independent and control variables. Ordinal logistic regression was chosen because the responses for the dependent variables are ordinal in nature. In the analyses, perceived causes of corruption – namely, economic factors, general culture of corruption, institutional (in)action on corruption –, perceived corruption by justice actors, as well as age and year of service were treated as covariates. Gender, income, education, religion, area of work, rank, department, and region were treated as factors.

The data is appropriate for the various data analyses used to produce the results reported in the article. A Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is 0.94, which suggests that the variables in the dataset are highly correlated, can produce distinct and reliable factors, as well as being adequate and appropriate for the chosen analyses (see Kaiser and Rice, 1974, Hutcheson and Sofroniou, 1999). Also, bivariate correlation analysis did not show multicollinearity among the independent variables, which could affect the regression results. None of the correlation coefficients of the independent variables is equal to or greater than the 0.8 threshold that will indicate the existence of multicollinearity (see Table 1). Also, a variance inflation factor analysis to cross-check the validity of the absence of multicollinearity provides figures ranging from 1.16 to 5.25, which are below the traditional cut-off point of 10 (O’Brien, 2007).

Table 1  
Bivariate Correlation Results

| 1. Pride in the Police                                                                | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4        | 5        | 6       | 7       | 8       | 9 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---|
|                                                                                       | 1        |          |          |          |          |         |         |         |   |
| 2. Pride in Judiciary/Courts                                                          | .644***  | 1        |          |          |          |         |         |         |   |
| 3. Pride in Prosecution Division/A-G Dept.                                            | .582***  | .735***  | 1        |          |          |         |         |         |   |
| 4. Pride in Legal Profession/Lawyers                                                  | .457***  | .646***  | .610***  | 1        |          |         |         |         |   |
| 5. Pride in Justice Administration                                                    | .468***  | .674***  | .672***  | .639***  | 1        |         |         |         |   |
| 6. Economic Factor                                                                    | -.162*** | -.139*** | -.151*** | -.154*** | -.153*** | 1       |         |         |   |
| 7. Institutional (In)action                                                           | -.262*** | -.210*** | -.228*** | -.170*** | -.241*** | .623*** | 1       |         |   |
| 8. Attitudes Toward Corruption                                                        | -.182*** | -.184*** | -.190*** | -.179*** | -.219*** | .638*** | .625*** | 1       |   |
| 9. Corruption by Justice Actors                                                       | -.223*** | -.281*** | -.297*** | -.222*** | -.295*** | .533*** | .644*** | .606*** | 1 |
| Note: N = 570–604; *** means correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed) |          |          |          |          |          |         |         |         |   |

[Table 1 near here]

## Results

### Sample Characteristics

The sample characteristics and distribution of independent variables are presented in Table 2. Over 77% of officers are below the inspectorate rank; such officers regularly interact with other CJIs and officials who are more likely to know of happenings in other CJIs. While a majority of the participants are males (64.3%), females (35.7%) are overrepresented in this study: available statistics show that 28% of police officers in Ghana are females (Sackey, 2021). The proportion of officers with post-high or secondary school education (44.7%) is higher than proportions recorded in prior studies (see Tankebe, 2013, Boateng, 2014). The high number of police officers with post-high or secondary school education is due to more graduates joining the police in recent times compared to the past: over 71% of officers with post-high-school education are sergeants, corporals, or constables, which is a vast deviation from results in previous studies in Ghana (Tankebe, 2013, Boateng, 2014).

Table 2  
Distribution of Independent Variables and Sample Characteristics

| Items                        | Average/Percent | SD    | Min | Max | Valid n |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-------|-----|-----|---------|
| Economic Factor              | 12.75           | 3.88  | 4   | 20  | 604     |
| Institutional (In)action     | 26.89           | 7.95  | 10  | 47  | 598     |
| Attitudes Toward Corruption  | 21.44           | 5.42  | 6   | 30  | 602     |
| Corruption by Justice Actors | 37.43           | 12.52 | 14  | 70  | 599     |
| Age                          | 37yrs           | 8.29  | 20  | 59  | 568     |
| Years of Service             | 14yrs           | 7.91  | 1   | 40  | 590     |
| Gender                       | 64.3%           |       |     |     | 616     |
| Male                         | 35.7%           |       |     |     |         |
| Female                       |                 |       |     |     |         |
| Religion                     | 1.7%            |       |     |     | 616     |
| No Religion                  | 89.0%           |       |     |     |         |
| Christian                    | 9.3%            |       |     |     |         |
| Muslim                       |                 |       |     |     |         |
| Area of Work                 | 60.9%           |       |     |     | 596     |
| Urban                        | 39.1%           |       |     |     |         |
| Rural                        |                 |       |     |     |         |
| Income (Monthly)             | 52.2%           |       |     |     | 596     |
| GH₵1500 or Less              | 47.8%           |       |     |     |         |
| Above GH₵1500                |                 |       |     |     |         |
| Education                    | 55.3%           |       |     |     | 611     |
| Basic to High School         | 44.7%           |       |     |     |         |
| Above High School            |                 |       |     |     |         |
| Rank                         | 59.4%           |       |     |     | 613     |
| Constable/Corporal           | 18.3%           |       |     |     |         |
| Sergeant                     | 22.3%           |       |     |     |         |
| Inspector and Above          |                 |       |     |     |         |
| Department/Unit              | 51.8%           |       |     |     | 612     |
| GPA                          | 39.8%           |       |     |     |         |
| CID                          | 8.4%            |       |     |     |         |
| MTTU                         |                 |       |     |     |         |
| Study Region                 | 38.3%           |       |     |     | 616     |
| Upper East                   | 32.6%           |       |     |     |         |
| Greater Accra                | 29.1%           |       |     |     |         |
| Ashanti                      |                 |       |     |     |         |

[Table 2 near here].

## Estimation of Pride in Criminal Justice Institutions

Proportions of police officers ascribing pride to CJIs and justice administration are reported in Table 3. The results show that majority of officers reposed some pride in CJIs and justice administration: between 77% and 87% of officers reposed some degree of pride in CJIs and administration. Expectedly, the police service has the highest mean score ( $M = 4.03$ ;  $SD = 1.13$ ) with the legal profession (lawyers) having the lowest mean score ( $M = 3.45$ ;  $SD = 1.13$ ). The proportion of officers that ascribe pride to CJIs is high; nonetheless, two out of every ten officers are not proud of justice administration in Ghana. This result can adversely affect justice delivery as police officers who are the first contact of the CJS may not do their job effectively due the lack of pride in justice administration. The results indicate that a higher percentage of police officers ascribe pride to the police compared to other CJIs. Paired-sample t-tests conducted to check whether officers' ascription of pride significantly differ between the police and other CJIs shows statistically significant differences in ascription of pride between the police and all other CJIs: judiciary ( $t_{(580)} = 10.736, p < .001$ ), prosecution ( $t_{(581)} = 9.749, p < .001$ ), legal profession ( $t_{(581)} = 11.658, p < .001$ ), and justice administration ( $t_{(581)} = 10.081, p < .001$ ). The effect sizes for the differences ranged from 0.404 to 0.483, suggesting that police officers regard the police institution as being more ethical, trustworthy, and valuable than other CJIs but with smaller effect sizes (see Table 4). These results are unsurprising as police officers are expected to rate the police ahead of other CJIs.

Table 3  
Descriptive Statistics of Police Officers' Pride in CJIs and Justice Administration

| Pride in Police Service             | Not at all Proud | Not Really Proud | A Bit Proud | Quite Proud | Very Proud | M    | SD   | Min | Max |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------|------|-----|-----|
|                                     | 3.0%             | 9.8%             | 14.7%       | 26.5%       | 46.0%      | 4.03 | 1.13 | 1   | 5   |
| Pride in Judiciary/Courts           | 3.8%             | 12.4%            | 24.4%       | 38.2%       | 21.2%      | 3.61 | 1.07 | 1   | 5   |
| Pride in Prosecution Service/A-G    | 4.1%             | 13.0%            | 24.7%       | 34.5%       | 23.7%      | 3.61 | 1.10 | 1   | 5   |
| Pride in Legal Profession (Lawyers) | 5.1%             | 16.0%            | 27.5%       | 31.3%       | 20.1%      | 3.45 | 1.13 | 1   | 5   |
| Pride in Justice Administration     | 5.9%             | 16.8%            | 21.7%       | 30.9%       | 24.7%      | 3.52 | 1.20 | 1   | 5   |

Table 4  
Mean Differences Between Pride in Police and Other CJIs

| Police vs Judiciary/Courts        | Mean | Std. Dev. | Std. Error Mean | t         | df  | Cohen's d |
|-----------------------------------|------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-----|-----------|
|                                   | .413 | .927      | .038            | 10.736*** | 580 | .445      |
| Police vs. Prosecution Service    | .412 | 1.020     | .042            | 9.749***  | 581 | .404      |
| Police vs. Legal Profession       | .569 | 1.177     | .049            | 11.658*** | 581 | .483      |
| Police vs. Justice Administration | .502 | 1.201     | .050            | 10.081*** | 581 | .418      |

[Table 3 near here].

[Table 4 near here].

Next, ordinal logistic regression analyses were conducted to explore whether causes of corruption, corruption by justice actors, demographic characteristics, and contextual factors impact police officers' ascription of pride in CJIs and justice administration. The models for the variables are presented in Table 5. The results show that some variables are associated with police officers' attribution of pride to CJIs and justice administration. Apart from few exceptions, officers who believe that economic circumstances, institutional (in)action, attitudes toward corruption, and corruption by justice actors are causes of corruption are less likely to ascribe pride to the police, judiciary, prosecution service, legal profession, and justice administration. However, only corruption by justice actors has a significant effect on officers' ascription of pride to the police ( $b = -.026, p < .05$ ), judiciary ( $b = -.040, p < .001$ ), prosecution service ( $b = -.046, p < .001$ ), legal profession ( $b = -.025, p < .01$ ), and justice administration ( $b = -.031, p < .001$ ). The negative impact of perceived corruption by justice actors on officers' ascription of pride to CJIs and justice administration is realistic because people working in or closely with institutions where corruption is perceived as frequent are likely not to be proud of such institutions.

Table 5  
Regression of Police Officers' Pride in Criminal Justice Institutions and Justice Administration

|                                    | <b>Model 1</b>      |        | <b>Model 2</b>         |        | <b>Model 3</b>      |        | <b>Model 4</b>          |        | <b>Model 5</b>                |        |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------|------------------------|--------|---------------------|--------|-------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|--------|
|                                    | <b>Police</b>       |        | <b>Judiciary/Court</b> |        | <b>Prosecution</b>  |        | <b>Legal Profession</b> |        | <b>Justice Administration</b> |        |
|                                    | <i>b (S.E)</i>      | Wald   | <i>b (S.E)</i>         | Wald   | <i>b (S.E)</i>      | Wald   | <i>b (S.E)</i>          | Wald   | <i>b (S.E)</i>                | Wald   |
| <b>Perceptions of Corruption</b>   |                     |        |                        |        |                     |        |                         |        |                               |        |
| Economic Factor                    | -.002<br>(.032)     | .002   | -.015<br>(.031)        | .244   | -.009<br>(.031)     | .086   | -.023<br>(.031)         | .574   | .026<br>(.031)                | .727   |
| Institutional (In)action           | -.029<br>(.016)     | 3.162  | .002<br>(.016)         | .012   | -.005<br>(.016)     | .106   | .007<br>(.016)          | .192   | -.013<br>(.016)               | .727   |
| Attitudes toward Corruption        | -.027<br>(.024)     | 1.230  | -.003<br>(.023)        | .020   | .004<br>(.023)      | .025   | -.013<br>(.023)         | .316   | -.039<br>(.023)               | 2.931  |
| Corruption by Justice Actors       | -.026<br>(.010)*    | 6.590  | -.040<br>(.010)***     | 16.015 | -.046<br>(.010)***  | 21.834 | -.025<br>(.010)**       | 6.948  | -.031<br>(.010)***            | 10.158 |
| <b>Demographic Characteristics</b> |                     |        |                        |        |                     |        |                         |        |                               |        |
| Age                                | -.014<br>(.020)     | .507   | .007<br>(.020)         | .130   | -.008<br>(.019)     | .187   | -.019<br>(.019)         | .996   | -.005<br>(.019)               | .080   |
| Year of Service                    | -.012<br>(.011)     | 1.100  | -.017<br>(.011)        | 2.258  | -.028<br>(.011)*    | 5.990  | -.030<br>(.011)**       | 7.125  | -.015<br>(.011)               | 1.774  |
| Gender - Female                    | .315<br>(.199)      | 2.500  | .265<br>(.195)         | 1.850  | .267<br>(.194)      | 1.899  | .426<br>(.192)*         | 4.909  | .313<br>(.193)                | 2.642  |
| Education -Tertiary                | -.255<br>(.192)     | 1.759  | -.266<br>(.188)        | 2.003  | -.357<br>(.187)     | 3.629  | -.261<br>(.185)         | 1.993  | -.437<br>(.186)*              | 5.492  |
| Income – Above GHS2000             | .345<br>(.208)      | 2.737  | .173<br>(.204)         | .716   | .143<br>(.204)      | .496   | .041<br>(.201)          | .041   | .150<br>(.202)                | .549   |
| Rank (Inspector & Above)           | .101<br>(.399)      | .064   | .466<br>(.392)         | 1.415  | .102<br>(.390)      | .068   | -.087<br>(.386)         | .051   | .299<br>(.387)                | .596   |
| Constable/Corporal                 | -.026<br>(.306)     | .007   | .136<br>(.301)         | .203   | .075<br>(.301)      | .063   | .059<br>(.298)          | .040   | .033<br>(.298)                | .012   |
| Sergeant                           |                     |        |                        |        |                     |        |                         |        |                               |        |
| Religion (No Religion)             | .757<br>(.670)      | 1.276  | .955<br>(.669)         | 2.040  | 1.187<br>(.668)     | 3.157  | -.100<br>(.666)         | .023   | 1.249<br>(.666)               | 3.517  |
| Christian                          | .930<br>(.721)      | 1.663  | .903<br>(.715)         | 1.595  | 1.012<br>(.713)     | 2.013  | -.243<br>(.711)         | .117   | .924<br>(.710)                | 1.693  |
| Muslim                             |                     |        |                        |        |                     |        |                         |        |                               |        |
| <b>Contextual Variables</b>        |                     |        |                        |        |                     |        |                         |        |                               |        |
| Area of Work - Urban               | .029<br>(.208)      | .019   | .044<br>(.204)         | .046   | -.031<br>(.203)     | .023   | .048<br>(.201)          | .057   | .243<br>(.202)                | 1.452  |
| Region (Greater Accra)             | .445<br>(.215)*     | 4.293  | .376<br>(.212)         | 3.161  | .413<br>(.211)*     | 3.819  | .214<br>(.208)          | 1.059  | .247<br>(.209)                | 1.395  |
| Ashanti                            | .404<br>(.265)      | 2.326  | .298<br>(.260)         | 1.313  | .204<br>(.259)      | .619   | .067<br>(.257)          | .069   | -.002<br>(.257)               | .000   |
| Upper East                         |                     |        |                        |        |                     |        |                         |        |                               |        |
| Department (MTTD)                  | -.051<br>(.328)     | .024   | -.082<br>(.318)        | .066   | -.125<br>(.317)     | .155   | .025<br>(.313)          | .006   | -.047<br>(.313)               | .023   |
| CID                                | -.172<br>(.325)     | .279   | -.318<br>(.315)        | 1.024  | -.217<br>(.313)     | .481   | -.187<br>(.309)         | .368   | -.051<br>(.309)               | .027   |
| GPA                                |                     |        |                        |        |                     |        |                         |        |                               |        |
| <b>Thresholds:</b>                 |                     |        |                        |        |                     |        |                         |        |                               |        |
| Not Proud at All                   | -5.56<br>(1.404)*** | 15.681 | -3.78<br>(1.357)**     | 7.754  | -4.77<br>(1.356)*** | 12.385 | -5.51<br>(1.349)***     | 16.663 | -3.92<br>(1.338)**            | 8.597  |

|                          | Model 1            |       | Model 2          |       | Model 3           |       | Model 4            |       | Model 5                |       |
|--------------------------|--------------------|-------|------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|------------------------|-------|
|                          | Police             |       | Judiciary/Court  |       | Prosecution       |       | Legal Profession   |       | Justice Administration |       |
|                          | <i>b</i> (S.E)     | Wald  | <i>b</i> (S.E)   | Wald  | <i>b</i> (S.E)    | Wald  | <i>b</i> (S.E)     | Wald  | <i>b</i> (S.E)         | Wald  |
| Not Really Proud         | -3.94<br>(1.384)** | 8.090 | -2.11<br>(1.342) | 2.475 | -3.17<br>(1.342)* | 5.580 | -3.89<br>(1.335)** | 8.512 | -2.43<br>(1.330)       | 3.348 |
| A Bit Proud              | -2.90<br>(1.380)*  | 4.423 | -.76<br>(1.340)  | .318  | -1.73<br>(1.338)  | 1.680 | -2.50<br>(1.328)   | 3.543 | -1.24<br>(1.327)       | .875  |
| Quite Proud              | -1.52<br>(1.375)   | 1.229 | 1.22<br>(1.339)  | .824  | .025<br>(1.334)   | .000  | -.90<br>(1.324)    | .460  | .36<br>(1.325)         | .073  |
| <b>Model Fit</b>         |                    |       |                  |       |                   |       |                    |       |                        |       |
| -2 LL                    | 1211.148           |       | 1275.193         |       | 1283.682          |       | 1352.896           |       | 1345.252               |       |
| <i>F</i> -test/ $\chi^2$ | 63.409***          |       | 53.928***        |       | 64.146***         |       | 36.648**           |       | 57.968***              |       |
| Nagelkerke $R^2$         | .134               |       | .115             |       | .135              |       | .079               |       | .122                   |       |
| <i>N</i>                 | 475                |       | 471              |       | 471               |       | 471                |       | 471                    |       |

For the impact of individual and contextual attributes, year of service, gender, region, and education are the only variables that significantly impact officers' ascription of pride to some CJIs and justice administration. Specifically, officers with more years of service in the police service are less likely to ascribe pride to the prosecution service ( $b = -.028, p < .05$ ) and legal profession ( $b = -.030, p < .01$ ). This result is reasonable as officers work longer in the police service develop cynical attitudes towards lawyers and prosecutors who work similarly and closely with lawyers (Terpstra and Kort, 2016, Amagnya, 2022, Amagnya, 2023a). Also, males officers compared to females are more likely to ascribe pride to the legal profession ( $b = .426, p < .05$ ). The positive image of the legal profession among male officers may be due to male officers usually working with the criminal investigation and prosecution departments who have more encounters with lawyers and perhaps understand the operations and procedures of the legal profession (Amagnya, 2022). Again, results show that officers with more education are less likely to ascribe pride to justice administration ( $b = -.437, p < .05$ ). Lastly, officers who work in the Ashanti compared to Greater Accra are more likely to ascribe pride to the police ( $b = .445, p < .05$ ) and prosecution service ( $b = .413, p < .05$ ). Remarkably, contextual and demographic traits like age, income, rank, religion as well as area and department of work did not significantly affect ascription of pride to CJIs and justice administration.

The regression model for the police explains 13% of the variance. This is a good proportion since police officers are expected to be proud of their institution. For the judiciary, prosecution service, and justice administration, 11.5%, 13.5% and 12.2% of the variance is explained by the regression models, respectively, which suggests police officers' level of pride in the judiciary, prosecution service and justice administration is not far from that for the police. This is reasonable as police officers work very closely with the prosecution service and judiciary as well as in most justice administration: police officers usually seek advice and direction from the prosecution service when handling some criminal cases (Amagnya, 2022, Amagnya, 2023a). Also, police officers work as prosecutors or prosecution witnesses in most criminal cases that are adjudicated by the courts as well as receivers and investigators of criminal cases. So, police officers are more likely to be aware of happenings in the prosecution service, judiciary and overall justice administration and hence repose some pride in those institutions. The legal profession model has an explained variance of 7.9%, which is far from the other explained variances and demonstrates some extent of cynicism towards the legal profession. The variance for each of the models are reasonable as police officers play an integral role in justice administration and should reasonably be aware of happenings across the CJS and CJIs. Nonetheless, the variances for institutions other than the police are surprising as police officers are usually skeptical about other CJIs and officials (Horwitz, 1998, Elsner et al., 2008, Amagnya, 2023a).

[Table 5 near here].

## Discussion

The results suggest that police officers' ascription of pride to CJIs is characterised by *partiality* towards their own institution. This is manifested in police officers' ascribing more pride to the police compared to the other CJIs under consideration. Being partial towards one's institution over others can lead to a sense of superiority, individuality, unnecessary competition, and prioritisation of one's institution interests, norms and practices over those of others. This can sometimes be at the expense of collaboration or objective evaluation (Howarth and Stark, 2017). Police officers usually believe that their own institution stands out or is superior to other CJIs due to

organisational culture in the police, loyalty, training, personal experiences, and professional pride. However, such a posture can adversely impact the administration of justice as officers may not recognise and appreciate the distinct roles of different institutions in maintaining law and order, consider and/or regard alternative views, and work collaboratively with other institutions to ensure a fair legal system and effective justice delivery. Addressing police officers' partiality towards the police requires multifaceted approaches that involves changing policies, practices, and the overall culture of the police. Specifically, police training in Ghana should be revised to incorporate content on partiality or bias and how to interact and collaborate with diverse institutions, communities and groups. It is also proposed that policing authorities in Ghana should revise the code of conduct for police officers to include the prohibition of partiality and bias in all policing practices.

Again, the results show that perceived impunity negatively impacts police officers' ascription of pride to CJIs. Impunity is manifested in the form of perceived corruption by justice actors, which negatively impact officers' ascription of pride to CJIs. Also, although not statistically significant, institutional (in)actions on corruption and general attitudes toward corruption adversely affect officers' ascription of pride to CJIs and justice administration. As noted in the literature, when corruption is perceived to be frequent or not taken seriously through the actions or inactions of police leaders and colleagues, officers are more likely not to ascribe pride in CJIs and justice administration (Lee et al., 2013, Boateng et al., 2019, Amagnya, 2023c). Similarly, when officers perceive that there are positive attitudes toward corruption in a country, they are less likely to ascribe pride, honour or legitimacy to CJIs, which is a creation of society (Lee et al., 2013, Amagnya, 2026). This will have significant effects on justice administration: officials who are cynical of institutions may despair or not put in their maximum effort when performing their duties. Also, officers can easily be lured into misconduct like corruption by believing that institutions have already lost credibility and/or will not act against corruption. It is proposed that acting stringently against corruption and corrupt officials is, therefore, a key and fast way to enhance pride in the CJS.

## Conclusion

There are some limitations of this study and opportunities for further research that should be noted. First, the conclusions drawn should be taken cautiously as the participants are predominantly junior officers, who are only a subset of police officers in Ghana. Also, there is limited scope for generalisation as the data came from a non-random and non-representative sample. In fact, the cross-sectional design limits causal inferences. In addition, the reliance on self-reported data introduces potential biases. The participants may not be honest: police officers in developing countries like Ghana are sometimes 'unprofessional' and can downplay citizens' concerns or exaggerate police performance. Future studies should try to draw on a representative sample to help establish how robust the findings are and their extension to other police officers. Second, the results may be affected by social desirability bias – the tendency for research participants to present themselves in a positive light rather than share actual experiences. Since the study measured police officers' self-reported perceptions, future studies should employ experimental designs that go beyond self-reports to capture actual views of police officers about levels of pride in CJIs. Also, more studies need to explore the relationship between participants' characteristics and their ascription of pride in CJIs, as only few participants' characteristics influence officers' perceived pride in CJIs in this study.

Notwithstanding the outlined limitations and opportunities for further research, this study has remarkable strengths. First, the study makes important contributions to the literature and debate on organisational pride from a Ghanaian and African perspective as well as provide directions for research, policy and practice. This study has remarkable strengths, including a large sample from three regions, multiple measures and controls, and robust statistical analyses. Another significant part of this study is that it is the first in Ghana to explore police officers' pride in multiple CJIs at the same time. This allows for comparison between various institutions as well as studies that focus on only one institution. This study contributes to research, policy and practice by highlighting areas that need further research as well as reforms that can be undertaken to help improve pride in CJIs. This study highlights the importance of police officers' ascription of pride in CJIs, which affects the legitimacy of CJIs. A key implication of the findings of this study is that leaders must institute reforms to address corruption in the CJS and attitudes toward corruption in Ghanaian society to improve the legitimacy of CJIs among CJOs and Ghanaians.

## Declarations

## Author Contribution

Moses conceptualised, designed and conducted the research including analysing the data and writing up the report.

## Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Professor Justice Tankebe of the University of Cambridge for providing feedback and comments on a draft this paper. I also thank Professor Susanne Karstedt of Griffith University for contributing to the development of the questionnaire for the study.

## References

1. Afrobarometer (2020a). *Afrobarometer Round 5, 6, and 7 Surveys: Publications*. Accra, Ghana.
2. Afrobarometer (2020b). *Summary of results: Afrobarometer Round 8 Survey in Ghana*. Accra, Ghana.
3. Afrobarometer (2022). *Approval rating of government's anti-corruption efforts dips after significant improvement in 2017, new Afrobarometer study shows*. Centre for Democratic Development-Ghana (CDD-Ghana).
4. Akinlabi, O. M. (2017). Do the police really protect and serve the public: Police deviance and public cynicism towards the law in Nigeria. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 17, 1–17.
5. Akoensi, T. D., & Tankebe, J. (2020). Prison officer self-legitimacy and support for rehabilitation in Ghana. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 47, 22–38.
6. Alias, M. R., & Bahron, A. (2019). Well-being and organisational pride in the Royal Malaysian Police Force: An initial investigation. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9, 418–427.
7. Amagnya, M. A. (2011). *An assessment of the criminal justice system of Ghana: Perspectives of police prosecutors*. Master of Philosophy. University of Cambridge.
8. Amagnya, M. A. (2020). *Understanding corruption in Ghana's criminal justice system: Voices from within*. Doctor of Philosophy. Griffith University.
9. Amagnya, M. A. (2022). Due process in police-led prosecutions: Views of Ghanaian police prosecutors. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 24, 369–381.
10. Amagnya, M. A. (2023a). Challenges of police prosecution in the Global South: Perspectives of Ghanaian police officers. In D. Watson, S. Amin, W. C. Wallace, O. M. Akinlabi, & J. C. Ruiz-Vanquez (Eds.), *Policing the Global South: Context specific perspectives on the security-crime-justice nexus*. Routledge. In.
11. Amagnya, M. A. (2023b). Patterns and prevalence of corruption in Ghana's criminal justice system: Views from within. In O. M. Akinlabi (Ed.), *Policing and the rule of law in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Routledge. In.
12. Amagnya, M. A. (2023c). Police officers' support for corruption: Examining the impact of police culture. *Policing: An International Journal*, 46, 84–99.
13. Amagnya, M. A. (2024). Corruption in Ghana's justice system in the eyes of police officers. In N. Stamatakis (Ed.), *Global trends in law enforcement - Theory and practice* (pp. 69–90). IntechOpen. In.
14. Amagnya, M. A. (2026). Perceived citizens' trust in criminal justice institutions: Does attitude and perception of corruption matter? *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, forthcoming.
15. Amagnya, M. A., & Karstedt, S. (2025). A matter of facts: Officers' belief systems about corruption in Ghana's police and criminal justice system. *International Criminology*, 5, 12–26.
16. Amnesty International (2012). *Prisoners are bottom of the pile' - The human rights of inmates in Ghana*. Amnesty International.
17. Appiahene-Gyamfi, J. (2022). The trends and patterns of crime in Ghana: The case of robbery. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 17, 93–109.
18. Bayley, D. H., & Perito, R. (2011). *Police corruption: What past scandals teach about current challenges (Special Report)*. Washington, DC.
19. Bbc (2023). *How clash between Ghana police den residents of Godenu kill two pipo*. BBC News Pidgin.
20. Bennett, R. R., & Schmitt, E. L. (2016). The effect of work environment on levels of police cynicism: A comparative study. *Police Quarterly*, 5, 493–522.
21. Boateng, F. D. (2014). Perceived organisational support and police officer effectiveness: Testing the organisational support theory in Ghana. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 24, 134–150.
22. Boateng, F. D., Makin, D. A., Abess, G., & Wu, G. (2019). Speaking out: Officers speaking about police misconduct in Ghana. *The Police Journal*, 91, 121–135.
23. Bradford, B., Quinton, P., Myhill, A., & Porter, G. (2014). Why do 'the law' comply? Procedural justice, group identification and officer motivation in police organizations. *European Journal of Criminology*, 11, 110–131.
24. Brown, J. D., & Marshall, M. A. (2001). Self-esteem and emotion: Some thoughts about feelings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 575–584.
25. Brunetto, Y., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2003). The commitment and satisfaction of lower-ranked police officers: Lessons for management. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 26, 43–63.
26. Caplan, J. (2003). Police cynicism: Police survival tool? *The Police Journal*, 76, 304–313.

27. Charles, D. (2023). Amid a region rife with coups and instability, Ghana is a democratic bulwark. USA: United States Institute of Peace. <https://www.usip.org/publications/2023/10/amid-region-rife-coups-and-instability-ghana-democratic-bulwark>
28. Club Mate (2023). *Viral video exposes shocking brawl: Police and civilians clash at Hohoe Police Station*. Ghanaweb.
29. Crow, M. M., Chang-Bae, L., & Jae-Jin, J. (2012). Organisational justice and organisational commitment among South Korean police officers. *Policing*, 35, 402–423.
30. Donkor, K. B. (2021). *Ejura youth clash with security personnel, 2 dead*. Graphic Online.
31. Dziwornu, M. G. (2021). Crime drop in Ghana? Some insights from crime patterns and trends. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, 23, 433–449.
32. Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
33. Elsner, B., Lewis, C., & Zila, J. (2008). Police prosecution service relationship within criminal investigation. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 14, 203–224.
34. Farmer, S. J., Beehr, T. A., & Love, K. G. (2003). Becoming an undercover police officer: A note on fairness perceptions, behavior, and attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 373–388.
35. Fitzgerald, & Commission (1989). *Report of a Commission of Inquiry pursuant to Orders in Council: Commission of Inquiry into possible illegal activities and associated police misconduct*. Government of the State of Queensland.
36. Fredrickson, B. L. (2013). Positive emotions broaden and build. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 1–53.
37. Freedom, & House (2018). *Freedom in the World 2018: Democracy in crisis - Ghana profile*. Washington, D.C.
38. Gadugah, N. (2009). *Fire-for-fire no solution to violent crimes – Attafuah Modern Ghana*. Modern Ghana.
39. Ghana Police, & Service (2017). *Police Regions* [online]. Ghana Police Service. Available from: <https://police.gov.gh/en/> [Accessed Access Date 27 August 2020].
40. Ghana Statistical Service (2022). *2021 Population and Housing Census*. Accra, Ghana.
41. Ghanaweb (2023). *Year In Review: 5 times the police were accused of using deadly force on civilians in 2022*. Ghanaweb.
42. Gouthier, M. H. J., & Rhein, M. (2011). Organizational pride and its positive effects on employee behavior. *Journal of Service Management*, 22, 633–649.
43. Government of Ghana. (1992). *The Constitution of the Fourth Republic of Ghana*. Government of Ghana.
44. Graves, W. (1996). Police cynicism: Causes and cures. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 65, 16–20.
45. Gyamfi, G. D. (2022). Exploring public trust in policing at a community in Ghana. *Security Journal*, 35, 1249–1262.
46. Haslam, S. A. (2004). *Psychology in Organizations: A Social Identity Approach* (2nd ed.). Sage.
47. Hickman, M. J. (2008). On the context of police cynicism and problem behavior. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, 4, 1–44.
48. Horwitz, A. (1998). Taking the cop out of copping a plea: Eradicating police prosecution of criminal cases. *Arizona Law Review*, 40, 1305–1378.
49. Howarth, D., & Stark, S. W. (2017). H.L.A. Hart's secondary rules: What do 'officials' really think? *International Journal of Law in Context*, 14, 61–86.
50. Hussey, I., Alsalti, T., Bosco, F., Elson, M., & Arslan, R. (2025). An Aberrant Abundance of Cronbach's Alpha Values at.70. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 8.
51. Hutcheson, G. D., & Sofroniou, N. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist: Introductory statistics using generalized linear models*. SAGE.
52. Joyonline (2017). *Judicial Council meets over Delta Force court attack*. Joyonline.com.
53. Kaiser, H. F., & Rice, J. (1974). Little Jiffy, Mark IV. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 34, 111–117.
54. Karstedt, S. (2010). The strength of institutions: Corruption, cultural values, and institutional regime. *Annual Conference of the American Society of Criminology*. San Francisco, CA.
55. Karstedt, S., & Lafree, G. (2006). Democracy, crime, and justice. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 605, 6–22.
56. Katzenbach, J. R. (2003). Pride: A strategic asset. *Strategy & Leadership*, 31, 34–38.
57. Klockars, C. B., Kutnjak Ivković, S., & Haberfeld, M. R. (Eds.). (2004). *The contours of police integrity*. Sage.
58. Knapp, & Commission (1972). *The Knapp Commission report on police corruption: Commission to investigate allegations of police corruption and the city's anti-corruption procedures*. George Braziller.
59. Kutnjak Ivković, S. (2005). Police (mis)behavior: A cross-cultural study of corruption seriousness. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 28, 546–566.

60. Kutnjak Ivković, S., & Sauerman, A. (2016). Police integrity in South Africa: A tale of three police agency types. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 39, 268–283.
61. Kutnjak Ivković, S., Sauerman, A., Faull, A., Meyer, M. E., & Newham, G. (2020). *Police integrity in South Africa*. Routledge.
62. Kuyini Mohammed, A. (2023). An evaluation of the quality of democracy of Ghana. *Democracy and Security*, 19, 347–388.
63. Langworthy, R. (1987). Police cynicism: What we know from the Niederhoffer scale. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 15, 17–35.
64. Lea, S. E. G., & Webley, P. (1997). Pride in economic psychology. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 18, 323–340.
65. Lee, H., Lim, H., Moore, D. D., & Kim, J. (2013). How police organizational structure correlates with frontline officers' attitudes toward corruption: A multilevel model. *Police Practice and Research*, 14, 386–401.
66. Lewis, M. (2000). Self-conscious emotions: Embarrassment, pride, shame, and guilt. In M. Lewis, & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (2nd ed., pp. 623–636). Guilford. In.
67. Ling, F. Y. Y., Ng, Y. J., & Zhai, W. (2024). Examining the mediating role of organizational pride on the relationship of human values and work outcomes of facilities managers. *Facilities*, 43, 129–148.
68. Lorenc, T., Petticrew, M., Whitehead, M., Neary, D., Clayton, S., Wright, K., Thomson, H., Cummins, S., Sowden, A., & Renton, A. (2014). Crime, fear of crime and mental health: Synthesis of theory and systematic reviews of interventions and qualitative evidence. *Public Health Research*, 2.
69. Mensah, K. (2023). *Ghana police arrest 49 as high cost of living triggers street protests*. Al Jazeera.
70. Misner, G. E. (1975). The organization and social setting of police corruption. *The Police Journal: Theory Practice and Principles*, 48, 45–51.
71. Murray, J. (1990). The paralegal police prosecutor - For how long? *Australian Institute of Criminology Conference, February 19–20*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology, 97–101.
72. Newburn, T. (1999). *Understanding and preventing police corruption: Lessons from the literature* London: Home Office, Policing and Reducing Crime Unit, Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
73. Niederhoffer, A. (1967). *Behind the shield: The police in urban society*. Doubleday & Company.
74. Nix, J., Pickett, J. T., & Wolfe, S. E. (2020). Testing a theoretical model of perceived audience legitimacy: The neglected linkage in the dialogic model of Police-community relations. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 57, 217–259.
75. O'brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality & Quantity*, 41, 673–690.
76. Oluwaniyi, O. O. (2011). Police and the institution of corruption in Nigeria. *Policing & Society*, 21, 67–83.
77. Oveis, C., Horberg, E. J., & Keltner, D. (2010). Compassion, pride, and social intuitions of self-other similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 618–630.
78. Oxford, E., & Dictionary (2025). *The historical English dictionary*. Oxford University Press.
79. Rafky, D. M. (1975). Police cynicism reconsidered - An application of smallest place analysis. *Criminology*, 13, 168–192.
80. Sackey, T. (2021). *Increase number of female officers in commanding positions - Police Ladies Association tells government*. Joyonline.
81. Sanders, S., Wisse, B., Van Yperen, N. W., & Rus, D. (2018). On ethically solvent leaders: The roles of pride and moral identity in predicting leader ethical behavior. *Journal Of Business Ethics*, 150, 631–645.
82. Singh, D. (2019). Understanding corruption in the lower levels of the Afghan police force. *The Police Journal: Theory Practice and Principles*, 93, 353–383.
83. Singh, D. (2022). The causes of police corruption and working towards prevention in conflict-stricken states. *Laws*, 11, 69–87.
84. Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's Alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48, 1273–1296.
85. Tangney, J. P. (2005). The self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment and pride. In T. Dalgleish, & M. J. Power (Eds.), *Handbook of cognition and emotion* (pp. 541–568). Wiley. In.
86. Tankebe, J. (2011). Explaining police support for the use of force and vigilante violence in Ghana. *Policing and Society*, 21, 129–149.
87. Tankebe, J. (2013). The making of 'democracy's champions': Understanding police support for democracy in Ghana. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 14, 25–43.
88. Tankebe, J. (2019). In their own eyes: An empirical examination of police self-legitimacy. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 43, 99–116.
89. Tankebe, J., & Boakye, E. K. (2019). Are murder and robbery on the increase in Ghana? Analysis of police crime statistics. *Research Brief Series No. 1*. Accra, Ghana: Africa Institute for Crime, Policy and Governance Research.
90. Terpstra, J., & Kort, J. (2016). Police officers' trust in criminal justice. *International Journal of Law Crime and Justice*, 47, 12–20.

91. Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 103–125.
92. Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 506–525.
93. Tv3 N.D. Shoot to kill approach - Ghana Police Service. Accra, Ghana: TV3.
94. Unodc (2022). *Corruption in Ghana - People's experiences and views*. United Nations.
95. Welander, J., Wallin, J., & Isaksson, K. (2017). Job resources to promote feelings of pride in the organization: The role of social identification. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 2.
96. Williams, L. A., & Desteno, D. (2008). Pride and perseverance: The motivational role of pride. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 1007–1017.
97. Zammuner, V. L. (1996). Felt emotions, and verbally communicated emotions: The case of pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 233–245.

## Footnotes

1. Organisational pride is a positive feeling that a worker or customer derived through assessment of an organisation's relative status or a positive feeling that a worker or customer perceives as a consequence of identifying with an organization's success and reputation (Haslam, 2004).
2. Customers develop organisational pride when they identify themselves with a reputable, successful and distinctive organization.

## Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [AppendixA.docx](#)