Publication by an MPICC researcher

Roché, S., & Oberwittler, D. (2018). Towards a broader view of police-citizen relations: How societal cleavages and political contexts shape trust and distrust, legitimacy and illegitimacy. In D. Oberwittler, & S. Roché (Eds.), *Police-Citizen Relations Across the World. Comparing sources and contexts of trust and legitimacy* (pp. 3-26). London: Routledge.

Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law Freiburg | www.mpicc.de

The original publication is available at the publisher's web site: www.routledge.com

1 Towards a broader view of police–citizen relations

How societal cleavages and political contexts shape trust and distrust, legitimacy and illegitimacy

Sebastian Roché and Dietrich Oberwittler

Introduction

How to think of relations between the police and the public across countries and in different regions of the world? The intention of this book is to broaden and expand current perspectives on the sources of police legitimacy and citizens' trust in the police. While research on police–citizen relations has proliferated in the last two decades, much of it is still centred on the USA, the United Kingdom, and a few other, predominantly Western countries. In contrast to what was observed ten years ago, research outside the USA has left its 'nascent' phase (Tonry 2007: 3; foreword, this volume) behind and contributed considerably to the field, calling for an expanded focus on cross-national comparisons. Among the many advantages of comparative research is the greater attention paid to national contexts. The impact of macro-level conditions, of societal cleavages, and of state and political institutions on police–citizen relations has been neglected in most contemporary research. Procedural justice theory, the dominant approach, has provided a theoretical basis for the study of public attitudes towards the police. It has gained strong empirical support and has started to inform public policies (Tyler, Goff, and MacCoun 2015). Yet with its focus on micro-level social interactions and citizens' experiences of policing, it may neither help us to fully grasp the sources of trust in the police and police legitimacy, nor always be suitable for understanding police–citizen relations in different countries.

Police–citizen relations are embedded in the broad context of polities and states. Polities are 'systems of authority' or 'of domination', to use Max Weber's words (Weber 1947). Governments dispose of coercive powers. Police forces are a visible branch of state authority, legally entrusted to protect society and maintain order by force when deemed necessary. However, governments cannot rely solely on force. They need to claim and obtain support from their citizens, and to promote national integration and a sense of cohesion among diverse segments of population, or face the risk of discontent and possibly violent conflict. In many countries, the reality is that some social groups do not perceive the political or social order as fair, and do not feel protected by the police. Some individuals or

groups may perceive the police as a partisan instrument or the ally of one group in a conflict situation. Thus, to understand police–citizen relations in general and police legitimacy in particular, we must take into account nation-states, the cultural pillars of the political order (e.g. its core values), government and major societal cleavages.

Legitimacy has been studied for longer than the police for a simple reason: The police as a government agency, distinct from the judiciary and the army, did not exist when political philosophers, following in the tradition of social contract theories, started to address the issue of public consent to state authority. When the most revered attempt to conceptualize legitimacy was carried out by Max Weber at the beginning of the twentieth century, policing was not his concern, to say the least (Smith 1970; Terpstra 2011). For very long, it was possible to write about morality, trust, and use of force, notions key to the legitimacy of the state, without touching the issue of policing. It was only in the post-World Word II era that the police became an object of theoretical and empirical examination. During the last 20 years, studies of police legitimacy have blossomed in many different countries. This book does not try to present a comprehensive overview but rather to stimulate the study of policing in a global perspective by including state- and society-level dimensions into the analysis. It brings together case studies from Europe and the USA as well as non-Western countries, in order to promote comparative perspectives on the conditions of police–citizen relations, and to question the generalizability of assumptions and models shaped by research in Western democracies.

From community policing to trustworthiness and legitimacy of the police

During the last 20 years, police legitimacy has emerged as an important academic theme and a political issue, but empirical studies of police–citizen relations have existed in the USA as early as 1930 (Bellman 1935; Parrat 1936). A major catalyst of early research was police use of force and other experiences of unfairness as well as recurrent race riots (often triggered by such incidents) since the 1960s in the USA and the 1980s in the UK (Bowling and Phillips 2008). However, anti-police riots did not prompt a comparable governmental or academic interest in other countries. The largest of such episodes of unrest in Europe took place in France in 2005 without a noticeable impact on research.

For many years, interest in police–citizen relations started from the ‘police end’ of the relationship and took the path of policing strategies. Many studies were concerned with various forms of community policing as a strategy to bridge the gap with segments of the population (see definition by Skogan 1998), leading to an interest in countries like Japan and their *koban* system (see Bayley 1976; cf. for reviews of research in Australia and Europe Coquilhat 2008; Mackenzie and Henry 2009). Only later did research shift its focus to the other end of the relationship: the citizen. Tom Tyler, in the introduction to his book *Why People Obey the Law*, gathered quotations illustrating that ‘the nature and underpinnings

of legitimacy are among the most neglected aspects of the dynamics of society', noticing 'the virtual absence of empirical examination of legitimacy' (Tyler 1990: 27).

More than 25 years later, the situation is very different in criminology, political science, and policing studies, with an unabated growth in the number of publications. Together with trust, the return of legitimacy to the forefront of research interests indicates a paradigm shift, 'a turn toward soft variables' (Sztompka 1999: 1) as opposed to 'hard' institutional structures and class stratification. There is an ongoing debate about the notions of trust and legitimacy. While some say that that the two notions are theoretically distinct and assert that it is possible to view an institution as a legitimate authority while simultaneously having little trust in it (Kaina 2008: 511), others present evidence that it is not the case empirically that 'constructs are distinguishable at a conceptual level' and that 'they are not empirically separable' (Maguire and Johnson 2010; Johnson *et al.* 2014). In this introduction, we will not draw a definitive distinction between the notions.

The critical element of legitimacy theory is its subjective nature, the subjective interpretations of reality, in line with Max Weber's 'interpretative sociology': 'The basis of every system of authority, and correspondingly of every kind of willingness to obey, is a belief, a belief by virtue of which persons exercising authority are lent prestige', Weber (1947: 382) writes. Such a reading of societies as made of individuals places a particular emphasis on the consciousness of actors as they interpret their actions and those of others. Individuals use their subjectively derived interpretations of the behaviour of others to predict the outcome of certain behaviours and, for example, whether to trust an organization, its principles, and its agents. In this line of thinking, interactions (as well as expectations about interactions) and related attitudes about fair interactions are key, and in empirical research survey questions about the feelings of the duty to obey and perceived fairness and trustworthiness are central. Many survey studies following procedural justice theory have stressed that people grant the police legitimacy if they feel they are being treated with fairness and dignity, irrespective of the outcome of the treatment (Donner *et al.* 2015; Jackson *et al.* 2013; Tyler 2011).

The contribution of this micro-level, socio-psychological approach to the field is undeniable. In its early stages, research on attitudes towards the police was driven by various poorly connected assumptions, for example on racial, class, and neighbourhood effects or a combination of these. No 'grand hypothesis' on the key dependent variables and the roots of obedience guided analyses (Webb and Marshall 1995: 49). It was only later with the interest in procedural justice in interactions that researchers have explored the complex structure of attitudes towards the police. The development of a multidimensional construct of citizen's perceptions (Shafer *et al.* 2003) led to the establishment of four core components of 'just procedure', formal and informal decision making and quality of treatment (Blader and Tyler 2003; Mazerolle *et al.* 2013b). The implementation of these concepts into opinion polls has resulted in a better and more nuanced

understanding of attitudes regarding procedural fairness and to their standardized measurement that is applied across many countries. This allows researchers to test comparable hypotheses in various cultural and political contexts.

The study of trust and legitimacy: the micro and the macro perspective

However, a theoretical alignment always comes at a price. An interactional orientation deflects the attention away from the impact of social and political structures (like the state, culture, and the economy) on individual attitudes and behaviours, and it tends to ignore political cleavages, policy alternatives (Miller 1974; Miller and Listhaug 1998), political power, social inequalities, and class relations (Farganis 2008: 322). The concept of emergence of larger social processes and structures from individual-level actions and social interactions is important. However, macro structures are critical as 'frameworks' which shape the situations in which individuals act and supply to actors a certain set of symbols that allow them to act. This is of particular relevance for the study of the police forces since they are state-controlled organizations, placed under the direction of elected officials operating in a political system. Thus, theoretically speaking, trust in the police and police legitimacy relate to trust in the political system and its legitimacy. In fact, empirically, we have indications that overall support for the political system has a very large influence on trust in the police and that attitudes vis-à-vis the police are influenced by national contexts regarding the quality of police organizations, societal homogeneity, and cohesion and crime levels (see below; cf. Kutnjak Ivkovic 2008; Morris 2001; Weitzer and Tuch 2006). These macro-level foundations of attitudes towards the police become visible in cross-national comparisons and need to be accounted for.

Scholars of political trust have highlighted the role of performance and satisfaction (for example in service delivery or respecting human rights), the importance of *institutional* procedures (equality before the law and free elections being the master legitimation processes) and participation in decision making mechanisms (Norris 2017). Weber insisted on respect for legal procedures (*versus* substance, see discussion and critique by Coicaud 2002). Psychologists have also studied procedures, however, at the *interactional* level, in micro-settings, as John Thibaut and Laurens Walker (1975) did in their seminal experimental work entitled *Procedural Justice, A Psychological Analysis*, and later in numerous opinion surveys about the feeling of fairness and its impact on attitudes towards the police and police legitimacy (Donner *et al.* 2015; Mazerolle *et al.* 2014). The name of procedural justice is used on the micro-level of interactions or attitudes towards such interactions as well as on the macro-or institutional level. The two traditions both of political scientists of input, 'throughput' (internal processes), and output processes as well as of psychologists of fair interactions with legal officials (again versus its substance or outcomes) highlight the importance of procedures in modern democracies. Similarities also exist in terms of the importance of utilitarian versus normative types of explanation among systems analysts

and interactions analysts. Among political scientists, David Easton (1965) made a still accepted distinction between diffuse and specific support, suggesting the role of the former for the stability of the political system: Diffuse support is not of a utilitarian nature while specific support may more often be of that sort. Fairness in interactions was also differentiated by psychologists from distributive justice (the output of the interaction) in courts and later in front of police officers.

Here, we contend that those two research streams need to be combined into a mixed approach as it was proposed almost two decades ago for the study of political support in order to fully grasp the nature and sources of trust in the police and police legitimacy (Booth and Seligson 2009; Mishler and Rose 2001). This avenue has started to be explored regarding the relation between trust and penal policies (Lappi-Seppälä 2008) and regarding attitudes towards the welfare state and their correspondence with welfare state regimes (Larsen 2016). On the one hand, there is evidence of the benefit of a micro-level approach to asking citizens about their subjective perceptions, their levels of trust or legitimacy, and about their experiences of interactions with the police. On the other hand, we defend the idea that variables relating to the national context, indicators of ideological, religious, and racial-ethnic cleavages, and the state's response to these as well as indicators of social integration at city and neighbourhood levels have a more important role to play (Taylor and Lawton 2012; Wu *et al.* 2009). Comparing studies from different countries and pursuing genuinely comparative studies provide opportunities for combining the analysis of micro-level interactions with a perspective on the contextual framework and varying national conditions. The contributions to this book can illustrate the strength of such a perspective and lead us to ask how specific national frameworks shape the structure of institutions and the experiences of policing. The findings indicate that generalizations of current theories about the sources of police trust and legitimacy across different types of societies are problematic.

State, culture, and history: the need for incorporating a broader societal context

The importance of institutions and political contexts

Procedural justice theory posits that perceptions of fair procedures have a strong causal influence on whether the public ascribe legitimacy to legal authorities. Legitimacy, in turn, will influence people's voluntary compliance with the directives of authorities and encourage cooperation (Jackson *et al.* 2013; Tyler 2011). It has often been confirmed in survey studies in Western nations that perceived police fairness rather than perceived effectiveness predicts police legitimacy (see Murphy and Cherney, Chapter 7 in this volume; cf. Bradford *et al.* 2014; Murphy *et al.* 2013; Sunshine and Tyler 2003; Tyler 2006). However, Weitzer (Chapter 2, this volume) insists that 'procedural justice is a micro-level variable but we know that police–citizen relations are influenced by factors at the meso

and macro levels as well', providing a review of studies of neighbourhood and racial effects. What seems to be undervalued in these findings is the impact of trust ('specific support' and 'diffuse support') in state institutions on police legitimacy.

In order to be certain both of the importance of 'specific support', most notably to the ruling political party or its policies, and of 'diffuse support' to the political system which can be measured through general trust in state institutions (Easton 1965), those concepts need to be more systematically taken into consideration and empirically measured. Political scientists have stressed the importance of people's overall perception of the institutions: They foster generalized trust in society as well as trust in the police. Several studies, mainly cross-national, have looked at the correlates of trust in state institutions, generalized social trust, and trust in the police. You (2012) found that generalized social trust was primarily linked to the existence of *institutional* procedural rules (democracy), an administration free from corruption, and distributive justice in terms of income distribution. Concerning police trust, studies found positive influences by trust in institutions in general and overall satisfaction with democratic functioning (Christensen and Lægreid 2005; Jang *et al.* 2010), i.e. stable and 'high level democracy' (Kutnjak Ivkovic 2008; Morris 2015). In comparative surveys, corruption is regularly a decisive variable when accounting for trust in the police at national level (Morris 2015; Rothstein and Uslaner 2005). Other research has found that trust in the political system is the strongest or among the strongest predictors of support for the police, at the world level, in Europe, and also in Latin America (Cao and Zhao 2005; cf. Thomassen 2013; Thomassen and Kääriäinen 2016). In fact, police systems are embedded in larger polities and the former are influenced by the latter, as can be observed in Nordic countries where police are 'heavily influenced by the Scandinavian welfare model' (Høigård 2011). While it seems safe to conclude from these studies that citizens' assessment of the trustworthiness of the police is embedded in a more generalized assessment of state institutions, a mono-causal interpretation remains difficult, and direct and indirect experiences of police fairness may well contribute to citizens' positive attitudes towards state institutions generally. This may especially be the case if individuals accumulate such experiences over time or 'when there are a *series* of incidents in a compressed time period that gain massive traction in the media and popular discourse' turning such personal and collective experiences in a longer-term impact. We do not see those micro and macro explanations as being mutually exclusive, on the contrary, and their possible linkage would require further exploration.

Testing procedural justice theory beyond Western societies

Two in-depth studies in this volume from Nigeria and Japan test the key assumption of procedural justice theory about the link between fairness perceptions and legitimacy. The study of Nigeria by Oluwagbenga Michael Akinlabi (Chapter 6,

this volume) portrays a complex reality: The perception of police fairness does not explain the legitimacy granted to the police and the willingness to cooperate – both of which are relatively low compared to developed democracies. At least three findings are notable from his study. First, anticipated cooperation with the police is not accounted for by perceptions of fairness, corruption or 'predatory policing' (a tendency to use police power for personal gains). Second, and contrary to findings from developed countries, citizens' assessment of police legitimacy is instead driven by perceptions of their efficiency. And, third, those who recognise the police as originating from the British colonial legacy are less likely to perceive the police as legitimate, reflecting the rather bleak historical roots of policing in Nigeria. The major purpose of colonial policing in Africa was to safeguard economic exploitation and to protect colonial interests against the resistance of the African people. Nigerian police officers until today have been guilty of arbitrary arrests, unlawful treatment of suspects, and extrajudicial killings. In sum, police forces were 'alien organizations established by foreigners' while the 'post-independence governments are guilty of malevolent indifference in their continuous neglect of police reform' that 'rendered the police largely unaccountable' (Akinlabi, Chapter 6, this volume). If we study the Afrobarometer (2010–2012), we learn that Nigerians very rarely disagree about the notion that 'people must obey the law' (7 per cent do so), far less than its neighbours (in Ivory Coast and Burkina Faso 15 per cent, in Benin 14 per cent), or that they should pay taxes (5 per cent compared to 24 per cent in Ivory Coast and Burkina Faso and 21 per cent in Benin), and Nigerians also show a higher degree of satisfaction with democracy. The rejection of the police might therefore not be based on the rejection of the idea of a national state (that would incorporate all ethnic groups) but on the failure of the state to regulate the police and prevent abuses. What seem to be at stake are the basic police functions in a modern state. Interactional fairness, in such a context, is probably perceived as a luxury that is not of major relevance in citizens' daily expectations. A second lesson learned is that obedience to the police and the law, often conflated when police officers are described as law enforcement agents, are not identical in nature: In contexts where police officers are not strictly bound by and frequently violate the law, citizens do not perceive them as representing the law.

In fact, these are not isolated findings in the African context. The perception of risks and the level of crime directly contribute to the attitudes of citizens towards the police in South Africa (Bradford *et al.* 2014) and Ghana, where Tankebe (2009) also showed that police legitimacy and public cooperation with the police were most strongly predicted by instrumental concerns, i.e. the perception of police effectiveness against crime. Even in Western nations such as Australia, Sargeant *et al.* (2014) found that perceived fairness was not at the core of trust and anticipated willingness to cooperate. In fact, a large set of studies shows that risk perceptions and crime experience matter (Hind and Murphy 2007; Ho and McKean 2004; Jang *et al.* 2010; Kääriäinen and Niemi 2014; Thomas and Hyman 1977; and the longitudinal analysis of Sindall *et al.* 2012).

In Japan, Tsushima and Hamai (2015) demonstrated that the procedural justice model was not applicable. Japan is well known for community policing in the academic domain since the work of Bayley (1976). The system of *koban*, dating back to 1971, consists of 'small neighbourhood police units [that] patrol the streets, make home visits to establish links, receive feedback on community safety, and respond to crime reports' (Sato, Chapter 5 in this volume). Mai Sato further investigates the main result of Tsushima and Hamai's study: 'The procedural justice model failed: While the first link (between trust in police fairness and legitimacy) worked, the second link (from legitimacy to cooperation) did not. Cooperation was also not explained directly by trust in police fairness'. And, contrary to Ghana or Nigeria, neither is willingness to cooperate with the police in Japan explained by perceived police effectiveness. Although untested in that survey, one possible explanation in the case of Japan may be that the *institutional* unfairness of a police system marked by high levels of corruption and illegal police actions for achieving high conviction outweighs the *interactional* fairness of the *koban* system (Johnson 2003; Miyazawa 1992). Mai Sato lets us feel how desperate Tsushima and Hamai were to try to find some good reasons why the model did not work, breaking the population into males and females or arguing that the police do not use stop and search enough, implying that it should have. But should it? What if the exception were the rule at a global level?

When comparing surveys from different national settings, two conclusions stand out. First, the interrelations of attitudes vis-à-vis the police prove inconsistent (in some countries, perceived fairness is related to willingness to cooperate/obey, in some others not). Second, the expectations about police performance and perceived levels of security are important and in some countries, they are the largest determinants of trust in the police and police legitimacy while perceived police fairness is less relevant. There are good reasons for these differences. In fact, we learn from comparative studies that perceptions of fairness, trust, and legitimacy of the police are dependent on macro-level conditions, in particular diffuse support of the state institutions of which the police are a part (or their rejection when they are perceived as colonial police) and of the levels of corruption (see above) as well as violent crime in the country (Jang *et al.* 2010; Stack *et al.* 2007). An important implication is that procedural justice theory cannot claim universal applicability across different criminal, cultural, and political contexts. Another implication is that one theory is not enough to determine the level of anticipated obedience and cooperation with the police, and in particular the importance of the outcomes of an encounter with the police need to be addressed (on *distributive justice* importance, see Weitzer, Chapter 2 in this volume).

Beyond attitudes: voluntary and involuntary interactions with police as state officials

Studies of the complex structure of attitudes towards the police in Anglo-Saxon countries tend to display stable findings. In Chapter 7 in this volume, Kristina

Murphy and Adrian Cherney, drawing on survey data of residents in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods in Brisbane and Melbourne (Australia), find that attitudes towards procedural justice policing enhances both feelings of belonging to the local community and trust in the police. The authors confirm a number of previous studies in which trust and perceived fairness were correlated, underscoring the importance of the latter on the production of what is frequently described as an essential lubricant of social life, trust. They also suggest that it would be particularly effective in building trust if it were possible to increase the number of marginalized people who assess the police as fair. This is an important issue since those are the segments of the population with the lowest levels of trust.

What remains to be understood is the relationship between attitudes and *actual* behaviour, a crucial issue in many research fields in the social and behavioural sciences. In survey research (as opposed to experimental research), one has to rely on declarations of intended behaviours or at best on self-reports of past behaviours which are more specific than intentions.

In a study of Nordic countries, Juha Kääriäinen (Chapter 13 in this volume) tests the notion that 'public trust in the police and the willingness of citizens to report offences or anti-social behaviour should go hand in hand'. Procedural justice theorists have maintained that victims who believe that the police are helpful and treat them well will be more inclined to turn to the police for assistance (Jackson *et al.* 2013; Tyler and Huo 2002). However, Juha Kääriäinen argues, few studies on actual reporting behaviour have been conducted, and they 'do not seem to confirm the hypothesis that public trust in the police translates into increased readiness among citizens to report offences'. Based on the Finnish 'Police Barometer' survey asking about actual victimization and victims' reactions, he finds a weak correlation only for one of three types of victimization (cf. also Kääriäinen and Sirén 2011). It is well established that at the individual level 'only some reasons for not reporting an offence have anything to do with the police', including attitudes towards the police. At the macro level of European countries, trust in the police and crime reporting behaviour are uncorrelated (see Figure 13.1). Likewise, no or even negative correlations between trust in the police and reporting behaviour have been found in studies from the Netherlands (Goudriaan *et al.* 2006) and Germany (Guzy and Hirtenlehner 2015). In the US, according to Barbara Warner (2007), trust in the police was not found to affect attempts to mobilize public authorities, another form of cooperation.

Such findings raise essential questions about the validity of core assumptions of procedural justice theory, even if more systematic research in more countries is necessary before definitive conclusions can be drawn. And these results echo other studies of a longitudinal or experimental nature, which included the measurement of actual behaviour (although not as an outcome but as an independent variable).

Some experimental studies of traffic stops have found beneficial effects of procedural treatment on general orientations towards the police (Mazerolle *et al.* 2013a; Murphy *et al.* 2013), and the use of some components of procedurally

fair policing in pre-existing studies (such as of community policing) have also displayed significant effects on some attitudes but not on legitimacy (Mazerolle *et al.* 2013b). However, and contrary to findings of cross-sectional surveys on attitudes, other recent research based on randomized control trials in the UK found that fairness-based interventions did not improve legitimacy in the police (MacQueen and Bradford 2015), and that procedurally just interventions did not affect drivers' views of police during random breathalyser tests (Lyndel *et al.* 2015). In some studies, if police behaviour was fairer, perceptions of police behaviour changed but without affecting more general attitudes towards police, at least in the case of the US (Lowrey *et al.* 2016) and Turkey (Shahin 2014). In a study of two US cities, Worden and McLean (2016) did not record positive changes in citizen attitudes after fair policing was introduced over several months, neither using police recorded behaviour or a direct observation based indicator. These findings leave us with two puzzles. Why do procedurally just interventions not affect people's perceptions of police legitimacy, and why do we observe an inconsistent effect of procedural fairness on general attitudes towards the police?

In conclusion, there is evidence that the procedural interactional model works at the attitudinal level in some Western countries: Perceptions of fair policing are correlated with the declared willingness to obey and cooperate with the police. Several attitudinal dimensions are intercorrelated, suggesting that those may in fact be part of one single consistent attitudinal complex. A robust debate on this issue has already taken place and will probably continue (Bottoms and Tankebe 2012; Gau 2011; Hough *et al.* 2013; Johnson *et al.* 2014; Tankebe *et al.* 2016). The cross-sectional nature of many surveys on which studies of the Procedural justice model rely casts some doubts on causal relationships. Respondents who trust the police more are also more likely to assess interactions with police officers positively, hinting at a reciprocal relationship between perceptions and attitudes (Hawdon 2008). Such an effect of pre-existing attitudes on the assessment of encounters with the police has been documented before (Brandl *et al.* 1994; Rosenbaum 2005). The notion that some variables are the causes or antecedents of the variations of others is still unclear and cannot be tested unless studies of behaviours are undertaken, preferably also using longitudinal designs with sufficient time duration. When asked about reporting crime to the police in cross-sectional surveys, citizens do not seem to act based on trust. When tested in real life experiments, the expected causal chain form perceived or observed fairness to positive attitudes is not always and, in fact, very rarely verified regarding changes in legitimacy (Lowrey *et al.* 2016; MacQueen and Bradford 2015; Shahin 2014; Worden and McLean 2016). A logical conclusion would be that other social processes may contribute to explaining citizen support for the police. Some relate to the structure of encounters, i.e. the suspect intoxication, disrespect, education of officer, social support of bystanders as theorized by Turk *et al.* (see Weidner and Terrill 2005) or Mastrofski *et al.* (2002), and others to the structure of society, which we discuss now.

Trust and legitimacy among ethnic minorities: social integration and policing policies make a difference

In many counties, there seems to be a strained relationship between the police and ethnic minorities (Rice and White 2010; Weitzer 2014). Minority adolescents have been prominently involved in almost all anti-police riots in the USA and across Western Europe, and police forces in these countries are suspected of widespread discriminatory treatment of minorities, most notoriously in the case of 'racial' or 'ethnic profiling' (Bradford and Loader 2016; Jobard and Lévy 2011; Newburn *et al.* 2016). Research conducted in Australia (Murphy and Cherney, Chapter 7 in this volume), Canada (Wortley and Owusu-Bempah 2009), Finland (Kääriäinen, Chapter 13 in this volume), France (Oberwittler and Roché, Chapter 4 in this volume), Turkey (Roché *et al.* Chapter 10 in this volume) and the USA (Weitzer, Chapter 2 in this volume) has found that attitudes towards the police are clearly more negative among ethnic or racial minority groups than among the majority population. In the developed democracies of Europe and North America, the ethnic dividing lines are mainly between 'White' and some sort of visibly 'Non-White' groups, while in other countries different kinds of ethnic cleavages may matter. In most societies, an ethnic minority status is associated with lower or marginal socio-economic status and a lower position in political and religious hierarchies. Social marginalization combined with the fact that in many countries police officers are recruited mostly from one ethnic group are seen as the main reasons for the strained relationship with the police (Davis and Henderson 2003; Weitzer 2010).

Several chapters in this volume aim to understand the roots of minorities' perceptions of the police in the USA, in European countries and in Turkey, focusing on societal, institutional, and policy factors. For example, perceptions of the police and other social institutions in the US correspond to a White-Latino-African American hierarchy, which 'is deeply rooted in racialized structural inequalities' (Weitzer, Chapter 2 in this volume). It remains an essential task to better understand how attitudes are connected with national structural and cultural contexts, since it can help us understand what makes fairness, trust, and cooperation thrive.

National variations in police–minority relations

Ben Bradford, Jonathan Jackson and Mike Hough (Chapter 3 in this volume) use data from the European Social Survey to assess whether accounting for 'modes of incorporation' (or societal integration) reduce the statistical effect of a dichotomous majority versus minority indicator on police legitimacy ('felt obligation to obey' and 'normative alignment with police' measured by support for the way police behave). Modes of incorporation consist of the felt discrimination, the age of respondents at the time of immigration (as a measure of voluntariness to adopt a place), citizenship status, decisions not to participate in elections, and economic precariousness. The authors find 'no consistent association between ethnic

minority status and police legitimacy'. In 11 countries, the felt obligation to obey is higher for minority members; in 14 others, it is lower. They find that, in general, the less minority members are integrated economically and politically, the less they see the police as legitimate. An important exception is that naturalized minority members are less inclined to obey the police than those still holding foreign citizenship as are those who are eligible to vote. In the multivariate model, immigrant status is no longer significant in explaining legitimacy.

These findings are remarkable in two respects. First, the assumption that ethnic minorities hold more negative views of the police is rejected in many European countries and, thus, not universally valid. Second, ignoring the unexpectedly negative effect of citizenship, the results indicate that the salience of ethnicity is found in social and economic integration into a host society. In the same vein, in Chapter 4, Dietrich Oberwittler and Sebastian Roché reveal that residence in socially and ethnically segregated French 'banlieues' proves a significant predictor of distrust in the police, thus, suggesting the formation of an anti-police culture in line with previous US studies (e.g. Berg *et al.* 2016; Weitzer 1999; Wu *et al.* 2009), a situation not seen in Germany. Again, the context seems to influence minority integration and relations with the police in nationally specific ways. These findings invite us to scrutinize the characteristics of state institutions and policies supporting minority cultural and economic integration.

Another avenue that has been explored is the contrast between minorities' experiences of institutions in their host countries and expectations formed in their countries of origin, a phenomenon that has been referred to as 'dual frames of reference' (Suarez-Orozco 1987). If the difference is positive, high confidence of first-generation immigrants in Europe may be explained by such contrasts as has been observed in the USA and Canada (Correia 2010; Wortley and Owusu-Bempah 2009). Röder and Mülhau (2012; cf. Nannestad *et al.* 2014) report similar findings about immigrants' attitudes towards criminal justice institutions in EU countries. The role of institutions rather than culture in shaping immigrants' attitudes need to be given proper attention.

Taken together, comparative analyses of the sources of police trust and legitimacy indicate that they are not only about policing. Minority groups' attitudes are also driven by their relation to the host societies and their political institutions, and in comparison to their countries of origin.

Policing policies and policing styles

Another aspect of political systems refers to how the state and elected officials implement policies. Police structures and policing policies are very divergent across cities and nations. In terms of citizens' involuntary contacts with police, for example, Mai Sato (Chapter 5 in this volume) presents the contrast within the EU between states like Finland and Sweden with many contacts and states like Portugal and Bulgaria with few contacts (see Table 5.2). Three chapters, two about two continental European countries and one on the USA, study the impact

of policing strategies, and another proposes avenues for improving the management of officers. They all find that aggressive policing has a deleterious effect on trust.

Wesley Skogan (Chapter 11 in this volume) studies the consequences on trust in police of 'stop-and-frisk' as a law enforcement strategy, which he explains has become the crime deterrence strategy of choice in Chicago since 2013 and, more largely, in American policing. No less than 29 per cent of people (and 40 per cent of those under 35) were checked in Chicago in 2015, compared to 20 per cent a decade before. He explores the risks of this for police efficiency on the one hand, since 'the ability of the police to accurately select suitably at risk people from among [residents of high crime places] is very limited, further reducing the 'hit rate' for seizing contraband and making arrests'; and for police–citizen relations on the other hand, since 'even in crime hot spots, most people, most of the time, are just going about their daily lives', and from their point of view these stops may be unjustified and ethnically unfairly distributed. Sixty-eight per cent of young African American men were stopped and 56 per cent searched and questioned, five times more than average. Use of physical force or threat with a gun was distributed unevenly to the detriment of minority groups.

Dietrich Oberwittler and Sebastian Roché (Chapter 4 in this volume) present findings from the POLIS study, a comparative research project, which compares adolescents in two cities in France and two cities Germany and support the notion that police strategies affect adolescents' trust in the police. While almost no difference in the prevalence of proactive stops is found in Germany between the majority and all minority groups (e.g. 29 per cent for native and 28 per cent for Turkish boys), in France, the largest minority group of Algerian origin is far more exposed to proactive stops (42 per cent for boys) than the majority group (20 per cent for boys), and this difference remains after accounting for a large number of relevant control variables.

Similar consequences are found on both sides of the Atlantic. Aggressive and discriminatory policing practices send a message that is contrary to the idea that the police are doing their best for the people. In line with other US studies, Wesley Skogan (Chapter 11 in this volume) finds that the level of trust in the police is lowest for Blacks and lower for Hispanics compared to White Chicagoans. In addition, those caught up in stop-and-frisk are less trusting of the police. In the POLIS study, trust in the police is considerably lower for minority compared to majority adolescents only in France, in line with the ethnic disproportionality of stops by French police, whereas in Germany very small ethnic differences in trust and no indications of ethnic profiling are found.

Maarten Van Craen, Stephan Parmentier and Mina Rauschenbach (Chapter 12 in this volume) indicate with their study in Belgium that disrespectful treatment of officers by their management equally encourages lack of fairness vis-à-vis citizens. Ron Weitzer (Chapter 2 in this volume) suggests that the American public want reform, that police chiefs are learning from ongoing events, and that its content should focus on how police departments are ethnically populated and police accountability.

These results from various countries show that there is no general law that demands a greater distance between minorities and the police. Learning that a specific ethnic group will not have the same relation to the police in different national settings casts doubt on the nature of the 'ethnic effect'. Moreover, this distance varies across time as much as across nations. Police may serve the minority against the majority (as in South Africa during the apartheid regime) since they are not meant to represent the people but to respond to the orders of the political authority that may be ethnically defined. Police may also be service oriented and not ethnically biased, most likely in political systems with a culture of equality and in which policies are oriented towards that aim. The case studies in this volume illustrate the existence of divergent relations between minority groups and the police. Lower levels of trust and legitimacy granted by minorities are in some cases accounted for by levels of integration into host societies, and strong evidence is found for the impact of policing strategies which are a source of tensions between minorities and police, underlining the relevance of fairness in policing. The convergence of US and European studies is striking in regard to the negative effects of stop-and-search strategies.

Ethnic, religious, and political identities and cleavages

While ethnic divisions have received substantial attention in studies on police–citizen relations, religious and political divisions have not. Such partitions do not necessarily make themselves felt constantly: They depend on identities that can be activated by conflicts, a series of events and processes through which they become expressed in the public arena and politicized. Examples are police killings of Black citizens in the USA and the subsequent ethnic mobilization (as in Black Lives Matter) or political discourses during elections campaigns, e.g. about secularism in France or national identity in Turkey. Studies that are able to capture the dynamics of cleavages and their consequences for police legitimacy in such instances are important but very rare. This volume brings together analyses of the Ferguson shooting in the USA, ethnic-religious tensions in France and political divides in Turkey, and all these examples highlight the interplay between societal tensions and social identities.

Unlike in Europe, the USA has frequent incidents of lethal police violence, with 991 citizens killed by police in 2015 and 963 in 2016 according to the *Washington Post* (Fatal Force 2017), and more than 1,000 each year according to the *Guardian* (The Counted 2016). After White Police Officer Darren Wilson shot and killed African American Michael Brown on 9 August 2014 in Ferguson, there three weeks of large protests, rioting, and looting. 'Police responded with fortified vehicles, riot gear, skirmish lines, beanbag bullets, and tear gas. The heaviest period of civil unrest lasted from 9 August and into September', Tammy Rinehart Kochel (Chapter 9 in this volume) writes. She assesses how such a high-profile incident affected citizens' attitudes towards the police, using a local panel survey with measurements before and after the incident. In the short term, a gulf along ethnic lines widened: Trust and perceived fairness

diminished significantly for Blacks (−26 per cent) but increased for Whites (+1.5 per cent), suggesting that the latter group did not judge the killing as relevant for themselves. In line with Easton's theoretical framework and empirical findings from Kaminski and Jefferis (1998), Tammy Rinehart Kochel observes that citizens who hold lower levels of diffuse support for police appear to have been more negatively affected by use of force. Important conclusions are that in the assessment of police use of lethal force, the impact of racial divisions and polarization are reinforced by a critical event and the way it is managed by authorities.

A Turkish case study (Roché *et al.* Chapter 10 in this volume) analyses public support for the use of violent and non-violent illegal means by the police, i.e. granting a moral right to use coercive powers which constitutes another aspect of state legitimacy. In order to explain who does agrees to deviant policing and who does not, Sebastian Roché, Mine Özaşçılar and Ömer Bilen take into account various societal divides, and it appears that political party orientation is the main predictor with supporters of the incumbent political party, the Justice and Development Party (AKP), most inclined to condone unlawful police actions. The AKP is a nationalistic, religiously conservative and free market-oriented party, and political cleavages in Turkey seem to be an amalgam of religious identity (Sunni Muslim versus other), ethnicity (Turkish versus Kurdish) and socio-economic preferences. Respondents' own experiences of police-initiated stops reinforce a critical assessment of illegal police actions only for supporters of the two oppositional parties, the CHP (a secular party) and HDP (a Kurdish-based party), which display the largest political distance vis-à-vis AKP. The authors suggest that political ideology organizes the subjective understanding both of policing policies and personal experiences with police. It is important to consider that central police forces in Turkey are organizations that take their orders from the executive branch of government. Hence, it is no surprise that legitimacy to act illegally is granted to the police primarily by supporters of the ruling party. For them, it seems that the end justifies the means. Political preferences are very strong determinants of the public evaluation of the morality of the government and its police (cf. Anderson and Tverdova 2003 on corruption). The role of political ideologies has been hinted at in recent research on attitudes towards the police: Political ideology predicts support for excessive use of force (Gerber and Jackson 2017), while conservative and authoritarian worldviews, which often include punitiveness, are ideological bases for seeing the police in a more positive light, as an agency defending social order against deviance (Dugan 2015; Hough *et al.* 2013: 46; Jackson *et al.* 2011; Messner *et al.* 2006; Silver and Pickett 2015).

The history of state building in some countries is marked by foreign domination, with long-lasting effects on how the police is perceived, such as in Nigeria (Akinlabi, Chapter 6 in this volume) or Ghana (Tankebe 2008). Others are deeply divided by religion or ethnicity to the point where different people live largely separately, as in Israel with corresponding distrust of the Israeli state and its police by the Arab minority (Hasisi 2008). Less extreme divides exist in European countries and adherence to the political community always manifests

itself as 'diffuse support' with significant effects on attitudes towards the police. In Chapter 8, Sebastian Roché, Anina Schwarzenbach, Dietrich Oberwittler and Jacques de Maillard analyse the role of religious beliefs and ethnic identities in minority adolescents' attitudes towards the police in France and Germany. Supporting the group engagement model (Bradford *et al.* 2014; Tyler and Blader 2003), they find that trust in the police is dependent on the identification of minority adolescents with the host society in both France and Germany, whereas adolescents who strongly identify with their group of origin are less trusting. And, importantly, they find that religiosity among Muslim minority adolescents (of Maghrebian origin in France and of Turkish origin in Germany) has diverging effects in both countries: Stronger religiosity *increases* trust the police in Germany but *decreases* trust in France. Depending on national contexts and the institutionalization of state-religion relationships (a means of building a political community), religion can turn into a political cleavage that may weaken the legitimacy of state institutions. We relate this divergence in the effect of social identification to the possible existence of a conflict (Sambanis and Shayo 2013), a tension about the legitimacy of institutional arrangements. When the state has legitimacy problems or a trust deficit with a large minority, it will in turn affect the group's relationship with the police (Brewer 1991). The conditional effect of religious identification underscores the importance of national political institutions. On a more general level, we propose that ethnicity, race, religion, or region play a role for trust only if they are 'expressed' (in an analogy to 'gene expression' in biology). While in Germany religious identity is not expressed, in France it is, and since the police are part of a larger political system, this process negatively impacts adolescents' trust in police.

Towards a renewed research agenda

The chief intention of this volume is to learn from the comparison of different experiences of police–citizen relations across various countries where the relationship between the governors and the governed, of which trust and legitimacy are a part, may vary. We have classically addressed legitimacy as the moral right to rule vested in government and police, i.e. voluntary compliance and cooperation, on the one hand, and the right to use coercive powers, on the other hand. Summing up the major points of our introductory discussion based on the case studies presented in this volume and on the relevant literature, we have identified four core issues for future research on police–citizen relations.

First, a major question is 'what are the main theories that may be needed in order to explain trust in the police and police legitimacy?' We believe that several theories are needed and we categorize them in four blocks: (a) adherence to the political and social order (and related institutions); (b) group position, integration into society and corresponding societal cleavages of various kinds (socio-economic, religious, ethnic); (c) policing policies (and in particular stop and search strategies) and performance of the police (the quality of service and efficacy against crime); and (d) those that deal with the interactions, i.e. the

structure of interaction, the procedural justice during interaction, and the outcomes of interactions or distributive justice.

A second issue is under which circumstances does the procedural justice model work at the attitudinal level? It appears that its core tenets apply mainly to Western liberal democracies but not necessarily beyond. Which countries should we then judge as the rule and which as an anomaly? There is some weight to the argument that political liberalism and the rule of law have combined to contribute to higher standards of living (although unevenly distributed), and have laid the groundwork for people's appreciation of fair procedures and rules. In other regions of the world, people may cooperate with the police for different reasons, but we need more systematic analyses to substantiate this hypothesis, starting with definitional issues. Cross-country comparisons have revealed that the concept of two components of legitimacy (duty to obey to and value alignment with police) do not match countries as Ghana, Nigeria, Japan or Israel, for example.

A third important problem is the disconnect between subjective and objective measures of fairness and legitimacy and the lack of studies which are able to combine survey data with observational or experimental data. Subjective assessments of interactions as recorded in surveys may well be coloured by ideology, strong identity, and other non-interactional factors. We echo other scholars' calls for assessments of specific examples of police conduct to be incorporated into surveys (Waddington *et al.* 2015). This is important if we want to ascertain the effects of interactional procedures on trust and legitimacy. In addition, we do not yet have at our disposal a shared and agreed upon measurement rod for observed interactional fairness. This situation may help explain why several programmes focusing on improving police interactions (recorded and coded by an observer) do not alter public perceptions.

A fourth issue is about the role for cross-national studies that can help to clarify the effects of macro-level variables (e.g. state institutions, culture, level of crime, cleavages). National contexts may impact all four blocks of theories mentioned in the first major issue. We advocate cross-national comparative surveys supplemented by measures of state institutions, criminal context, and socio-political cleavages. The chapters in this volume have been examples of research underscoring the impact of these dimensions on police–citizen relations.

A series of hypotheses relating to the role of institutions might be worth testing in future research. First, states have distinct regimes and quality of government. An effect of those two major aspects of states on generalized trust and attitudes towards the welfare state have started to be observed with various methodologies (Larsen 2016; Rothstein and Eek 2009). Extant research already has found effects on trust and other attitudes towards the police of police responsiveness and competence, impartiality and fairness, transparency and accountability, all being classic notions useful for measuring the quality of service rendered to citizens by police, before, during, and after interactions take place. Regimes and quality of government may influence the quality of policing and, as

a consequence, attitudes vis-à-vis police in different ways. The quality of policing may matter for producing support to the political system, a sense of belonging to a superordinate group, and a sense of citizenship. That makes it a candidate explanation for diffuse system support (Rodgers and Taylor 1971). And we know that such trust has lot to do with the legitimacy of the police. Second, police forces across the world are hardly comparable in their organization, their control by the political authority, and the behaviour of their units and members. Trust and legitimacy might depend on those factors directly or indirectly and in combination with other factors. For example, centralization of forces with strong government oversight may promote more homogeneous policing and may, in combination with a policy of equal treatment of all citizens, explain the privileged situation of Nordic European countries. Conversely, a poorly supervised and decentralized set of forces might lead to open police distrust. Third, political ideologies are likely to influence judgements about the police and policing in a diversity of states (Stack and Cao 1998). It is also well established that supporters of the incumbent party are more positive about the policies and it is likely that they are in the same mood regarding policing, i.e. ready to endorse the actions of the police for reasons of ideological proximity with the government (Anderson *et al.* 2005). A cross-national analysis of the correspondence between citizens' political leaning, ideological distance to incumbent office holder, and trust or legitimacy of police might help to unveil the importance of ideology. Fourth, levels of violence and crime may vary greatly across states, affecting support for the police. Their systematic incorporation to research protocol would help to include contextual data that are correlated to state performance. Fifth, societies are more or less divided along fault lines, and the police are often placed in the middle of opposing groups in the case of tensions (Waddington 2003). Group cleavages are related to the politicization of group identities, and governments contribute to feeding or defusing such cleavages by their identity policies and their use of police forces (Brewer 1991). Attitudes vis-à-vis the police may vary according to support to the government's policies in handling such cleavages. A measurement of the degree of division of the country combined with a measurement of the related government policies might enlighten support given to police deviance as well as fair policing.

Bibliography

Afrobarometer Round 5 (2010–2012). 'Afrobarometer online data analysis', online. Available www.afrobarometer-online-analysis.com/aj/AJBrowserAB.jsp (accessed 27 April 2017).

Anderson, C., Blais, A., Bowler, S., Donovan, T., and Listhaug, O. (2005). *Losers' Consent: Elections and Democratic Legitimacy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, C. J. and Tverdova, Y. V. (2003). 'Corruption, political allegiance, and attitudes toward government in contemporary democracy', *American Journal of Political Science* 47, 91–109.

Bayley, D. (1976). *Forces of Order: Policing Modern Japan*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bellman, A. (1935). ‘A police service rating scale’, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 26: 74–114.

Berg, M., Stewart, E., Intravia, J., Warren, P., and Simons, R. (2016). ‘Cynical streets: neighborhood social processes and perceptions of criminal injustice’, *Criminology*, 54: 520–47.

Blader, S. L. and Tyler, R. T. (2003). ‘A four-component model of procedural justice: defining the meaning of a “fair” process” ’, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29: 747–58.

Booth J. A. and Seligson M. A. (2009). *The Legitimacy Puzzle in Latin America: Political Support and Democracy in Eight Nations*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bottoms, A. and Tankebe, J. (2012). ‘Beyond procedural justice: a dialogic approach to legitimacy in criminal justice’, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 102: 119–70.

Bowling, B. and Phillips, C. (2008). ‘Policing ethnic minority communities’, in Newburn, T. (ed.), *Handbook of Policing*, Cullompton: Willan, 611–41.

Bradford, B. and Loader, I. (2016). ‘Police, crime and order: the case of stop and search’, in B. Bradford, B. Jauregui, I. Loader, and J. Steinberg (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Global Policing*, London: Sage, 241–60.

Bradford, B., Murphy, K., and Jackson, J. (2014). ‘Officers as mirrors: policing, procedural justice and the (re)production of social identity’, *British Journal of Criminology*, 54: 527–50.

Brandl, S., Frank, J., Worden, R., and Bynum, T. (1994). ‘Global and specific attitudes toward the police: disentangling the relationship’, *Justice Quarterly*, 11: 119–34.

Brewer, J. (1991). ‘Policing in divided societies: theorizing a type of policing’, *Policing and Society*, 1: 179–91.

Cao, L. and Zhao, J. (2005). ‘Confidence in the police in Latin America’, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33: 403–12.

Christensen, T. and Lægreid, P. (2005). ‘Trust in government: the relative importance of service satisfaction, political factors, and demographics’, *Public performance and Management Review*, 28: 487–511.

Coicaud, J.-M. (2002). *Legitimacy and Politics. A Contribution to the Study of Political Right and Political Responsibility*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coquilhat, J. (2008). *Community Policing: An International Literature Review*, Wellington: New Zealand Government.

Correia, M. (2010). ‘Determinants of attitudes toward police of Latino immigrants and non-immigrants’, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38: 99–107.

Davis, R. and Henderson, N. (2003). ‘Willingness to report crimes: the role of ethnic group membership and community efficacy’, *Crime and Delinquency*, 49: 564–80.

Donner, C., Makaly, J., Fridell, L., and Jennings, W. (2015). ‘Policing and procedural justice: a state-of-the-art review’, *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 38: 153–72.

Dugan, A. (2015), ‘Trust differs most by ideology for church, police, presidency’, online. Available www.gallup.com/poll/183875/trust-differs-ideology-church-police-presidency.aspx?version=print (accessed 27 April 2017).

Easton, D. (1965). *A Framework for Political Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Farganis, J. (2008). *Readings in Social Theory*. Columbus, OH: McGraw Hill.

Fatal Force (2017). ‘Fatal force’, *Washington Post*, online. Available www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/national/police-shootings-2016 (accessed 5 May 2017).

Gau, J. (2011). ‘The convergent and discriminant validity of procedural justice and police legitimacy: an empirical test of core theoretical propositions’, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39: 489–98.

Gerber, M. and Jackson, J. (2017). ‘Justifying violence: legitimacy, ideology and public support for police use of force’, *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 23: 79–95.

Goudriaan, H., Wittebrood, K., and Nieuwbeerta, P. (2006). ‘Neighbourhood characteristics and reporting crime effects of social cohesion, confidence in police effectiveness and socio-economic disadvantage’, *British Journal of Criminology*, 46: 719–42.

Guzy, N. and Hirtenlehner, H. (2015). ‘Trust in the German police: determinants and consequences for reporting behavior’, in: Mesko, G. and Tankebe, J. (eds), *Trust and Legitimacy in Criminal Justice. European Perspectives*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 203–29.

Hasisi, B. (2008). ‘Police, politics, and culture in deeply divided societies’, *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 98: 1119–45.

Hawdon, J. (2008). ‘Legitimacy, trust, social capital, and policing styles: a theoretical statement’, *Police Quarterly*, 11: 182–201.

Hinds, L. and Murphy, K. (2007). ‘Public satisfaction with police: using procedural justice to improve police legitimacy’, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 40: 27–42.

Ho, T. and McKean, J. (2004). ‘Confidence in the police and perceptions of risk’, *Western Criminology Review*, 5: 108–18.

Høigård, C. (2011). ‘Policing the North’, in M. Tonry and T. Lappi-Seppälä (eds) *Crime and Justice in Scandinavia (Crime and Justice, vol. 40)*, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 265–348.

Hough, M., Jackson, J., and Bradford, B. (2013). ‘Legitimacy, trust and compliance: an empirical test of procedural justice theory using the European Social Survey’, in J. Tankebe and A. Liebling (eds), *Legitimacy and Criminal Justice: An International Exploration*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 326–52.

Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., Kuha, J., Stares, S. R., Widdop, S., Fitzgerald, R., Yordanova, M., and Galev, T. (2011). ‘Developing European indicators of trust in justice’, *European Journal of Criminology*, 8: 267–85.

Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Stanko, E., and Hohl, K. (2013). *Just Authority? Trust in the Police in England and Wales*, London: Routledge.

Jang, H., Joo, H.-J., and Zhao, J. (2010). ‘Determinants of public confidence in police: an international perspective’, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38: 57–68.

Jobard, F. and Lévy, R. (2011). ‘Racial profiling: the Parisian police experience’, *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 53: 87–93.

Johnson, D. (2003). ‘Above the law? Police integrity in Japan’, *Social Science Japan Journal*, 6: 19–37.

Johnson, D., Maguire, E., and Kuhn, J. (2014). ‘Public perceptions of the legitimacy of the law and legal authorities: evidence from the Caribbean’, *Law and Society Review*, 48: 947–78.

Kääriäinen, J. and Niemi, J. (2014). ‘Distrust of the police in a Nordic welfare state: victimization, discrimination, and trust in the police by Russian and Somali minorities in Helsinki’, *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 12: 4–24.

Kääriäinen, J. and Sirén, R. (2011). ‘Trust in the police, generalized trust and reporting crime’, *European Journal of Criminology*, 8: 65–81.

Kaina, V. (2008). ‘Legitimacy, trust and procedural fairness: remarks on Marcia Grimes’s study’, *European Journal of Political Research*, 47: 510–21.

Kaminski, R. and Jefferis, E. (1998). 'The effect of a violent televised arrest on public perceptions of the police: a partial test of Easton's theoretical framework', *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 21: 683–706.

Kutnjak Ivkovic, S. (2008). 'A comparative study of public support for the police', *International Criminal Justice Review*, 18: 406–34.

Lappi-Seppälä, T. (2008). 'Trust, welfare, and political culture: explaining differences in national penal policies', *Crime and Justice*, 37: 313–87.

Larsen, C. (2016). *The Institutional Logic of Welfare Attitudes: How Welfare Regimes Influence*, London: Routledge.

Lowrey, B., Maguire, E. R., and Bennett, R. R. (2016). 'Testing the effects of procedural justice and overaccommodation in traffic stops: a randomized experiment', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Advance online publication, doi: 10.1177/0093854816639330.

Lyndel, J. B., Antrobus, E., Bennett, S., and Martin, P. (2015) 'Comparing police and public perceptions of a routine traffic encounter', *Police Quarterly*, 18: 442–68.

Mackenzie, S. and Henry, A. (2009). *Community Policing: A Review of the Evidence*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research.

MacQueen, S. and Bradford, B. (2015). 'Enhancing public trust and police legitimacy during road traffic encounters: results from a randomised controlled trial in Scotland', *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 11: 419–43.

Maguire, E. and Johnson, D. (2010). 'Measuring public perceptions of the police', *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 33: 703–30.

Mastrofski, S. D., Reisig, M. D., and McCluskey, J. D. (2002). 'Police disrespect toward the public: an encounter-based analysis', *Criminology*, 40: 519–52.

Mazerolle, L., Antrobus, E., Bennet, S., and Tyler, T. (2013a). 'Shaping citizen perceptions of police legitimacy: a randomized field trial of procedural justice', *Criminology*, 51: 33–63.

Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E., and Manning, M. (2013b). 'Legitimacy in policing: a Systematic Review', *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 9.

Mazerolle, L., Sargeant, E., Cherney, A., Bennett, S., Murphy, K., Antrobus, E., and Martin, P. (2014). *Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Policing*, New York: Springer.

Messner, S. F., Baumer, E. P., and Rosenfeld, R. (2006). 'Distrust of government, the vigilante tradition, and support for capital punishment', *Law and Society Review*, 40: 559–90.

Miller, A. (1974). 'Political issues and trust in government: 1964–1970', *American Political Science Review*, 68: 951–72.

Miller, A. and Listhaug, O. (1998). 'Policy preferences and political trust: a comparison of Norway, Sweden and the United States', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 21: 161–87.

Mishler, W. and Rose, R. (2001). 'What are the origins of political trust? Testing institutional and cultural theories in post-communist societies', *Comparative Political Studies*, 34: 30–62.

Miyazawa, S. (1992). *Policing in Japan: A Study on Making Crime*. New York: University of New York Press.

Morris, C. S. (2011). *A cross-national study on public confidence in the police*. PhD thesis, Northeastern University, online. Available https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/files/neu:1022/fulltext.pdf (accessed 27 April 2017).

Morris, C. (2015). 'An international study on public confidence in police', *Police Practice and Research. An International Journal*, 16: 416–30.

Murphy, K., Mazerolle, L., and Bennett, S. (2013). 'Promoting trust in police: findings from a randomised experimental field trial of procedural justice policing', *Policing and Society*, 24: 405–24.

Nannestad, P., Svendsen, G., Dinesen, P., and Sønderskov, K. (2014). 'Do institutions or culture determine the level of social trust? The natural experiment of migration from non-Western to Western Countries', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40: 544–65.

Newburn, T., Diski, R., Cooper, K., Deacon, R., Burch, A., and Grant, M. (2016). ' "The biggest gang"? Police and people in the 2011 England riots', *Policing and Society*, online. Available www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10439463.2016.1165220 (accessed 11 May 2017).

Norris, P. (2017). 'The conceptual framework of political support', in S. Zmerli and T. van der Meer (eds) *Handbook on Political Trust*, Cheltenham: Elgar Publishing, 19–32.

Parratt, S. D. (1936), 'A critique of the Bellman police service rating scale', *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 27: 895–905.

Rice, S. and White, M. (2010), *Race, ethnicity and policing*, New York: New York University Press.

Röder, A. and Mühlau, P. (2012). ‚What determines the trust of immigrants in criminal justice systems in Europe?', *European Journal of Criminology*, 9: 370–87.

Rodgers, H. and Taylor G. (1971). 'The policeman as an agent of regime legitimation', *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, 15: 72–86.

Rosenbaum, D. (2005). 'Attitudes toward the police', *Police Quarterly*, 8: 343–65.

Rothstein, B. and Eek, D. (2009). 'Political corruption and social trust: an experimental approach', *Rationality and Society*, 21: 81–112.

Rothstein, B. and Uslaner, E. (2005). 'All for all: equality, corruption, and social trust', *World Politics*, 58: 41–72.

Sahin, N. M. (2014). *Legitimacy, procedural justice and police–citizen encounters: A randomized controlled trial of the impact of procedural justice on citizen. Perceptions of the police during traffic stops in Turkey*, Phd thesis, State University of New Jersey, online. Available https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/43841/PDF/1/ (accessed 27 April 2017).

Sambanis, N. and Shayo, M. (2013). 'Social identification and ethnic conflict', *The American Political Science Review*, 107: 294–325.

Sargeant, E., Murphy, K., and Cherney, A. (2014). 'Ethnicity, trust and cooperation with the police: testing the dominance of the process-based model', *European Journal of Criminology*, 11: 500–24.

Schafer, J. A., Huebner, B. M., and Bynum, T. S. (2003). 'Citizen perceptions of police services: race, neighborhood context, and community policing', *Police Quarterly*, 6, 440−68.

Silver, J. R. and Pickett, J. T. (2015). 'Understanding politicized policing attitudes: conflicted conservatism and support for police use of force', *Criminology*, 53: 650–76.

Sindall, K., Sturgis, P., and Jennings, W. (2012). 'Public confidence in the police', *British Journal of Criminology*, 52: 744–64.

Skogan, W. (1998). 'Community policing in Chicago', in Alpert, G. and Piquero, A. (eds), *Community Policing: Contemporary Readings*, Prospect Heights, NY: Waveland Press, 159–74.

Smith, R. (1970). 'The concept of legitimacy', *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, 35: 17–29.

Stack S. and Cao L. (1998). 'Political conservatism and trust in the police: a comparative analysis', *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 21: 71–76.

Stack, S., Cao, L., and Adamzyck, A. (2007). 'Crime volume and law and order culture', *Justice Quarterly*, 24: 291–308.

Suarez-Orozco, M. (1987). 'Becoming somebody: Central American immigrants in U.S. inner-city schools', *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18: 287–99.

Sunshine, J. and Tyler, T. (2003). 'The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing', *Law and Society Review*, 37: 513–48.

Sztompka, P. (1999). *Trust: A Sociological Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tankebe, J. (2008). 'Colonialism, legitimation, and policing in Ghana', *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 36: 67–84.

Tankebe, J. (2009). 'Self-help, policing, and procedural justice: Ghanaian vigilantism and the rule of law', *Law and Society Review*, 43: 245–69.

Tankebe, J., Reisig, M., and Wang, X. (2016). 'A multidimensional model of police legitimacy: a cross-cultural assessment', *Law and Human Behavior*, 40: 11–22.

Taylor, R. and Lawton, B. (2012). 'An integrated contextual model of confidence in local police', *Police Quarterly*, 15: 414–45.

Terpstra, J. (2011). 'Two theories on the police. The relevance of Max Weber and Emile Durkheim to the study of the police', *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice* 39: 1–11.

The Counted (2016). 'The Counted. People killed by police in the US', *Guardian*, online. Available www.theguardian.com/us-news/ng-interactive/2015/jun/01/the-counted-police-killings-us-database (accessed 5 May 2017).

Thibaut J. J. and Walker, W. (1975), *Procedural Justice. A Psychological Analysis*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Thomas, C. and Hyman, J. (1977). 'Perceptions of crime, fear of victimization, and public perceptions of police performance', *Journal of Police Science and Public Administration*, 5: 305–16.

Thomassen, G. (2013). 'Corruption and trust in the police: a cross-country study', *European Journal of Policing Studies*, 1: 152–68.

Thomassen, G. and Kääriäinen, J. (2016). 'System satisfaction, contact satisfaction, and trust in the police: a study of Norway', *European Journal of Policing Studies*, 3: 437–48.

Tonry, M. (2007). 'Preface', in T. Tyler (ed.), *Legitimacy and Criminal Justice*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 3–8.

Tsushima, M. and Hamai, K. (2015). 'Public cooperation with the police in Japan: testing the legitimacy model', *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 31: 212–28.

Tyler, T. (1990). *Why People Obey the Law*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tyler, T. (2006). 'Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57: 375–400.

Tyler, T. (2011). *Why People Cooperate: The Role of Social Motivations*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tyler, T. and Blader, S. (2003). 'The group engagement model: procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior', *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7: 349–61.

Tyler, T. and Huo, Y. (2002). *Trust in the Law: Encouraging Public Cooperation with the Police and Courts*, New York: Russell-Sage Foundation.

Tyler, T., Goff, P., and MacCoun, R. (2015). 'The impact of psychological science on policing in the United States: procedural justice, legitimacy, and effective law enforcement', *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16: 75–109.

Waddington, P. A. J. (2003). Policing public order and political contention, in Newburn, T. (ed.), *Handbook of Policing*, Cullumpton: Willan, 394–421.

Waddington, P. A. J., Williams, K., Wright, M., and Newburn, T. (2015). 'Dissension in public evaluations of the police', *Policing and Society*, 25: 212–35.

Warner, B. (2007). 'Directly intervene or call the authorities? A study of forms of neighborhood social control within a social disorganization framework', *Criminology*, 45: 99–129.

Webb, V. J. and Marshall, C. E. (1995). 'The relative importance of race and ethnicity on citizen attitudes toward the police', *American Journal of Police*, 14: 45–66.

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, New York: The Free Press.

Weidner, R. R. and Terrill, W. (2005). 'A test of Turk's theory of norm resistance using observational data on police–suspect encounters', *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42: 84–109.

Weitzer, R. (1999). 'Citizens' perceptions of police misconduct: race and neighborhood context', *Justice Quarterly*, 16: 819–46.

Weitzer, R. (2010). 'Race and policing in different ecological contexts', in Rice, S. and White, M. (eds), *Race, Ethnicity and Policing*, New York: New York University Press, 118–39.

Weitzer, R. (2014). 'The puzzling neglect of Hispanic Americans in research on police–citizen relations', *Ethnic & Racial Studies*, 37: 1995–2013.

Weitzer, R. and Tuch, S. (2006). *Race and Policing in America: Conflict and Reform*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Worden, R. and McLean, S. (2016). 'Measuring, managing, and enhancing procedural justice in policing: promise and pitfalls', *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, advance online publication, doi: 10.1177/0887403416662505.

Wortley, S. and Owusu-Bempah, A. (2009). 'Unequal before the law: immigrant and racial minority perceptions of the Canadian criminal justice system', *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 10: 447–73.

Wu, Y., Sun, I., and Triplett, R. (2009). 'Race, class or neighborhood context: which matters more in measuring satisfaction with police?', *Justice Quarterly*, 26: 125–56.

You, J.-S. (2012). 'Social trust: fairness matters more than homogeneity', *Political Psychology*, 33: 701–21.