

Chapter 2

Getting a Little More PJ in Your Day

Introduction

In Chap. 1, we demonstrated how important it is that the public believe that the police are legitimate, and we identified procedural justice (PJ) as the key antecedent of legitimacy. So, how can police improve public perceptions of legitimacy in their day-to-day activities? How do police get a little more PJ in their day? What types of police tactics and interventions lend themselves to the “doing” of PJ? Clearly, many different types of police tactics, interventions, and approaches could incorporate elements of PJ and could improve public perceptions of legitimacy, but what exactly might comprise PJ-enhancing strategies and interventions?

In the current chapter, we draw on an extensive collection of studies that were part of a systematic search (see Bennett et al. 2009) and review (see Mazerolle et al. 2013b) that described evaluations of interventions designed to build police legitimacy. In our reading of this literature, we identified a range of different policing interventions that have incorporated PJ and/or sought to improve legitimacy. We focus on ways that police might incorporate PJ into their day-to-day routine.

We begin by summarizing how we collected the police studies and then discuss how we categorized the interventions into four broad groups according to the typology put forth by Weisburd and Eck (2004). For each of the broad policing categories (community policing, problem-oriented policing, hot-spots policing, and the standard model of policing), we describe how these policing approaches can enhance legitimacy and how including and/or emphasizing elements of PJ can best achieve this goal.

Gathering the Studies

The systematic search (Bennett et al. 2009) and review (Mazerolle et al. 2013b) gathered studies from all over the world that explored and evaluated police-led interventions to enhance citizen perceptions of police legitimacy. Published and unpublished studies up until 2009 (an updated search and review is in the works) were

identified using six electronic databases (CSA, Informat, Ingenta Connect, Ovid, Proquest, and Web of Knowledge), two library catalogs (National Police Library and the Cambridge University Library and dependent libraries), reference lists of eligible studies, as well as the biographies and publication lists of authors influential in the field of PJ and legitimacy. Search keywords focused on terms relating to police legitimacy, PJ, and police effectiveness and resulted in over 20,000 relevant abstracts (see Bennett et al. 2009). Screening of these documents identified 963 unique studies incorporating police legitimacy and/or the elements of PJ policing including dignity and respect, trustworthy motives, neutrality, and citizen participation (i.e., voice). Of the 963 studies identified in the search, 163 contained empirical evaluations of police-led interventions (see Mazerolle et al. (2013b) for a complete list of studies).

In this chapter, we draw on studies identified through the systematic search that sought to improve police legitimacy, or interventions that included an element of PJ as a component of the outcome or intervention. Collectively, these studies help to illustrate the variety of ways that police might improve legitimacy, with a specific focus on how police might incorporate PJ into many different types of day-to-day policing strategies.

We have used Weisburd and Eck's (2004) four broad categories of policing intervention approaches to group the policing studies described in this chapter. These categories vary mostly in their focus and content (e.g., mostly law enforcement versus interventions using a variety of crime control partners). *Community policing* includes interventions that rely on strong police–community partnerships (including restorative justice (RJ) and school-based interventions) that utilize a diverse range of approaches to deal with a broad spectrum of crime problems. In contrast to community policing, *problem-oriented policing (POP)* interventions are highly focused on *specific* problems or people and involve police partnerships with other entities to reduce crime and disorder. *Hot-spots policing* involves law-enforcement-focused strategies (in contrast to POP, which involves a broader range of problem-solving approaches) aimed at problem people and/or places. Finally, the *standard model of policing* includes generalized, law enforcement responses without a focus on specific problem people or places. Using the four Weisburd–Eck categories to describe a range of police-led interventions, we highlight how police-led interventions can embrace PJ as part of the approach, infusing some of those “key ingredients” of PJ into their activities and show that there are many ways for police to get more PJ in their day, even within the existing range of police interventions.

Community Policing

Community policing strategies are naturally and easily oriented to incorporate the principles of PJ, offering an ideal vehicle for utilizing the principles of PJ to enhance police legitimacy in the community. The PJ elements of citizen voice (i.e., participation) and demonstrating trustworthy motives are particularly easily adapted to com-

munity policing interventions. Community policing involves the “coproduction” of community safety and the development of working relationships with the community (Greene 2000, p. 311). While community policing includes a broad range of principles and practices (Mastrofski 2006; and see the COPS website—www.cops.usdoj.gov—for improved tools to measure community policing components), there are commonalities across community policing approaches. These include police working in closer contact with communities, engaging in problem-solving activities, and mobilizing community residents to get involved in community regulation (Bayley 1994; Corder 1998; Kelling and Moore 1988; Myhill 2006; Skogan 2006). This section of the chapter presents “general” models of community policing, “restorative justice” processes, and “school-based policing” to demonstrate the variety of programs and strategies that encompass community policing approaches for getting more PJ in your day.

General Models of Community Policing

The foundational elements of community policing are expected to enhance legitimacy outcomes, such as trust, satisfaction with police, and citizen cooperation. Table 2.1 presents a summary of general community policing studies identified through our research (e.g., see Mazerolle et al. 2013b) and we discuss each of these strategies below.

Weed and Seed: The Weed and Seed approach involves increasing police–community interactions to control violent and drug crime, and to respond to local community problems in targeted high-crime neighborhoods (Dunworth and Mills 1999a). The name of this approach is derived from an explicit goal to “weed” out offenders and disorder and “seed” initiatives to improve community capacity. Weed and Seed readily activates PJ elements, such as *trustworthy motives*, *dignity and respect*, and *citizen participation* when police “establish mutual trust between law enforcement and the public,” “enlist the community’s help in identifying patterns of criminal activity,” and “enable residents in the target area to improve their community morale” (Dunworth and Mills 1999a, b, c, pp. 1–2). Weed and Seed programs also provide police with opportunities to participate in community events, such as school activities, which allow police informal settings to communicate with the public and enhance trust (see Dunworth and Mills 1999a, b, c). While all Weed and Seed operations do not automatically implement the four principles of PJ, they can provide a useful vehicle for police to communicate PJ to citizens.

Neighborhood Watch: Neighborhood watch programs enable citizens to play a pivotal role in local crime management and emergency preparedness. A group of citizens within a defined neighborhood work in partnership with police. While the specific activities may vary, citizens generally volunteer to assist with monitoring and report suspicious events to police, and police provide information about crime in the community and crime-prevention techniques. Neighborhood watch and similar community-based interventions offer police ideal opportunities to interact

Table 2.1 Community policing

Intervention name	Description of approaches
Weed and seed	Targeted policing in particular geographical locations to “weed” out offenders and disorder, and “seed” areas with explicit initiatives to strengthen community capacity
Neighborhood watch	Police–community partnership to discuss crime trends and prevention
Reassurance policing	Implementation of local schemes to ease fear of crime and rationalize perceptions of risk and safety Increase police presence, community involvement, and targeted policing initiatives
Beat policing	Dedicated police officer to certain geographical location to increase police–community relations Small police stations positioned in residential areas or shopping centers
Dedicated police teams	Police teams dedicated to crime detection and prevention in specific locations
Increased visibility	Increase police visibility and enhance approachability from public
Citizen contact patrols	Police officers offer crime-prevention programs Disseminate informative crime-prevention brochures to the public
Interagency collaboration	Police responsibility for follow-up on domestic violence calls increased communication and enhanced propensity to report crime Communication among relevant services and agencies to increase intelligence sharing and crime reduction Improved communication among police and the community to reduce prevalence of crime Prostitutes encouraged to report violent clients to outreach services that inform the police and other prostitutes

with residents and obtain their views about community problems and community safety. During community meetings, police can demonstrate that they are fair and equitable by explaining their reasons behind crime control and prevention priorities. Police can also encourage citizens to participate and “have voice” (in PJ terms), by making time during meetings for citizens to express their views. In addition, community forums provide police with a great opportunity to market police successes and strategies used to prevent/reduce crime, demonstrating that they are trustworthy representatives of the community and that they care about community problems (Jackson and Bradford 2009).

Reassurance Policing: Reassurance policing strategies involve the police working in collaboration with the community to specifically respond to community priorities and neighborhood problems. This policing approach gives community members the ability to voice their concerns and enables police to prioritize their response in order to maximize public satisfaction (Tuffin et al. 2006) and community safety (Singer 2004). When the public perceive that the police are listening *and* actively responding to their concerns, they are reassured that police are acting legitimately (Singer

2004). Reassurance policing is therefore a useful avenue to explore when police are seeking to improve police legitimacy and to incorporate the principles of PJ into their interactions with the public.

Beat Policing: Beat policing is a well-known community policing strategy. However, the traditional “bobby on the beat” role has expanded significantly in recent years. Officers who are responsible for a defined area or beat are expected to go beyond just foot patrols. Today, beat policing involves dedicated officers who liaise with local organizations to improve community areas, identify and respond to community problems, and attend community meetings. Bond and Gow’s (1997) study of the beat policing program in Toowoomba, Qld, Australia, for example, assigned police officers to particular beats. These officers were wholly responsible for area foot patrols, answering calls for service, and solving problems within their beat so as to develop a positive rapport with local residents. Beat policing provides an opportunity for dedicated officers to get more PJ in their day when they provide citizens with opportunities to discuss and respond to concerns, and these officers are neutral in their decision making and promote solutions in these everyday encounters.

Dedicated Police Teams: Dedicated police teams aim to develop, cultivate, and deepen key relationships with community stakeholders around a dedicated area and/or problem (e.g., problematic housing estate). Dedicated teams are not normally redirected to other work and therefore provide the community with continuity when the same police rotate on and off shifts in the same geographic areas. In a study conducted in West Yorkshire, Brownlee and Walker (1998) found that the dedicated police teams established wide-ranging networks with individuals and groups within schools, neighborhood watches, and community forums and were able to foster community cooperation because of the time police spent with key individuals/groups in engaging ways (e.g., litter clear-ups, community sporting events). Dedicated teams can encourage citizen participation and further optimize PJ when they foster trustworthy relationships within the community.

Increased Visibility: Our review identified PJ ingredients in a range of approaches aimed at increasing police visibility, such as foot patrols (Holmberg 2005; Pate and Annan 1989), mini police stations (Moon et al. 2005), and police shop fronts (Taylor and Charlton 2005). We have included the increased visibility studies under the banner of “community policing” (rather than the standard model of policing), because in these studies the police engaged in activities that made them more accessible to the public and used PJ elements as part of this process. For example, in 1992, the Queensland Police Service implemented a shop front program which resulted in 49 small police offices in shopping centers and central business districts in Queensland (Taylor and Charlton 2005). Shop front police beat officers built relationships with retailers when they listened to their concerns, provided retailers with valuable information about crime and safety tips, encouraged them to report crime, and were accessible when retailers did need to report crime (Taylor and Charlton 2005). The authors unsurprisingly found that retailers who had a police shop front were significantly more likely to report crime than retailers who did not. Police can

maximize the benefits of such encounters by making sure that all such encounters are packed with PJ.

Citizen Contact Patrols: The citizen contact patrol strategies involve developing and maintaining contact with residents and informing them of crime-prevention techniques. T. Bennett (1990) found that consistent police contact with residents—including door-knocking, a persistent policing presence in the community, and identifying and responding to citizen concerns—fostered greater trust in police. Beedle (1984) found that a citizen contact patrol initiative (police provided information on burglary prevention and detection techniques) yielded similar results. Citizen contact patrols provide opportunities for police to get more PJ into their encounters, particularly around eliciting citizen participation (i.e., giving citizens “voice”) in setting priorities and developing solutions to neighborhood crime problems.

Interagency Collaboration: Interagency collaboration represents another opportunity for police to include more PJ within the community policing context. Interagency collaboration refers to interventions where police actively use formal arrangements with other organizations to address a wide array of crime problems and/or to improve service delivery. When there is a high degree of common purpose, collaborative relationships between police and other organizations can greatly assist in increasing or improving the effectiveness of a jointly supported or undertaken enterprise.

When police portray trustworthy motives and actively involve and engage other organizations in deciding how to solve problems, it allows them to collaborate effectively with a range of organizations and groups when tackling numerous policing problems. In addition, police can maximize the benefits and/or responses to specific problems by including relevant agencies with specialty skills. For example, Davis and Taylor (1997) explored an interagency response to repeat domestic violence victims. Police enlisted the support of social workers and education for follow-up appointments with victims and their perpetrators (if present). A dialog between victims and specialists provided an opportunity for participants to learn about the legal, personal, and social nature of domestic violence and receive referrals or on-the-spot counseling where required. This joint response increased participants’ confidence in the ability of *police* to handle domestic violence *even though* the police were not responsible for the delivery of the whole intervention (e.g., social workers conducted the counseling and/or referrals).

Overall, interagency collaboration provides an important avenue for police to foster legitimacy. While police could arguably engage in these strategies in a transactional way, these strategies point to opportunities for police to incorporate PJ into their interactions not only with citizens, but also with organizations. Police can also improve performance by showing leadership and problem-solving skills. As Matthews (1993) suggests: strong and coordinated collaboration is dependent on shared priorities and commitments, resources, responsibility and accountability, as well as formalized protocols that can be maintained when shifts in leadership occur.

Restorative Justice Processes

Restorative processes are being increasingly incorporated within courts (e.g., diversion), police stations (e.g., cautions), prisons (e.g., adjudications), and schools (e.g., bullying interventions) to reduce, resolve, or prevent harmful behavior from occurring (Sherman and Strang 2007; Wenzel et al. 2008). While there are many different approaches that use restorative processes—such as mediation, family group conferences, RJ conferences, and court-ordered restitution—the underlying aim is to empower parties with a stake in a specific problem to collectively resolve how the problem should be dealt with (see Marshall 1999). As such, they are an example of community policing. RJ processes linked to policing generally include:

1. A respectful process that involves deliberative dialog assisted by a neutral facilitator/convenor
2. Disapproval of the offending and/or noncompliant behavior
3. An understanding and acknowledgment of how people have been affected
4. A plan put in place that allows affected parties to move forward
5. The capacity to follow-through to escalate regulatory intervention in the face of continuing noncompliance (in some RJ approaches)

PJ ingredients (neutrality, voice, dignity and respect, and trustworthy motives) are foundational within each of these RJ components. Consequently, it is not surprising that RJ approaches share with PJ the goal of developing informal and formal *legal procedures* that strengthen the influence of social values on law-abiding behavior. When dealing with people who have broken social rules, the aim of RJ "...should be to seek ways to heighten the future motivations that those people have to engage psychologically and behaviorally in society" (Tyler 2006a, p. 315). Tyler (2006a, p. 315) argues, therefore, that this engagement "...includes developing or becoming more committed to social values that promote self-regulation, and consequently adhering more closely to laws and social regulations in the future." RJ aims to facilitate and enhance self-regulatory actions by encouraging feelings of remorse in the offender, along with an acceptance of responsibility for actions and a connectedness to family, friends, and community. The idea is that this commitment, in turn, works against future transgressions of the law (Braithwaite 2002).

When people develop greater feelings of responsibility to others in the community, they become more motivated to either follow their moral principles or obey social authorities or institutions. Some evidence also suggests that RJ conferences build internal motivation to defer to authority in the future (Tyler 2006a). RJ processes often involve third parties, such as regulatory agencies and other services (see Mazerolle and Ransley 2005). These agencies and services help provide the participants with an understanding of the legal consequences of the issue at hand and offer direct access to a range of support services and resources.

Most evaluations of RJ report face-to-face meetings between affected parties, supporters, and support agencies. Although conferences can be convened by a civilian, when police endorse, facilitate, and/or support RJ, improved perceptions of

Table 2.2 Restorative processes

Intervention name	Description of approaches
Restorative cautioning	Use of RJ-based script for police to use to caution offenders and promote deterrence
Restorative justice conferencing	Police facilitation of family conference meeting to aid interaction between juvenile offender and their family to discuss implications of harm caused and appropriate reparations
Police-led mediation	Police assist in mediation process to aid dispute resolution processes

police legitimacy can result. Police also have direct power to enforce the outcomes of the conference (Moore and O'Connell 1994).

Our systematic review identified restorative processes which incorporated at least one of the PJ principles and evaluated the impact of the intervention on legitimacy outcomes, such as citizens' confidence in police, satisfaction with police, and perceptions about PJ (see also Chap. 3). Table 2.2 presents a summary of these processes (see Mazerolle et al. 2013b), which include restorative cautioning, police facilitated conferences, and police-led mediation. We discuss each of these interventions below.

Restorative Cautioning: Restorative cautioning uses a structured PJ dialog during a formal police disposal. Hoyle et al. (2002) found that police facilitated interactions to address the offense and its consequences in a neutral and respectful manner. This involved police using a script that emphasized neutrality throughout the process and stressed the importance of giving each individual voice at each stage of the encounter with the offender.

Restorative Conferencing: The studies that described the PJ elements of restorative conferencing (see McCold 2003; McCold and Wachtel 1998; Shapland et al. 2008; Sherman et al. 1998) found that the key way police used PJ was by facilitating impartial discussion (Shapland et al. 2006; Sherman et al. 1998) and voluntary participation (McCold 2003), ensuring that respect was given to all parties when discussing the harms caused by offenses (Shapland et al. 2008) and reaching an agreement that enhanced both victim and offender satisfaction (McCold and Wachtel 1998).

Police-Led Mediation: In police-led mediation, police act as a third party, resolving disputes between victims and offenders. Officers are trained in mediation (Volpe and Phillips 2003) and subsequently ensure that each party maintains mutual respect and participates voluntarily in the resolution process. If police act as a neutral third party in such encounters, one would expect that perceptions of PJ and police legitimacy would improve.

Table 2.3 School-based policing

Intervention name	Description of approaches
Informal contact	Integration of police officers into school-based activities to enhance communication and trust in police
Gang resistance education and training	School-based program led by police officers to educate and inform students against gang formation and criminality
Truant recovery program	Cooperative intervention by police and school personnel to reduce incidence of truancy and increase identification of at-risk students
School resource officers	Dedicated police officers provide services including counseling and crime-prevention information and education to reduce onset of criminality

School-Based Policing

We present the school-based policing interventions identified in our review under the broad umbrella of “community policing.” School-based officers are typically embedded within schools in order to promote positive relationships between the police and the school community and to encourage a safe learning environment. These types of initiatives allow officers to take part in the day-to-day activities of the school (Dogutas 2007; Murray 2003), or they may involve more short-term programs where police officers visit schools either for targeted talks (Sellers et al. 1998) or to deliver certain programs (e.g., to combat truancy, see White et al. 2001). School-based policing initiatives allow the school-based police officers to interact with students and teachers, counsel students at risk of offending, and educate students on the law and the role of police in society. Some officers get involved in a variety of activities within the school, including helping teachers to develop curricula on law and police duties, engaging in partnerships with other agencies regarding youth welfare, and providing advice regarding personal safety and crime prevention. They are also able to attend to police-related matters within the school community.

The school-based community policing strategies in our pool of eligible studies include informal contact, gang resistance education, truancy programs, and school resource officers. All school-based interventions aimed to enhance students’ trust and confidence in police through the implementation of a range of informal integrative initiatives and educational training sessions to aid interaction and mutual cooperation. Table 2.3 presents a summary of the approaches, each of which we discuss below.

Informal Contact: Informal contact studies promote informal interactions between police and schoolchildren in nonconfrontational situations. In her study, for example, Hinds (2009) describes that police used PJ by being fair and neutral in all interactions with adolescents and had a clear intent to enhance young people’s

perceptions of police (Hinds 2009). Informal contact is one way that police can engage in positive interactions with school children and incorporate PJ principles.

Gang Resistance Education: Gang resistance approaches involve police visiting schools and giving talks on conflict resolution and ways that young people can resist gang recruitment (Sellers et al. 1998; Winfree et al. 1999). The key aim of these programs is to convey factual information in a nonjudgmental (e.g., neutral decision making) and professional manner with nonpersonal examples (dignity and respect), provide information and alternatives to gang involvement (trustworthy motives), and engage people in discussion (citizen participation). When PJ ingredients are activated, these programs provide an opportunity for young people to perceive the police as legitimate.

Truancy Programs: Truancy reduction approaches involve police facilitating discussions between the truanting child, his or her parent, teachers, and other relevant services. In a study evaluated by White and colleagues (2001), the police allowed the child to voluntarily voice his or her issues and provided a forum for all parties to develop a deeper, more nuanced understanding of the factors contributing to the child's truancy. By allowing children to have a voice (one element of PJ) in these types of interactions, police have the potential to improve perceptions of police legitimacy.

School Resource Officers: PJ in this context is integrated into education and counseling programs by school resource officers (Dogutas 2007; Murray 2003). The role of school-based resource officers (see evaluations by Dogutas 2007 and Murray 2003) is to develop rapport with students, treat students with respect, and promote trustworthy motives by representing themselves as people students can confide in and approach if or when they were experiencing difficulties in their lives (Murray 2003). Again, creating a positive forum for police–citizen interactions is conducive to the implementation of PJ principles.

Problem-Oriented Policing

Like community policing, problem-oriented policing (POP) requires police to look beyond traditional policing strategies and develop a wide array of solutions to problems. In contrast to community policing, POP interventions are highly focused, either on problem places or on problem people. POP is also distinguished from the standard model and hot-spots policing through its use of a “diversity of approaches” (Weisburd and Eck 2004, p. 45). Herman Goldstein originally conceptualized POP in the late 1970s in order to address the focus in police agencies on responding to crime incidents (Goldstein 1990). Rather than simply reacting to violations of the law, POP shifts “the prime focus of the police away from incidents toward identifying, understanding, and solving problems” (Reisig 2010, p. 2). The process of solving problems involves police working with citizens and other crime control partners



<http://www.springer.com/978-3-319-04542-9>

Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Policing

Mazerolle, L.; Sargeant, E.; Cherney, A.; Bennett, S.; Murphy, K.; Antrobus, E.; Martin, P.

2014, XI, 81 p. 4 illus., Softcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-04542-9