Increasing Community Involvement in Law Enforcement Through Procedural Justice to Improve Ties with The Community

John Motsamai Modise

1. South African Police Service

Abstract:

This research paper examines how a procedural justice policing approach affects how people perceive their duty to follow police orders. It investigates whether the degree of confidence that a citizen has in law enforcement during a police-citizen encounter may have an impact on how procedural justice functions in relation to their duty to uphold the law. The effectiveness of procedural justice in enticing citizens to uphold the law is examined, as well as the possibility that citizens' trust in the authorities may play a role in this. Numerous studies have examined how procedural justice affects people's attitudes toward and cooperation with the police and other elements of the criminal justice system, but many of these investigations did not break down procedural justice into its different strands, such as police procedural justice. The public's perception of the police will increase if they execute their authority in a procedurally fair manner, according to Tyler's process-based model of policing. In the past, process-based study has largely ignored public trust in the police in favor of focusing on the sources of legitimacy. Tyler's process-based policing model argues that the police can improve the public's view of their legitimacy and dependability by exercising their power in a procedurally fair manner. Up until now, process-based research has mostly disregarded the legitimacy of the police and focused on the sources of legitimacy.

Keywords: public encounters, procedural justice, policing, training, policing, trust, legitimacy, Procedural justice theory, obligation to obey police; Police-citizen encounters.

INTRODUCTION

"Treating people with dignity and respect, giving citizens 'voice' during encounters, being neutral in decision-making, and conveying trustworthy motives" are the four guiding principles of procedural justice. Research shows that these principles help to build relationships between authorities and the community in which the community: 1) has trust and confidence in the police as honest, unbiased, benevolent, and lawful; 2) feels obligated to obey the law and the orders of legal authorities; and 3) believes it shares similar interests and values with the police. An increase in community views of police legitimacy, or the conviction that authorities have the right to impose appropriate behavior, is closely related to procedurally just policing. It is crucial to the growth of good will between police and communities. According to research, people are more likely to follow the law and cooperate with the police when they perceive the power of the police to be legitimate. Establishing and keeping police legitimacy encourages the acceptance of police judgments, correlates with high levels of law compliance, and increases the likelihood that communities and police will work together to fight crime.

Police departments have stressed more and more recently how crucial it is to strengthen police-community ties in order to increase public confidence in the force. This prioritization of activities is supported by centuries of research showing that individuals are more likely to trust, consider as legitimate, and indicate they would obey police when they perceive them as respectful, unbiased, and fair (Donner et al., 2015). Procedural fairness as a result has been dubbed the mythical "silver bullet" for enhancing police-citizen relations, especially between officers and communities of color. Although it has been shown in numerous studies that general perceptions of procedural justice are linked to better police-citizen relations, it is less obvious how pre-existing attitudes affect police relations with minorities based on a specific encounter. Furthermore, less is known about how well police procedural justice works to build confidence with people who might feel discriminated against.

It is crucial to comprehend how minorities view and react to police treatment. Studies have shown that ethnic and racial minorities have a more negative perception of police and are far less likely to trust police than non-minorities (Kahn et al., 2017). To improve minorities' trust and confidence in the police, police departments endeavor to establish procedurally fair practices; yet, this may not be sufficient to alter deeply rooted unfavorable perceptions. Researchers have questioned whether procedural justice applies equally to everyone in the case of people who may believe that police have predetermined biases against them personally or their ethnic or religious group more generally (Madon & Murphy, 2021; Williamson et al., 2022). Multiple researches have found that the positive procedural justice effect on police perceptions is universal across populations (Brown & Reisig, 2019), although other academics have questioned the effect's applicability to all populations.

Although we firmly believe that procedural justice is essential to policing, the findings of Murphy et al. (2020) raise doubts about whether procedural justice will ever be implemented correctly. We argue that it is critical to comprehend the lens through which people view contacts with the police, particularly for those who feel they are a part of a stigmatized group and who likely expect routine bias from police. According to one stigmatized minority group, they had low levels of trust in the police and experienced considerable levels of police discrimination. It becomes sense to believe that many people assume they may encounter unjust police treatment.

CONCEPTUAL FRAME WORK: THE PROCESS-BASED MODEL OF POLICING

This research primarily adheres to the model put forth by Van Craen (2016), who contends that interpersonal confidence is crucial in bridging IPJ and external procedural justice. Even though the relationship between internal and external procedural justice may be reciprocal (i.e., improved external justice may enhance IPJ), Van Craen's model suggests that the connection is most likely to have its roots within the police department because supervisors play a crucial role in influencing officers' operational styles and occupational attitudes, especially in the formative years of their careers.

Police officers' perceptions of process-based justice from organizational supervisors (i.e., IPJ) are connected to their equitable and just stances toward assisting community members (e.g., external procedural justice; (Roberts & Herrington, 2013; Van Craen & Skogan, 2017; Wu et al., 2017). The social learning theory (Bandura, 1971) is typically used to explain this idea of "fair policing from the inside out," with an emphasis on supervisor modeling (Van Craen, 2016). In other words, this framework assumes that police officers will emulate the procedurally right behaviors

of people in positions of authority and high status, such as their immediate superiors, and incorporate the values and rules they have learned into their daily operations.

It is essential to note that there are some significant differences between the decision to trust authorities and their agents in a social context and the decision to trust other members in an organizational setting with regard to the nature and frequency of contacts and interactions. Colleague interaction and information sharing are expected as a regular part of working within a company. A fair process provided in a respectful manner by managers within a police department, who have control over resources, rewards, and disciplinary actions, is likely to win back officers' confidence and strengthen their adherence to institutional rules and policies (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). According to Conchie and Donald (2006), a trusting environment fosters fair exchanges between individuals and their direct supervisors as well as the organization as a whole. This in turn favorably correlates with operational cooperation among organizational members, which can also be interpreted as members' rational choice (Colquitt, et al., 2001; Masterson et al., 2000). Such an understanding of justice within the employing company fosters a kind workplace culture and favorable attitudes toward the business (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

In the context of policing, supervisors build up and create a bank of trustworthiness from prior contacts, on which they can rely during future incidents, by engaging in frequent interactions to gain subordinates' recognition of integrity and ability. Organizational commitment and subsequent team success depend on the trust built up through cooperative efforts in the past. Procedural injustice can cause officers worry and emotional exhaustion even though it increases their adherence to organizational rules and suppresses deviant attitudes and behaviors within agencies (Donner, et al., 2015; Wu, et al., 2017). Studies carried out all over the globe have largely confirmed the relationship between internal and external procedural justice. For instance, in the US, IPJ is connected to external procedural justice among Chicago police officers both directly and indirectly (via confidence in citizens) (Van Craen & Skogan, 2017). Through moral alignment with supervisors and citizens, as well as citizen confidence, IPJ in China also serves as a direct or indirect predictor of external procedural justice (Sun, Han, et al., 2019). A second study discovered that Chinese officers' work satisfaction and anger mediate the relationship between perceived internal accountability and external accountability. (Wu et al., 2019). IPJ was favorably correlated with citizen trust in Croatia, but it wasn't a good indicator of external procedural justice (Ivkovic et al., 2019). The study by Haas et al. (2015) on the Argentina police may be the most pertinent to this one. It found that higher levels of IPJ and confidence were associated with higher levels of compliance with managers and rules.

Building untrustworthy relationships within a company could have disastrous effects on both the individual and the organization. An officer's skepticism and vigilance may spark a range of unfavorable behaviors toward the supervisor if he or she sees unfairness while interacting with them. Officers may assume organizational procedural injustice when the perceived unfairness can be attributed to institutionalized procedure.

Relationships that inspire distrust can result in resistance to collaboration and information sharing within a company (Toma & Butera, 2009), as well as personal emotional responses like frustration, anger, and fear. The organization may incur additional expenses as a result of members' subpar work performance and compromised psychological well-being as a result of distrusting relationships (Gurtman, 1992; McKay, 1991). It is important to observe that accepting managers and other authority figures does not always eliminate mistrust. After all, trust serves as a social

relationship's connecting thread between the trustor and the fiduciary (Blau, 1964; Wheatcroft et al., 2012).

According to the procedural justice theory, fairness in the police's use of processes is essential for good police-public interactions (Murphy, 2015; Woo et al., 2018; Solomon, 2019). In fact, the process-based model of policing places more emphasis on how the public and the police engage than on the results of those interactions (Grant & Pryce, 2019; Nix, 2017). The likelihood of receiving positive feedback from the community is higher if the police follow fair protocols when dealing with them (Maguire et al., 2016).

In Australian research that distinguished between procedural justice considerations for youths and adults, Murphy (2015) found that procedural justice was more important for securing cooperation from youths than for adults. This is a significant discovery because, in the Kenyan context, a large portion of the post-election violence discussed further in this article involved young people who felt excluded by the nation's authorities (Klopp & Kamungi, 2008; Roberts, 2009). Therefore, procedural justice provided by judicial authorities, such as the courts and the police, may stop future post-election unrest and bloodshed in Kenya and other regions of the African continent. Procedural justice may be especially essential to those who feel marginalized by society, as Murphy (2015:69) explained.

In conclusion, confidence is the essential component of procedural justice, which turns attention away from the outcomes of reward distributions and toward the distribution process itself. While the public is generally more interested in police officers' competence, dependability, alignment with community priorities, and politeness when dealing with citizens (Stoutland, 2001), going further to look into the procedural justice in the chain of command within law enforcement organizations would be helpful in understanding policing (Van Craen, 2016). While a lack of organizational trust can result in institutional inefficiency, a toxic work environment (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001), and even diffuse externally (Van Craen, 2016; Van Craen, 2016), it can also have serious political repercussions (Tyler, 1990; Wu et al.; 2012).

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

The foundation of procedural justice policing is a knowledge of police-citizen interactions informed by psychology. Procedural justice focuses on how much a person feels they have been treated fairly, given "voice," treated with respect and dignity by authorities, and dealt with impartially during a personal meeting with a representative of authority (Tyler, 2006). The procedural justice literature initially focused on how people's views of the legitimacy of legal authorities were influenced by fair treatments in terms of result as well as the decision-making process, with the simple but fundamental question of why people follow the law in mind (Tyler, 1990). Political confidence resulting from procedurally fair treatment, which has its roots in social psychological studies, can impact the stability of the organizations responsible for enacting or upholding laws (Rohl, 2018). When people believe institutional decisions are just and beneficial for the people, they tend to regard legal authorities as legitimate (Tyler, 2006), and as a result, they feel obligated to obey the authorities (Tyler & Huo, 2002).

Tyler's procedural justice paradigm postulates that (perceived) procedural justice raises public confidence in the police and that the resulting confidence incites helpful public behavior. Tyler (2005: 325, 327, 333) claims that confidence in the police "shapes public cooperation," "increases citizens' deference to the directives of the police," and "motivates compliance with the law" in his

theory on process-based policing. Studies conducted in various nations (Dirikx and Van den Bulck, 2014) and among numerous ethnic groups have also supported this assertion (Jackson et al., 2012; Murphy and Cherney, 2012).

People lose trust in the police when they think they are abusing their power, which makes them less likely to cooperate with the police. (Tyler, 2005: 339). In this process-based policing paradigm, the relationship between compliance and trust is predicated on the notion that people are more likely to comply with and cooperate with the police when they have faith in their intentions which is considered to be the essence of trust (Tyler and Huo, 2002). Stoutland (2001) and Skogan and Frydl are two other academics who have made contributions to the creation and dissemination of the concept of trust-based compliance and collaboration. (2004). According to the former author, "if police sincerely work to build trust…, residents have reasons to become eager for police protection and ready to work with law enforcement". Skogan and Frydl (2004: 291) stressed that if citizens trust the police, they will call them when they need assistance and assist them in identifying offenders in accordance with this.

Although Tyler and his colleagues (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler & Huo, 2002) theorized about the importance of procedural justice in fostering good relations between the police and the public, the policing literature now contains a significant number of studies that connect procedural justice with other components of the process-based model of policing. When police officers handle the general public fairly and with respect, they are more likely to have their cooperation and trust in the police (Pryce, 2016; Pryce, 2018). Citizens are more likely to work with the police and be more satisfied with the police and the criminal justice system if they believe that the actions of legal authorities and agents of social control are legitimate because citizens' behavior and actions are intricately connected to the values, they hold dear and also share with others and with authority figures (Johnson et al., 2014; Tyler et al., 2010). In reality, findings from the literature already in existence have demonstrated that if the police behave in a procedurally fair way, interactions between them and the public would be more successful, increasing public satisfaction with the police (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Mastrofski et al., 1996; Pryce, 2018).

Four elements make up police procedural justice: participation, neutrality, respect and dignity, and trustworthy intentions. When an officer acknowledges a citizen's contribution during a conversational-style interaction, it is considered participation. When an officer interacts with a citizen in a neutral manner, they base their choices on the law rather than their own emotions. When an encounter between an officer and a citizen is positive and the officer sincerely affirms the citizen's personhood, dignity and regard are demonstrated.

A police officer's willingness to help a citizen during an interaction is highlighted by trustworthy motivations. Simple tasks like giving directions and giving advice fall under this category of assistance. The policeman must also show a general concern for the welfare of the individual. Participation and neutrality are the first two elements that come under quality of decision-making, while respect and dignity and reliable motives are the last two (Nix, 2017; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). Citizens' perceptions of police procedural justice also indicate that, in the absence of one or more procedural justice elements, officers may encounter less-than-desirable levels of citizen collaboration and compliance. Police procedural justice is typically operationalized as the quality of decision-making and the quality of treatment, despite the fact that this four-part conceptual structure of police procedural justice is a mainstay in the current criminological literature (Pryce, 2019; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003).

Although fewer studies have examined the relative effects of these two procedural justice components on legitimacy and willingness to cooperate with the police, the majority of studies have combined these two aspects of procedural justice into a single independent variable in regression analyses (Nix, 2017; Pryce et al., 2017; Tyler et al., 2010). Last but not least, the significance of procedural justice in enhancing the relationship between the police and the public has been amply recorded, whether in cross-sectional or experimental studies. Thus, this study contributes to the growing body of work on procedural justice (Grant & Pryce, 2019).

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND POLICING IN PRACTICE

When police are impartial, treat people with respect, exhibit fairness and trustworthy motives, and give people a chance to express their concerns to officers before decisions are made, these behaviors are typically regarded as being procedurally just (Tyler, 1990). Most scholars believe that procedural justice effects are always favorable or "invariant" across people, groups, and contexts based on study findings in the literature (Wolfe et al., 2016).

The treatment of people when they deal with authorities like the police is addressed by the theory of procedural justice (Tyler, 1990). People's perceptions of fairness and reasonableness in the way they are treated will determine whether they view the police as genuine (Nivette, Eisner, and Ribeaud 2020). Additionally, treatment can be personally experienced by people or learned about through the experiences of others, which can contribute to generalized ideas about the law and those who uphold it (Tyler, 2003). Tyler identifies the following as the main characteristics of fairness in interactions with the authorities and in the results:

- Voice – the chance to give their side of the story;
- Respect – treatment is polite and dignified;
- Neutrality – decisions are unbiased;
- Trustworthiness – the police show their interest for the public and community.

Importantly, some research indicates that utilizing these components regularly can help people perceive the legitimacy of the police, even if they have lost interest in them (Madon, Murphy, and Sargeant, 2017). However, it must be acknowledged that procedural justice cannot guarantee the perceptions of legitimacy it offers. According to Bottoms and Tankebe (2012:168), many encounters between the police and others are inherently uncertain, which makes legitimacy "elusive and multi-faceted." The fundamental components of procedural justice are all open to various readings and reactions. For instance, Camp et al. (2021) study of body camera recordings of police interactions with American citizens took tone of speech into account. They discovered that police officers spoke to white males in a more cordial manner than they spoke to black men, whose tone eroded confidence in the force.

Working with procedural justice can be challenging, despite the fact that police officers frequently engage in interactions that bear threat and danger. Procedural justice can still guide how such encounters are policed even if police officers are forced to use physical force in the face of difficulty (Worden and McLean, 2017a). Different views and interpretations of how procedural justice is working against the acknowledgment of legitimacy may exist, and the social and historical context of any interactions may have an impact (Worden and McLean, 2017b). For instance, during the Covid pandemic, the police's use of PPE, such as face masks and medical gloves, impacted people's views of procedural justice (Sandrin and Simpson, 2022). Police forces were required to guarantee compliance with measures during the pandemic years, which began

in 2020 and coincided with the passing of legislation to protect public safety in nations like the UK. This posed a challenge to the police in terms of legitimacy views, necessitating the adoption of a procedurally just strategy (Farrow, 2020).

Predictive analytics, which bases specific crimes and/or an individual's criminality on data sets that create algorithms, will have a greater impact on how police interact with the public (Baraniuk, 2018). There is concern that algorithms could learn to continue to target minority communities because such data sets may contain historical seeds that support stereotypes and activities that target particular groups (Brantingham, Valasik, and Mohler, 2018). According to Nagtegaal (2021), perceptions of procedural justice are more favorable for simpler practices in situations where police practices are decided by algorithms. However, an excessive reliance on predictions at the cost of comprehending the complex and dynamic factors at play can have a negative impact on how procedural justice is perceived (Babuta, 2017).

Integrating Procedural Justice with Trust

According to procedural justice theory, citizens value both equitable procedure and fair treatment when assessing their interactions with the police. To do this, citizens must have a chance to express their concerns (have a voice), be treated fairly and respectfully (have respect believe that an officer's choice was based on the available information have neutrality, and have faith in the police should behave ethically (Tyler, 2006). According to research, both general populations and minority groups trust the police more if they believe they are acting fairly and impartially (Donner et al., 2015; Maguire et al., 2017; Tyler, 2005). A theory of enhancing citizens' confidence in government, according to Yang (2005: 273), "is incomplete without an explanation of administrators' trust in citizens because trust is mutual and reciprocal." This is in line with Kääriäinen and Sirén's (2012) assertion that "mutual trust" is a prerequisite for successful police-public relations efforts: Higher levels of civilian confidence in police are associated with perceptions of police as more procedurally just (Murphy et al., 2020).

However, it appears that both stigmatized and unstigmatized people are affected differently by procedural justice. According to a study by Madon and Murphy (2021) on Australian Muslims, those Muslims who believed that the police were less biased toward their culture had a stronger sense of procedural fairness. Procedural justice had a weaker correlation with police confidence in people who believed that officers were biased against them. These results imply that when taking into consideration people's preexisting attitudes and beliefs about police, procedural justice effects may differ. Furthermore, research has shown that certain community members are less inclined to trust or willingly aid police in the future if they believe that police are biased or operate in an unfair manner. Murphy et al., 2020; Madon & Murphy, 2021; Cherney & Murphy, 2016). This is consistent with more thorough research that demonstrates a relationship between perceptions of police bias or discrimination and lower levels of trust in the police across various minorities (Van Craen & Skogan, 2015; Kearns et al., 2020).

The fact that the aforementioned studies depend on data from cross-sectional surveys to make inferences about the connection between procedural justice and public confidence in the police, however, is a significant flaw in their methodology. Although the methodology of these research has contributed greatly to the body of knowledge, it naturally limits the conclusions that can be made about the influence of police treatment on public perceptions of police (Johnson et al., 2017). Furthermore, a large portion of the literature currently in print explores how people around the world view whether or not police procedures are usually just. Few studies have looked at how

trust is affected by procedural justice or injustice during a particular police-citizen encounter. Therefore, it is less obvious to what degree procedurally fair or unfair treatment affects minorities' trust in the police. Also unexplored is whether pre-existing stigmatization emotions influence how procedural justice affects public confidence in law enforcement. Experimental methodology is necessary to more fully comprehend which get beyond the limits of the existing research, these variables are causally related to one another in police-citizen interactions.

A theory of enhancing citizens' confidence in government, according to Yang (2005: 273), is incomplete without an explanation of administrators' trust in citizens because trust is reciprocal and mutual. According to this, but concentrating specifically on the area of public safety, Kääriäinen and Sirén (2012) claimed that "mutual trust" is necessary for productive collaboration between the police and the public: police agents' and citizens' confidence in one another. They were shocked to learn that "policing research has focused only on the first part of this equation." Despite the fact that (Kääriäinen and Sirén, 2012: 277) have emphasized police officers' procedural justice as a crucial element for boosting the public's confidence in the police, the issue of how trustworthy police behavior can be achieved has not been fully addressed. Although this connection has only been hypothesized (for some exceptions), some authors (Schafer, 2013; Tankebe, 2011; Tyler, 2011) have proposed that it may be related to the effectiveness of interaction and communication within police organizations.

The officers' confidence in their superiors is the second related gap. According to a well-known theoretical piece by Bottoms and Tankebe (2012), police research should pay much more attention to the interaction between junior and senior power holders. My examination of the confidence literature supports their claims. Officers' confidence in supervisors has been the subject of few empirical studies (De Angelis and Kupchik, 2009; Wheatcroft et al., 2012), and there are also few theoretical reflections on this subject (Roberts and Herrington, 2013; Schafer, 2013).

INTERACTIONS BETWEEN POLICE AND CITIZENS AND PROCEDURE JUSTICE

The impacts of procedural justice on crucial outcomes including cooperation, the obligation to obey the law, police legitimacy, and public confidence in the police have been studied using experimental methodologies (e.g., Maguire et al., 2017). Randomized controlled field trials were first employed in study to examine how changing a police practice affected the public's perception of police (MacQueen & Bradford, 2015). Although these trials have a lot of methodological advantages, they cannot persuade police to apply an unfavorable or unfair procedural rule (Maguire et al., 2017). It would be unethical for police departments to instruct their officers to abuse people in order to research the effects of such treatment. However, by changing both the fair and unjust treatment of residents by police, experimental vignette designs that examine a wider range of police-citizen interactions and their impacts have been employed (Brown & Reisig, 2019).

A dearth of research has explored the impact of procedural justice—or lack thereof—on public confidence in law enforcement, despite the increasing use of experimental procedures to evaluate both procedurally just and unjust treatment. Maguire et al. (2017) investigated the impact of witnessing positive, negative, and neutral police treatment of citizens during traffic stops on participants' duty to obey police orders, willingness to cooperate with police, and trust in police using a randomized video vignette design with college students in the USA. The study's findings showed that seeing a film that was entirely devoted to law enforcement operations enhanced

each of the three final factors. In contrast, procedurally unfair police actions had a negative effect on participants' evaluations of all three outcome variables.

The impact of procedural justice and fairness on important outcomes for racial and ethnic minorities has not been well studied in many experiments. Furthermore, nothing is known about how minority group members' faith in the police is impacted by their opinions of procedural justice or injustice during a police interaction with a citizen. Johnson et al. (2017) state that because minorities are frequently the targets of disproportionate enforcement, it is crucial to take into account how they react to various police-citizen encounters. Johnson et al. (2017) used a randomly generated traffic stop video vignette with a sample of college students, altering the driver's race and the police officer's reaction to it to be either positive, negative, or neutral (Black or White).

According to research by Johnson et al. (2017), watching a video in which police handled the driver in a procedural manner. Manner had a significant, positive impact on participants' faith and confidence in the police. The authors did, however, find that there is an uneven association between perceptions of police unfairness and sentiments toward the force, with procedurally unfair treatment having a stronger influence than procedurally just treatment. Black respondents had a higher negative assessment of the police in regard to all three scenarios involving police treatment, despite the fact that the race of the vignette's driver had no influence on their opinion. Lastly, an increasing body of experimental research on procedural justice has made an effort to deepen our understanding of the causal links between police behavior and public opinion of the force. Only a small number of studies have examined the effects of both fair and unfair police conduct on the public's trust in law enforcement; one such study focused specifically on the treatment of ethnic minorities by the police. In 2017, Johnson et al. In an attempt to lessen these disparities, the new study also looks at how minority members' perceptions of stigma impact their confidence.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE TRUST AND COMPLIANCE

Procedural justice is the study of observed fairness in decision-making processes and how people are treated by decision-makers (i.e., an authority). Four factors are frequently used to describe procedural justice as well as voice, objectivity, respect, and dependability (Tyler and Murphy 2011). The first two, which deal with decision-making processes and incorporate voices, also deal with fairness; the second two, which deal with how people are treated by authorities, do so. During interactions with institutions of authority, people appreciate the chance to explain their situation or give their point of view. When given a "voice" (Tyler and Murphy 2011), people report feeling more satisfied with interactions because they perceive individuals in positions of control have made thoughtful decisions. Evidence that the authority they are working with is impartial is also welcomed by people. Making choices based on the facts of the case, rather than an officer's biases or personal opinions, is known as being neutral (Tyler 1990).

Additionally, it involves guaranteeing consistency and equality of treatment for all groups. According to Tyler (1990), people are highly receptive to cues that authority view them with respect and dignity. Because they feel they have a right to be treated with respect and decency, people react extremely negatively to displays of rudeness and demeaning interpersonal treatment. Last but not least, individuals look for indications that indicate the objectives and character of the legal authority they are working with (i.e., their credibility). People react

favorably to authorities when they believe they are nice and compassionate and are sincerely attempting to do what is best for the people they are working with (Tyler and Murphy, 2011).

The tremendous impact that procedural justice has on people's attitudes and behaviour is demonstrated by a large body of research. (Murphy, Hinds, and Fleming, 2008; Hinds and Murphy, 2007). We are aware that, in a number of settings, including policing, procedural justice can have a particular and positive effect on people's faith and confidence in authorities. For instance, procedural fairness promotes trust in law enforcement, according to Tyler and Huo's (2002) research. More so than other instrumental variables, procedural justice was a significant predictor of public confidence in police in their research of 1,656 Californians who had direct interactions with law enforcement.

Tyler (1990) further demonstrates, using survey data from 1,575 Chicago residents, that the quality of the treatment citizens experienced from police was the primary factor determining their trust and confidence in police. Research on procedural justice also demonstrates a connection between confidence in authority and ensuing cooperative behavior. Using survey data from 1,653 New Yorkers of different ethnic backgrounds (Whites, African Americans, and Hispanics), Tyler (2005) demonstrated that trust and confidence in police were a major predictor of the public's willingness to cooperate with police in crime fighting efforts across all ethnic groups studied. When people trusted the police, they were more likely to help them (DeCremer and Tyler 2007; see Scholz and Lubell 1998 for findings in other regulatory contexts). These findings are important because it seems that people's degrees of trust in law enforcement will influence how willing they are to assist and defer to officers in a variety of policing operations. It's crucial to comprehend why people respect the police because, as Tyler (2004) indicates, if people don't generally obey them, the police's ability to maintain order is put in jeopardy.

Despite being abstract, the concept of "trust" is one that is firmly established in experience. Based on their contacts with other individuals and previous experiences with organizations, people develop expectations about how they will be treated in the future (Goldsmith, 2005). If someone has been treated poorly, they are likely to have negative expectations for subsequent interactions, which can breed mistrust in the person or organization they engage with. "To say we trust you means we believe you have the right intentions toward us and that you are competent to do what we trust you to do," said Hardin (2006: 17) in defining trust. Hardin emphasizes both the interpersonal and practical elements of trust in this passage. It's crucial to distinguish between interpersonal and instrumental confidence (Murphy 2004). According to instrumental-based trust, trust is associated with competence and personal views about the likelihood of getting good results from dealing with authorities. For instance, in the context of policing, assessments of public safety may be connected to instrumental-based confidence. The argument in favor of this point of view states that individuals will make an immediate, costly effort, such as obeying the law, in the hopes of gaining some form of future, collective advantage, such as a decrease in crime rates and an increase in public safety.

Receiving these benefits was a positive experience, and this increased faith and confidence in the police, increasing the likelihood that more people would continue to follow the law. This viewpoint contends that if police do their duties effectively, deal with community concerns, and reduce crime, the public will have more faith and confidence in the institution of policing. On the other side, the negative experience of not receiving those advantages from the police would lead to a reduction in both trust and confidence in the police as well as compliance with the law. But

as Jackson and Bradford (2009) pointed out recently, confidence goes beyond simple public perceptions of how well and quickly police carry out their duties to also include a sense that the police are aware of community needs and treat people fairly. Therefore, interpersonal or socially based confidence is faith that is founded on social ties and treating others fairly. People will trust an authority figure's intentions, develop a long-term commitment to accepting its decisions, if people think that the police are striving to be fair, treat individuals with dignity and respect, and genuinely care about the public, they will be more likely to obey its laws (Tyler and Huo, 2002).

It would seem that establishing trust and confidence in the police depends on both how they behave and how the public perceives them. While not negating the influence of police performance in building trust and confidence in police, it has been suggested that interpersonal encounters may actually be more significant for determining a person's trust and confidence in authority. Researchers like Tyler and Huo (2002), Levi 1998, and Folger and Konovsky (1989) assert that the key to fostering trust is to act in a way that the public will regard as ethical.

POLICE LEGITIMACY

Hinds and Murphy (2007: 30) provide evidence that "[...] in contemporary, democratic societies, police legitimacy rests on public consent." In other words, the public is required to follow the police and their commands for them to be legitimate. Furthermore, it is impossible to disregard a person's choice to acknowledge the legitimacy of police authority and the power it possesses. According to Hinsch (in Jackson & Bradford, 2010: 3), moral compatibility between individuals and the criminal justice system should be the focus of the conversation. "If one follows these criteria, then judgements among individuals about the legitimacy of an institution must be based to some extent on assessments of the congruence between its goals, practices, and behaviors and their own," she writes.

According to Jackson (2010), legitimacy is more than just an explanation for power; it also serves as a justification for the power, which is known as "moral alignment" between people and the criminal justice system they use. Because of this, researchers must take into account a normative, ideological, or moral component of legitimacy. It is important to remember that legitimacy is founded on the expression of shared values. Jackson's framework of legitimacy was thus built on the understanding that "an individual confers legitimacy on the justice system when that individual feel: a) an obligation to obey the authority; b) that the authority expresses shared morals; and c) that the justice system follows its own internal rules" (Jackson, 2010: 10–11). People's faith in the legal system is almost inescapably shaped by their experiences; extant research indicates that the public's perceptions of the police are largely shaped by factors beyond their control, but authorities can also use their performance to build or deplete this stock of legitimacy and other attitudes toward them. Citizens' subjective perceptions of procedural fairness are influenced by a number of factors:

- When given the chance citizens are pleased when they "state their version towards the tale" and justify their behavior in front of the officials.
- Community members think governmental choices are supported by facts, they are pleased with.
- When people perceive that they have been treated with dignity and respect, they are more pleased.

- When people believe in the intentions of the authorities, they are more likely to be satisfied. This is especially true when the authorities' justifications for their actions show that they have considered the requirements and concerns of the populace.

The procedural justice paradigm of policing is centered on police legitimacy, or public confidence in and sense of duty to obey the police. Such perspectives are obviously crucial, but they are also crucial because research indicates that they contribute to a number of other desirable outcomes, including adherence to the law, information sharing with the police, collaboration on neighborhood issues, and acceptance of their decisions and directions during interactions with the latter. In accordance with Tom Tyler's based on processes regulation paradigm, trust is influenced by how authorities are perceived to use their authority. As a result, it would seem that trust may be increased by enhancing the procedural justice with which police behave. The National Research Council's Committee to Review Research (2004:291) defined legitimacy as "the judgments that ordinary citizens make about the rightfulness of police conduct and the organizations that employ and supervise them" with regard to the police in particular.

Tyler, though, has emphasized the significance of acknowledging authority as a mark of its legitimacy. Tyler (2004: 87) defined legitimacy for his seminal study of Chicago as "a perceived obligation to obey" as well as "support for legal authorities." Tyler emphasizes the importance of the latter concept, saying that "when people feel that an authority is legitimate, they authorize that authority to determine what their behavior will be in a given set of circumstances."

Nevertheless, latent constructs of support or confidence for the police are distinct from the construct of obligation, according to empirical research examining the characteristics of these legitimacy constructs. Reisig, Bratton, and Gertz (2007) concluded that trust and obligation are separate constructs with only weak relationships to one another during their examination of the construct validity of process-based measures. Underlying these identifiers is a two-dimensional structure that Jacinta Gau (2011) found. Furthermore, Reisig et al. (2007: 1022-23) discovered that while obligation had no effect on either compliance or cooperation, confidence did. As a result, we view obligation and trust as two separate social psychological aspects.

The most popular social psychological theory of legitimacy is Tyler's paradigm of process-based regulation. This concept holds that the supply of procedural justice while using police power to interact therewith the general population is the main antecedent of legitimacy (Tyler, Goff, and MacCoun 2015). The focus of procedural justice is on how rather than whether power is used. Police officers do not have to choose between being equitable and tough; they can be both, according to Schulhofer, Tyler, and Huq in 2011.

Although Tyler's model has been the conceptual cornerstone of social psychology research on police legitimacy, it would be a stretch to say that there is a consensus on what legitimacy is. Justice Tankebe (2013: 2014) states that police legitimacy has four dimensions: lawfulness, procedural justice, distributive fairness, and efficacy. She emphasizes that legitimacy should not be mistaken with either confidence or obligation. James Hawdon (2008) asserts that legitimacy is different from confidence. Ben Bradford and Jonathan Jackson (2009) indicate the fact that a great deal of the studies in the public's views regarding law enforcement depends upon the premise that citizens are drawn to a single outlook about the police that shapes their judgments about various aspects of the police, even though there may be significant differences among trust, confidence, support, satisfaction, and legitimacy. We recognize these warnings but do not

agree with their conclusions. Given these divergent ideas about authenticity and the potential for misinterpretation with organizational legitimacy, we lay the appropriate focus on trust and obligation.

People's opinions of the police are correlated with their subjective experiences with the police in one-on-one conversations, including either free-will interactions when people report crimes or ask for help and compulsory encounters when people are apprehended by police officers. The association demonstrates reciprocal causal relationships: police satisfaction with individual contacts promotes police satisfaction generally, while perceptions of police performance in particular police-citizen encounters are likewise influenced by police attitudes overall (Brandl et al. 1994).

THE INVARIANT EFFECT OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE ON LEGITIMACY

The Relationship Between Procedural Justice and Police Legitimacy Needs to Be Reexamined Procedure justice, defined as the perception of fairness in a specific institution's decision-making and interactions with participants acting on its behalf (Tyler, 1990), has emerged as a leading theory in criminology and legal psychology. There is a large body of research emphasizing a strong and positive relationship between an individual's perceptions of procedural justice, their evaluations of the reliability of criminal justice institutions, such as the police, courts, and tribunals, as well as courts and prisons (Gau et al., 2012; Tyler & Wakslak, 2004), as well as their compliance with law-abiding behavior.

Researchers have discovered that there is a positive correlation between procedural justice and legitimacy in the context of encounters with the police that is significant across nations and demographic subgroups (Bradford et al., 2014a; Sun et al., 2017). Additionally, the empirical data seems to hold true for various meanings of legitimacy. For instance, Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) argued against the validity of measures drawing on the "obligation to obey" with an institution's norms, which prompted other researchers to investigate the "obligation to obey" and "trust" aspects of legitimacy independently (Baker & Gau, 2018; Wolfe et al., 2016). However, other researchers made a distinction between a person's "duty to obey" and their "moral alignment" with a particular organization (Hough et al., 2013; Jackson et al., 2012a; 2012b).

The observed relationship between procedural justice and legitimacy is almost always found to be positive, significant, and strong, at least for the body of research based on cross-sectional data, regardless of the measurement method or sample configuration. This was supported by Walters and Bolger's (2019) meta-analysis, which found that only one of the 64 studies they examined found a negative relationship between procedural justice and legitimacy (Reisig & Mesko, 2009). Most researchers have, more or less explicitly, interpreted these results as evidence of a causal impact of procedural justice on legitimacy, with a few notable exceptions (Murphy, 2005; Walters, 2018). Both intuitive and in line with the theoretical framework, this view. Police legitimacy and procedural justice need to be reevaluated.

It only needs to be understood that the formation of legitimacy beliefs comes before procedural justice and is an independent process that is entirely determined by the actions of agents of a given authority. Making such conclusions from a corpus of research, which is dominated by observational studies, which are most frequently cross-sectional surveys, is challenging (Murphy et al., 2016). This interpretation of the data ignores the fact that views of procedural justice and legitimacy are both subjective reports, and that for cross-sectional designs, their temporal order

cannot be determined. Some of these issues were noted by Nagin and Telep (2017). They came to the conclusion that there hasn't been a convincing case for causality after carefully examining how the procedural justice model has been used in policing studies. They identified third common causes (also known as third variables or confounding factors) and reverse causal paths as two key problems that previous procedural justice research has been unable to ignore. They demanded clearer proof regarding the causal impact of procedural justice as a result.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRUST BETWEEN POLICE COMMUNITIES

The public's perception of the authorities' ability to act justly and efficiently (typically the police and courts) is referred to as confidence. Jackson (2010: 1) stresses the significance of people believing that the police and courts have the authority to regulate and prescribe proper behavior. In general, three viewpoints are used to study police trust: (1) police compliance; (2) police procedural fairness; and (3) police distributive fairness. Citizens' subjective expectations that police will act in certain expected ways, such as with honesty, respect, and effectiveness, are the foundation for citizens' trust in the police. These expectations are the result of both direct and indirect interactions with cops (Jackson & Gau, 2016). Depending on how they or someone they know has been treated in the past, people decide whether or not to trust the police. Hardin (2002) said.

Thus, people's perceptions of the police's treatment of people who are similar to them play a critical role in establishing their level of trust. The police must be trusted by both the public and the officers. If people don't trust the police, they might be less likely to ask for help or collaborate with them freely (Murphy et al., 2014). Police collaboration may suffer from public mistrust, making their job more difficult (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). According to research, think that all Muslims are now viewed by the authorities as "suspects" (Cherney & Murphy, 2016). Numerous Muslims feel stereotyped and stigmatized as a result of the rise in Islamophobia over the past 20 years and the increased police monitoring (Blackwood et al., 2013; Spalek, 2010). However, it is not believed that one side of this mistrust is unjustified because many Muslims also believe that authorities are untrustworthy of them. The fact that many Muslims' reports mistrusting the police in this situation is not surprising (Cherney & Murphy, 2016; Madon & Murphy, 2021). One method to promote more confidence in these settings has been suggested procedural justice theory.

"The nature of trust and confidence needs to be addressed as a separate issue in and of itself if public trust and confidence in the police are not connected to objective performance. What constitutes the foundation for the perception of police legitimacy? We can assess policing policies and practices using a new paradigm if we can understand how public perceptions of police legitimacy evolve (Tyler, 2011: 255). According to Tyler (2011: 258), public perception and sentiments toward the police are significantly influenced by the manner in which and the caliber of a police officer's performance as well as his attitude toward the public during legal proceedings. The police must therefore put into practice strategies that support a community-based strategy that prioritizes public opinion, focusing on how the public perceives the police and the actions of the police.

Tyler (2011: 263) is certain that these societal perceptions influence how people respond to the police. Additionally, because it affects perceptions of and participation in the justice system, public confidence in policing is crucial and required. Furthermore, institutional legitimacy and widespread adherence to the law are significantly impacted by public confidence in the justice system. Jackson, Bradford, Hough, and Murray (2012: 30) define police legitimacy in this manner

and connect it to legal legitimacy, cynicism, and adherence to the law by defining it as "obligation to obey and moral.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE-BASED MODEL OF POLICE ACTION

The application of this collection of research to police practice is not straightforward, though. The comprehensive research on procedural justice and legitimacy serves as the foundation for the procedural justice model of policing that is described by Stephen Schulhofer et al. (2011). They raise an important point: people can still be satisfied with their interactions with police even in cases where the outcomes are negative for them, as long as they believe they were treated fairly. The outcomes, such as whether or not a citizen is ticketed, searched, or even arrested, are not indicative of the subjective experience of those citizens.

As they stress, the implication is that police are not required to choose between "toughness" and "fairness." When officers carry out enforcement actions while mindful of procedural justice, they can be both "tough" and fair: "Instead of attempting to instill fear or project power, officers would aim to treat citizens courteously, briefly explain the reason for a stop, and, absent urgent circumstances, give the citizen an opportunity to explain himself before significant decisions are made" (Schulhofer et al. 2011: 352).

Since no enforcement is not recommended by the procedural justice paradigm. It concerns how police power is used, not whether it is used. When it comes to the forms that procedurally just policing takes on the street and its justification, the procedural justice model is extensive. However, it is rather condensed when it comes to the administrative measures that police agencies should take to put the model into operation. One of these measures is the creation of protocols for procedurally just enforcement (Schulhofer et al. 2011).

... such actions could be made a standard component of every officer's conduct while on duty. Operational policies within each department could formalize the proper actions in relation to street stops, such as the requirement for polite treatment, the duty to inform the citizen of the reason for the stop, and the right to an opportunity to explain the situation. The rules governing police stops might simply be summarized on a card that officers may carry and deliver to those they stop. The rights that must be upheld would be listed on the card, along with the procedures for submitting a complaint against unfair treatment. These rights include the right to an explanation of the grounds for the stop and the right to present one's case before decisions are taken (Schulhofer et al. 2011: 354).

In addition, we would anticipate that police agencies who used this model would set and implement policies governing the proper use of force by their officers in compliance with procedural justice. According to Schuck and Rosenbaum (2011) and Skogan, Van Craen, and Hennessy (2014), they would train their operators in social interactions with citizens. They would keep an eye on the present indications of police performance, such complaints and the use of force, and, realizing the limitations of these metrics, they would give supervisors the task of conducting on-the-spot inspections of the quality of police-citizen interactions. Accountability mechanisms ought to prioritize results over mere output counts. If unit commanders are to be held responsible for results and for putting up sincere attempts to influence those results in ways that are desired, then outputs are significant primarily as the results or byproducts of successful tactics. Compstat's measurement of outcomes is typically limited to criminal activity, which means that significant outcomes that should be the focus of police attention are left out. Mark

Moore outlines several performance factors, or results, that demonstrate the importance of law enforcement. These include:

- Lessen abuse by criminals;
- Bring criminals to justice;
- decrease fear and increase physical safety;
- Ensure protection in public areas;
- Utilize money resources in a fair, effective, and efficient manner;
- Fair, efficient, and successful use of force and authority;
- Fulfill client demands, and gain credibility with those under police scrutiny (Moore 2002: 131–33).

IMPLICATIONS OF "CUSTOMER SATISFACTION"

By employing a customer example, police managers should create a mindset and policing strategy that is more customer-focused. It is conceivable that considering the people with whom law enforcement engages as clients will boost awareness of both what the public expects of the police and the value of interpersonal ties. Police officers would be more approachable with the public if they adhered to the procedures that define procedural justice, such as asking for and taking into account citizen accounts of their interactions with police, acting civilly, and disclosing their actions and motives. According to a study, these procedural elements are significant for people who contact with the authorities. Even though the customer comparison has its limitations, its dimensions' ambiguity encourages or permits officers to interpret it in various ways.

A true customer in a private market transaction is someone who decides to look for a good or service, finds a supplier, calculates the cost, and then participates in a transaction that involves paying the agreed price for the good or service. The price that the consumer is ready to pay for them symbolizes the absolute minimum value that she sets on them. Both parties are freely exchanging goods and services. If the product or service met her expectations in respect to the price she paid for it, it will determine whether she was ultimately satisfied with it. The benefit of the good or service will probably only benefit her and her family, and it won't benefit any other persons not participating in the transaction.

This kind of consumer is comparable, in certain respects, to someone who phones the police to report a loud party or the theft of a bicycle. He asks for a service, such as official acknowledgement and documentation of a crime of which he is the victim or third-party action to cease a situation that he considers to be a disruption. He may decide to forego any help in locating the bicycle or in making an insurance claim, or he could decide to put up with the commotion that the party represents until it stops on its own without his help. It is fully voluntary and on his own initiative that he interacts with the police.

However, this transaction is non-voluntary because the person has no other options in the police market and is often required to contact his municipal or town police force in order to acquire police assistance from any organization. The service is free to him since the community has already paid for it, in addition to any taxes he may pay (which he must pay whether he uses the service or not). As a result, when the service is rendered, he does not pay a set fee for it.

A community member is still a consumer who pays for the officers' availability and presence even if she never asks for assistance from the police with a particular problem. The benefits from the police services for which she pays are shared by the entire community, not just her and her family. These are collective, not individual, services. In another sense, the payment for these services is not voluntary because taxes that support police activities are forced payments.

According to Mark Moore (2002), an officer's ability to provide prompt service to a more urgent situation may be compromised by the time she spends providing high-quality service to one complainant. This is because it's possible that sacrificing offering customers high-quality service might allow police to be ready to respond to emergency calls. In principle, police are not permitted to offer "customers" what they demand when doing so would go against their legal or resource restrictions. Assumed offenders have "obligation encounters" with police, so the police also deal with citizens who come into touch with them (Moore 2002). What kind of assistance is rendered to those who are detained by the police for booking, those who receive traffic tickets, and those who are pulled over for questioning on foot? Given that they may have transgressed moral and/or legal boundaries, to what kind or degree of service are they entitled? At the absolute least, their rights to be protected from arbitrary intrusions into their person and property, to be subject to no more force than what is required to overcome any resistance they may offer, and to be subject to no more force than the minimal standard of service stipulated by the Constitution, must be respected.

We would expect an even better quality of service than that, in the form of treating residents and officers with respect, given its inherent value as well as its potential instrumental usefulness in obtaining compliance and reducing injuries. However, "client" could be a preferable term to use when referring to these persons who employ police services as "customer" is probably overused. Like the beneficiaries of many human services, many persons who deal with police, including those of those who need their assistance, frequently lack knowledge of what they ought to. Some of them can't think clearly because of their mental illness or intoxication. Even if they do not take drugs or have a mental disorder, they may not be qualified to assess the quality of the available service options. This is true of many consumer decisions. A single mother of a rebellious kid who calls the police in a panic may not know what the cops can or should do to assist. If we assume that the consumer is always right, the customer service example will be flawed.

Consequently, there are several reasons why the customer service analogy is flawed: clients, as we will refer to those who receive police services, are typically not voluntary in the sense that they do not have a meaningful range of choice in service providers; some interactions are clearly uninvited; some clients might not be able to make an informed decision; and clients might not have access to crucial information that would enable them to assess the quality of the services they receive. We could also point out that, unlike companies in the private sector, police do not reward repeat customers; nonetheless, they would reward public "loyalty" if it implied support and cooperation from the public. Customer happiness study, which also offers some further insight into the degree of satisfaction that the public has with the police, is consistent with these findings. The first is that "products" are more likely to please customers than "services" are (Fornell et al. 1996). Services are "co-produced" by the provider and the consumer, which means that the provider has less control over the production process and is less likely to standardize it (Anderson, Fornell, and Rust 1997).

BENEFITS OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE FOR THE POLICE

Because it affects outcomes at the individual, team, and organizational levels, the idea of organizational justice is essential. Research indicates that organizational fairness is linked to benefits such as:

- trust,
- job performance and satisfaction,
- organizational commitment, and
- organizational citizenship behaviors (Colquitt et al., 2013).

The association between organizational justice and unfavorable outcomes such unproductive work behaviors, turnover, and burnout is consistent with the fact that workers who believe that procedures and outcomes are fair tend to engage in less of these bad behaviors (Colquitt et al., 2013). Ensuring just and equitable processes and outcomes is crucial for businesses to treat their workforce equitably. Organizations can ensure transparent and equitable organizational processes to maintain employee commitment to the organization's goals.

KEY TAKE-AWAYS IN PROCUDURAL JUSTICE IN THE ARTICLE

1. The three primary types of organizational justice are distributive, procedural, and interactional;
2. Employees experience distributive justice when they think that results are fair;
3. The objective of procedural justice is to ensure that decisions are made fairly;
4. Interactional justice emphasizes how a person is treated when choices are made;
5. Interactional justice is the outcome of effective communication;
6. When employers involve workers in decision-making, there is an improvement in perceptions of justice;
7. Perceptions of fairness are influenced by state and trait;
8. Organizational fairness affects both individuals and teams;
9. Individual, team, and organizational results are affected by organizational justice.

RECOMMENDATION OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE FOR THE POLICE

Recommends that adherents have a clear legal framework for the enforcement of competition law, including laws and regulations defining and governing competition, rules, policies, or guidance regarding the identification and handling of confidential information, and fair and clear rights and obligations for parties and third parties. As a result, adherents should:

1. Assure the transparency and predictability of the application of competition law by making the following provisions: the competition authorities' legal framework and procedures, as well as the relevant deadlines and procedures for filing requests for judicial review of decisions, must be made public;
2. Subject to the preservation of confidential information, publishing the facts, legal foundation, and sanctions pertaining to decisions, including decisions to settle cases; promoting transparency of competition authorities' enforcement priorities; and;
3. Supporting the implementation of international competition law enforcement transparency and procedural fairness best practices.
4. Ensure that law enforcement is impartial, independent, and professional by ensuring that it is carried out by accountable public bodies that are free from political interference or pressure, and that interpret, apply, and enforce competition law based on relevant legal and economic arguments rooted in sound competition policy principles;

5. Ensuring that all pertinent information and evidence are properly considered by competition authorities and judges;

6. Enforcing competition law with clear and transparent rules that prevent, identify, and resolve any material conflicts of interest among competition authorities and court personnel;

7. Ensuring that competition authorities have the knowledge of competition law, economics, or other pertinent subjects, as well as adequate human, financial, and enforcement resources, to carry out their responsibilities successfully;

8. Maintaining officials' duties to keep information received in their official capacity confidential; and;

9. Supplying authorities with sufficient investigative and cooperative instruments to carry out competition law enforcement efficiently.

Make Sure That the Application of Competition Law Is Impartial, Reasonable, and Consistent in All Instances That are Similar, In Particular By:

1. Tailoring inquiries to the gravity and specifics of each case, and preventing the competition authority or parties from incurring unnecessary costs or obligations;

2. Tailoring inquiries to the gravity and specifics of each case, and preventing the competition authority or parties from incurring unnecessary costs or obligations;

3. having uniform rules and guidelines for the procedures used in competition law enforcement, including information requests, inspections, and interviews, as well as making sure that these procedures do not stray outside the parameters of the inquiry;

4. Applying internal controls to guarantee the legality, proportionality, and consistency of procedural procedures;

5. Evaluating an investigation's progress at crucial points and choosing whether to continue an investigation or end it;

6. Ensuring impartial decision-making by carefully evaluating the facts and proof and implementing internal checks and balances for judgments;

7. making sure that all correspondence between the decision-maker (e.g., competition authority or court, as appropriate) and the parties and third parties is in writing or, if oral, is documented, as much as is practical, in written minutes that are part of the case file or record.

Protect Privileged and Confidential Material

Considering the public's interest in open and efficient competition law enforcement, as well as the right to a defense and other legal rights, in particular by:

1. Ensuring that the competition authorities take the necessary precautions to prevent the unwarranted disclosure of confidential information that they are in control of; and

2. Take into account establishing, revising, or enhancing procedures for handling privileged communications between lawyers and clients and upholding any relevant legal privileges.

Make Sure You Can Receive a Fair Evaluation

Decisions, including intermediate mandatory procedural decisions, are made by an adjudicative body (a court, tribunal, or appellate body) that is autonomous and distinct from the competition authority. Therefore, adherents ought to:

1. Allowing courts to examine facts, evidence, and the merits of judgments regarding the enforcement of competition laws;

2. Demand that all decisions be made in writing, solely on the basis of records, and comprise information about the relevant findings of fact, legal conclusions, and sanctions;
3. Consider the character and complexity of the case as you work to finish the review in a reasonable amount of time.

Review their legal framework, public policies, and rules, procedures, and guidelines for the competition authority on a regular basis to make sure they adhere to this recommendation, to enhance their enforcement methods, and to pursue convergence with best practices.

CONCLUSION

According to the process-based model of regulation, when the public views authoritative figures as reliable and legitimate, compliance, cooperation, and empowerment are more likely to occur. While academics have focused a lot of attention on the causes and effects of legitimacy, trust has received much less attention. The current research showed that levels of trust among citizens are partially influenced by perceived collective efficacy. However, when procedural justice views are taken into account, the impact of perceived collective efficacy is heavily muted. These two results close significant voids in the process-based literature. If Tyler's process-based model were strictly followed, it would imply that procedural justice should totally override (i.e., mediate) the impact of perceived collective efficacy on citizen trust levels.

However, our results show that even after taking procedural justice into consideration, perceived collective efficacy is still important. This indicates that (a) perceived collective efficacy, while not as important as procedural justice, is crucial to the explanation of trust in and of itself, and (b) procedural justice is a main antecedent of trust. Therefore, when examining public confidence in the police, future study should not ignore the impact of citizen perceptions of collective efficacy. Having said that, there are a number of theoretical and practical consequences that call for more discussion. Literature on the foundations of police confidence. Procedure fairness, which includes respect, objectivity, and status recognition, appears to be crucial in how people evaluate how much confidence to place in law enforcement. Our findings show that, despite being different concepts, the process-based model explains citizen confidence in the police in a manner similar to how it explains assessments of police legitimacy.

REFERENCES

Babuta, A. (2017), Big Data and Policing: An Assessment of Law Enforcement Requirements, Expectations and Priorities Royal United Services Institute for Defence and Security Studies.

Bandura, A. (1971). Social learning theory. New York, NY: General Learning Press.

Baraniuk, C. (2018). Exclusive: UK police wants AI to stop violent crime before it happens. New Scientist, November 26th 2018. https://www.newscientist.com/article/2186512-exclusiveuk-police-wants-ai-to-stop-violent-crime-before-it-happens/

Blackwood, L., Hopkins, N. and Reicher, S. (2013a). 'I know who I am, but who do they think I am? Muslim Perspectives on Encounters with Airport Authorities', Ethnic and Racial Studies, 36: 1090-1108.

Blackwood, L., Hopkins, N. and Reicher, S. (2013b). 'Turning the Analytic Gaze on "Us"', European Psychologist, 18: 245-52.

Blau P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.

Brantingham, P. J., 2017. The logic of data bias and its impact on place-based predictive policing. Ohio state journal of criminal law, 15 (2), 473{486.

Camp, N. P., R. Voigt, D. Jurafsky, and J. L. Eberhardt. 2021. "The Thin Blue Waveform: Racial Disparities in Officer Prosody Undermine Institutional Trust in the Police." Journal of Personality & Social Psychology. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/pspa0000270.

Cherney, A., & Murphy, K. (2016). Being a 'suspect community' in a post 9/11 world – The impact of the war on terror on Muslim communities in Australia. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 49(4), 480–496

Cohen-Charash Y., Spector P. (2001). The role of justice in organization: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278–321.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86, 278-321. doi:10.1006/obhd.2001.2958

Colquitt J. A., Conlon D. E., Wesson M. W., Porter C. O. L. H., Ng K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445.

Colquitt J. A., LePine J. A., Piccolo R. F., Zapata C. P., Rich B. L. (2011). Explaining the justice-performance relationship: Trust as exchange deepener or trust as uncertainty reducer? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 1–15.

Conchie S. M., Donald I. J. (2006). The role of distrust in offshore safety performance. *Risk Analysis*, 26(5), 1151–1160.

Counter terrorism policing: A study of Muslim Americans. Law and Society Review, 44(2), 365-401. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5893.2010.00405. x.

Daniel S. Nagin, Cody W. Telep. 2017. Procedural justice and legal compliance. Criminology and Public policy. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12499

De Angelis J and Kupchik A (2009) Ethnicity, trust, and acceptance of authority among police

Donner. C, Maskaly J, Fridell L, Jennings. W. G. (2015) Policing and procedural justice: A state-of-the-art review. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 38(1): 153–172.

Farrow, K. (2020). Policing the pandemic in the UK using the principles of procedural justice. Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice, 14(3), 587–592.

Folger, R. & Konovsky, M. (1989), 'Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Raise Decisions', Academy of Management Journal, 32: 115--130.

Gau J. M. (2011). The convergent and discriminant validity of procedural justice and police legitimacy: An empirical test of core theoretical propositions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 489-498.

Goldsmith, A. (2005). Police reform and the problem of trust. Theoretical Criminology, 9(4), 443–470. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480605057727.

Grant L., Pryce D. K. (2019). Procedural justice, obligation to obey, and cooperation with police in a sample of Jamaican citizens. Police Practice and Research: An International Journal. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2019.1644178

Gurtman M. B. (1992). Trust, distrust and interpersonal problems: A circumplex analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(6), 989–1002.

Haas N., van Craen M., Skogan W., Fleitas D. (2015). Explaining officer compliance: The importance of procedural justice and trust inside a police organization. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 15, 442–463

Hardin, R. (2006). Trust. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hinds L, Murphy K (2007) Public satisfaction with police: Using procedural justice to improve police legitimacy. *Australia & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 40(1): 27–42

Ivkovic S., Peacock R., Mraovic I. (2019). The role of organizational justice and community policing values in the model of external procedural justice in Croatia. International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice. Advance online publication. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01924036.2019.1599972

Jackson J, Bradford B, Hough M, Myhill A, Quinton P, Tyler TR (2012) Why do people comply with the law. Legitimacy and the influence of legal institutions. Br J Criminol 52:1051–1071.

James Hawdon, 2008. Legitimacy, Trust, Social Capital and Policing Styles: A Theoretical Statement. Virginia Tech (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University). Article in Police Quarterly June 2008

Jonathan Jackson, Ben Bradford, Mike Hough, Paul Quinton. 2012. Why Do People Comply with the Law? Legitimacy and the Influence of Legal Institutions. British Journal of Criminology · February 2012. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.1994490.

Kääriäinen J. & Sirén R. (2012). Do the police trust in citizens — European comparisons? European justice. Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism 8: 131–143.

Kahn, K. B., Lee, J. K. Renauer, B., Henning, K. R., & Stewart, G. (2017). The effects of perceived phenotypic racial stereotypicality and social identity threat on racial minorities' attitudes about police. The Journal of Social Psychology, 157(4), 416–428.

Katharine, L. Brown and Michael, D. Reisig. 2019. Procedural injustice, police legitimacy, and officer gender: A vignette-based test of the invariance. School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ, USA.

Klopp J., Kamungi P. (2008). Violence and elections: Will Kenya collapse? *World Policy Journal*, 24(4), 11–18.

LEVI, M. (1998), 'A State of Trust', in V. Braithwaite & M. Levi, eds., Trust and Governance, 77-101. New York: Sage.

MacQueen, S., & 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(3), 419–443. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-015-9240-0

Madon, N, Murphy, K & Cherney, A. 2017, 'Promoting community collaboration in counter-terrorism: do social identities and perceptions of legitimacy mediate reactions to procedural justice policing?', British Journal of Criminology, vol. 57, no. 5 pp. 1144–1164.

Madon, N. S., & Murphy, K. (2021). Police bias and diminished trust in police: A role for procedural justice? Policing: An International Journal, 44(6), 1031–1045.

Maguire E. R., Lowrey B. V., Johnson D. (2016). Evaluating the relative impact of positive and negative encounters with police: A randomized experiment. Journal of Experimental Criminology. Advance Online Publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-016-9276-9

Maguire ER, Johnson D (2010) Measuring public perceptions of the police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 33(4): 703–730.

Masterson S. S., Lewis K., Goldman B. M., Taylor M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738–748.

Mastrofski, S. D., Snipes, J. B., & Supina, A. E. (1996). Compliance on demand: The public's response to specific police requests. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 33, 269–305.

McKay J. (1991). Assessing aspects of object relations associated with immune function: Development of the affiliative trust–mistrust coding system. *Psychological Assessment*, 3(4), 641–647.

Meares Tracey L. 2009. The legitimacy of police among young African-American men. *Marquette Law Review* 92 (4): 651–66.

Miller J, Davis RC, Henderson NJ, Markovic J, Ortiz CW (2003) Public Opinions of the Police: The Influence of Friends, Family, and News Media. National Criminal Justice Reference Service. URL (accessed 24 January 2020): http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/publications/abstract.aspx?ID=205619.

Moore, M. (1992) "Problem-Solving & Community Policing" in M. Tonry & N. Morris (eds) Modern Policing (Crime & Justice - A Review of Research Vol 15) Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Murphy K, Cherney A (2012) Understanding cooperation with police in a diverse society. Br J Criminol 52:181–201.

Murphy K. (2009). Public satisfaction with police: The importance of procedural justice and police performance in police–citizen encounters. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 42(2), 159–178.

Murphy, K., & Mazerolle, L. (2016). Policing immigrants: Using a randomized controlled trial of procedural justice policing to promote trust and cooperation. Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 51, 3–22.

Murphy, K., Hinds, L., & Fleming, J. (2008). Encouraging public cooperation and support for police. Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy, 18, 136–155.

Murphy, K., Madon, N. S., & Cherney, A. (2020). Reporting threats of terrorism: Stigmatisation, procedural justice and policing Muslims in Australia. Policing and Society 30(4), 361–377.

Murphy, K., Mazerolle, L., & Bennett, S. (2013). Promoting trust in police: findings from a randomised experimental field trial of procedural justice policing. Policing and Society: An international Journal of Research and Policy. doi: 10.1080/10439463.2013.862246

Nix J. (2017). Do the police believe that legitimacy promotes cooperation from the public? *Crime & Delinquency*, 63(8), 951–975.

Nix, J, Wolfe, S, Rojek, J & Kaminski, R 2015, 'Trust in the police: the influence of procedural justice and perceived collective efficacy', Crime and Delinquency, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 610–640.

Pryce D. K. (2016). Ghanaian immigrants' experiences with and perceptions of U.S. police: A qualitative study. *Criminal Justice Review*, 41(4), 469–487.

Pryce D. K. (2018). Does procedural justice influence general satisfaction with police? A study from a hard-to-reach population of immigrants in the United States. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 41, 31–48.

Pryce D. K. (2019). The relative effects of normative and instrumental factors of policing on police empowerment: Evidence from a Sub-Saharan African immigrant community. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 30(3), 428–450.

Reisig M. D., Bratton J., Gertz M. G. (2007). The construct validity and refinement of process-based policing measures. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 1005-1028.

Reisig M. D., Lloyd C. (2009). Procedural justice, police legitimacy, and helping the police fight crime: Results from a survey of Jamaican adolescents. *Police Quarterly*, 12(1), 42-62.

Roberts, K. & Herrington, V. (2013) Organizational and procedural justice: A review of the literature and its implications for policing. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263499049

Roberts M. J. (2009). Conflict analysis of the 2007 post-election violence in the police and courts. New York, NY: Russell-Sage Foundation.

Roberts, K., & Herrington, V. (2013). Organizational and procedural justice: A review of the literature and its implications for policing. Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism, 8, 115–130

Rosanna Nagtegaal. 2021. The impact of using algorithms for managerial decisions on public employees' procedural justice https://www.researchgate.net/publication/347335878.

Rosenbaum DP, Lawrence DS, Hartnett SM, McDevitt J, Posick C (2015) Measuring procedural justice and legitimacy at the local level: The police–community interaction survey. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 11(3): 335–366.

Rosenbaum DP, Schuck AM, Costello SK, Hawkins DF, Ring MK (2005) Attitudes toward the police: The effects of direct and vicarious experience. *Police Quarterly* 8(3): 343–365.

Ryan Sandrin, Rylan Simpson & Janne E. Gaub 2022. An experimental examination of the perceptual paradox surrounding police canine units. Journal of Experimental Criminology (2022).

Schafer, J. A. 2013. The role of trust and transparency in the pursuit of procedural and organisational

Scholz, J. T., Lubell M., 1998a. Adaptive political attitudes: duty, trust, and fear as monitors of tax policy. American Journal of Political Science 42(3), 903.

Scholz, J. T., Lubell M., 1998b. Trust and taxpaying: testing the heuristic approach to collective action. American Journal of Political Science 42(2), 398.

Schulhofer, S. J., Tyler, T.R., & Huq, A.Z. (forthcoming 2011). American Policing at a Science and the Law, 19(2), 215-235. doi:10.1002/bsl.438.

Skogan W., Frydl K. (2004). *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence* (Committee to Review Research on Police Policy and Practices, Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Skogan, W. G. (2006). Asymmetry in the impact of encounters with police. Policing & Society, 16, 99-126. doi:10.1080/10439460600662098

Solomon, S. J. 2019. How do the components of procedural justice and driver race influence encounter-specific perceptions of police legitimacy during traffic stops? Forthcoming in Criminal Justice & Behavior. Department of Sociology Kent State University.

State Journal of Criminal Law, 7, 307-359. Retrieved from http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/osjcl/

Stephen J. Schulhofer, Tom R. Tyler, and Aziz Z. Huq, *American Policing at a Crossroads: Unsustainable Policies and the Procedural Justice Alternative*, 101 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 335 (2011). https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc/vol101/iss2/1

Steven G. Brandt, Robert E. Worden, James Frank, 1964. Global and Specific Attitudes Toward the Police: Disentangling the Relationship. Article in Justice Quarterly. March 1994. DOI: 10.1080/07418829400092161

Sun I. Y., Han Z., Wu Y., Farmer A. K. (2019). Trust in the police in rural China: A comparison between villagers and local officials. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 14(3), 241–258

Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T.R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. Law and Society Review, 37(3), 513–547.

Tankebe, J 2009, 'Public cooperation with the police in Ghana: does procedural fairness matter. Criminology, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 1265–1293.

Tyler T. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. Yale University Press

Tyler T. R. (2006) Why *people obey the law*. Princeton University Press.

Tyler T. R. (2007). Procedural justice and the courts. *Court Review*, 44(1–2), 26–31.

Tyler T. R., Huo Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. Russell Sage Foundation

Tyler T. R., Wakslak C. J. (2004). Profiling and police legitimacy: Procedural justice, attributions of motive, and acceptance of police authority. *Criminology*, 42, 253–282.

Tyler, T. R. (2005). Promoting employee policy adherence and rule following in work settings: The value of self-regulatory approaches. Brooklyn Law Review, 70, 1287–1312.

Tyler, T. R., Goff, P. A., & MacCoun, R. J. (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*(3), 75–109.

Tyler, T.R. (1988). What is procedural justice? Criteria used by citizens to assess the

Tyler, T.R. (1990), 'Why People Obey the Law'. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tyler, T.R. (2000). Multiculturalism and the willingness of citizens to defer to law and to legal authorities. Law and Social Inquiry, 25(4), 983-1019. doi:10.1111/j.1747-4469. 2000.tb00314.x

Tyler, T.R. (2001). Public trust and confidence in legal authorities: What do majority and minority group members want from the law and legal authorities Behavior.

Tyler, T.R. (2004), 'Enhancing Police Legitimacy', Annals of the American Academy, 593: 84--99.

Tyler, T.R. (2004). Enhancing police legitimacy. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 593, 84-99. doi:10.1177/0002716203262627

Tyler, T.R. (2005), 'Policing in Black and White: Ethnic Group Differences in Trust and Confidence in the Police', Police Quarterly, 8: 322--342.

Tyler, T. R. (2005). Policing in Black and White: Ethnic group differences in trust and confidence in the police. Police Quarterly, 8(3), 322–342.

Tyler, T.R. (2006), Why people obey the law. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tyler, T.R. (2006a). Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation. Annual Review of Psychology, 57, 375-400. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190038.

Tyler, T.R. (2006b). Why people obey the law. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tyler, T.R. (2007). Racial profiling, attributions of motive, and the acceptance of social authority. In R.L. Weiner, B.H. Bornstein, R. Schopp, and S.L. Willborn (Eds.) Social consciousness in legal decision making. Springer.

Tyler, T.R. (2009). Legitimacy and criminal justice: The benefits of self-regulation. Ohio.

Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. (2002). Trust in the Law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Publications.

Tyler, T.R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Why do people cooperate with the police? Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law, 6, 231-275. Retrieved from http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/osjcl/

Tyler, T.R., & Huo, Y.J. (2002). Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with

Tyler, T.R., & Wakslak, C. (2004). Profiling and police legitimacy: Procedural justice, attributions of motive, and acceptance of police authority. Criminology, 42(2),

Tyler, T.R., Schulhofer, S., & Huq, A.Z. (2010). Legitimacy and deterrence effects in
Van Craen, M. (2016a). Understanding police officers' trust and trustworthy behavior: A work relations framework. European Journal of Criminology, 13, 274–294.

Van Craen, M. (2016b). Fair policing from the inside out. In M. Deflem (Eds.), The politics of policing: Between force and legitimacy (pp. 3–19). Bingley, England: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Van Craen, M., & Skogan, W. (2017). Achieving fairness in policing: The link between internal and external procedural justice. Police Quarterly, 20, 3–32.

Wheatcroft J. M., Alison L. A., McGrory D. (2012). The influence of trust on senior investigating officers' decision making in high-profile critical incidents. *Police Quarterly*, 15(4), 386–413.

Wheatcroft JM, Alison LA and McGrory, D. (2012). The influence of trust on senior investigating

Williamson, H. Murphy, K. & Madon, N. S. (2022). The negative implications of relative deprivation: An experimental of vicarious police contact and Muslims' perceptions of police bias. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, online first. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2022.2058472

Wolfe, S. E., Nix, J., Kaminski, R., & Rojek, J. (2016). Is the effect of procedural justice on police legitimacy invariant? Testing the generality of procedural justice and competing antecedents of legitimacy. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 32(2), 253–282.

Worden, R. E. and McLean, S. J. (2017), "Research on police legitimacy: the state of the art", Policing: An International Journal, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 480-513. https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-05-2017-0062.

Wu, Y., Sun, I., Chang, C., & Hsu, K. (2017). Procedural justice received and given: Supervisory treatment, emotional states and behavioral compliance among Taiwanese police officers. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 44, 963–982.

Yang, Kaifeng. 2005. Public Administrators' Trust in Citizens: A Missing Link in Citizen Involvement Efforts. Public Administration Review 65(3): 273-285.