

The Effects of Procedural Justice and Police Performance
on Citizens' Satisfaction with Police

by

Stacey Smith

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

Approved June 2012 by
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Michael D. Reisig, Chair
Justin Ready
Kristy Holtfreter

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2012

ABSTRACT

It is hypothesized that procedural justice influences citizens' satisfaction with the police. An alternative argument holds that police performance measures, such as perceptions of crime and safety, are more salient. This study empirically investigates the predictive validity of both theoretical arguments. Using mail survey data from 563 adult residents from Monroe County, Michigan, a series of linear regression equations were estimated. The results suggest that procedural justice is a robust predictor of satisfaction with police. In contrast, several police performance measures failed to predict satisfaction with police. Overall, these findings support Tyler and Huo's (2002) contention that judgments regarding whether police exercise their authority in a procedurally-just fashion influence citizens' satisfaction with police more than fear of crime, perceptions of disorder, and the like.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was supported by grant #97-CK-WX-0010 awarded by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
MODELS OF CITIZENS' SATISFACTION WITH POLICE.....	2
Police Performance Model.....	2
Procedural Justice Model.....	5
COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENTS OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND POLICE PERFORMANCE.....	6
CURRENT FOCUS.....	8
METHODS.....	8
Data.....	8
Dependent Variable.....	9
Independent Variables.....	10
Control Variables.....	11
Analytic Strategy.....	13
RESULTS.....	13
DISCUSSION.....	17
Key Findings and Implications.....	17
Limitations.....	19
Conclusion.....	20
REFERENCES.....	21

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Sample Comparison	9
2. Summary Statistics and Pearson's r Coefficients.....	12
3. The Effects of Police Performance and Procedural Justice on Satisfaction with Police.....	15

Introduction

The police are often the first contact people have with the legal system. The extent to which citizens are satisfied with police is frequently used to gauge the effectiveness of police services. Research has shown that citizen-initiated encounters are generally rated more favorably than police-initiated contacts (Skogan, 2005). Demographic characteristics are also related how people rate the police. For example, younger people, Hispanics, and African-Americans hold more negative attitudes toward the police relative to older citizens and Whites (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Weitzer & Tuch, 2004). Citizens' satisfaction is also affected by neighborhood structural features, such as concentrated poverty (Reisig & Parks, 2000; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998).

Two explanations of citizens' satisfaction with the police have emerged. The "procedural justice model" posits that citizens will express greater levels of satisfaction with police if they believe they are treated fairly, in a kind manner, and with respect (Tyler & Huo, 2002). Tom Tyler (1990) argues that this relationship will hold even if the outcome is not favorable for the citizen. The second argument, known as the "police performance model," posits that satisfaction increases when people believe the police are effective in fighting crime and maintaining order in their community. The question of whether the procedural justice model or police performance model is a more valid explanation of citizens' satisfaction with police requires empirical investigation.

The present study assesses the effects of procedural justice and police performance on citizens' satisfaction with police. More specifically, this study

contributes to the research literature by conducting a comparative assessment of the police performance model and the procedural justice model. Which model better explains satisfaction with police? Multivariate analyses are carried out using data from a mail survey administered to 563 adults in Monroe County, Michigan.

Models of Citizens' Satisfaction with Police

Early studies of citizens' satisfaction with the police were limited in scope because they only focused on demographic correlates. In their review of the literature, Brown and Benedict (2002) found that certain variables, such as age, race, and sex, have consistently explained citizens' attitudes toward police. More specifically, minorities, men, and younger people are generally less satisfied with the police. Although these demographic correlates are notable, other relevant factors also impact satisfaction. Recent research has been directed toward more theoretically-informed frameworks, two of which are the police performance and procedural justice models.

Police Performance Model

The police performance model posits that residents' levels of satisfaction are influenced by perceptions of how effective the police are at combating and preventing crime, as well as providing security and protection. Prior studies have used a variety of measures to gauge police performance, including perceptions of crime and disorder, perceptions of safety, and fear of crime (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Frank, Smith, & Novak, 2005; O'Connor, 2008; Skogan, 2006; Sung,

2002). These variables have been used to operationalize police performance because it is what residents believe is feasible police work.

Cao, Frank, and Cullen (1996) argued fear of crime and perceptions of disorder weaken citizens' confidence in police. Indeed, being afraid of crime and perceptions of disorder were found to have a substantive negative impact on confidence with police. In fact, perceptions of disorder had the largest effect on confidence in police of all the variables included in the analysis. The effect is explained by the fact that citizens hold police responsible for neighborhood disorder. Incivilities (or visible signs of disorder) are a sign that police have lost control over the community. More recent studies, such as Reisig and Parks (2000), report that the most salient predictor of satisfaction with police includes perceived safety, perceived neighborhood crime, and perceived incivility.

Sims, Hooper, and Peterson's (1999) study investigated whether perceptions of disorder and fear of crime predict citizens' attitudes toward police. Unexpectedly, the authors found that the relationship between fear of crime and attitudes toward police was in the opposite direction (strong and positive), meaning those who are more fearful of crime hold more positive attitudes toward police. This finding does not square with the literature which shows that people who are fearful of crime express more negative attitudes toward police. Interestingly, perceptions of disorder predicted more support for the police. In other words, citizens who report local problems associated with graffiti, drinking in public, and loitering teenagers are more likely to hold positive attitudes toward police.

O'Connor's (2008) study, which was conducted in Canada, generated findings largely consistent with studies from the United States. O'Connor hypothesized that individuals who are satisfied with their level of safety from crime judge the police more favorably, and those who perceive their neighborhoods as more crime ridden are less favorable toward the police (see also Wu, Sun, & Triplett, 2009). The results showed that perceptions of safety had the strongest relationship with attitudes toward police.

In the end, the police cannot be expected to overcome structural correlates of crime (e.g. community poverty and unemployment). But many people hold them responsible for crime in their neighborhoods. Perceptions of crime and disorder are known to be associated with negative attitudes toward police (Bridenball & Jesilow, 2008; Reisig & Parks, 2000). The fact that police cannot keep neighborhoods free of public drunkenness or auto theft lowers citizens' satisfaction with them (see also Schuck, Rosenbaum, & Hawkins, 2008).

A major criticism of the police performance model is that factors said to reflect police performance (e.g., social disorder and fear of crime) are caused by a multitude of factors, not just what the police do. There is an overemphasis on the police in which the public unfairly attaches social conditions (e.g., abandoned buildings) that are outside the scope of law enforcement. Although the police cannot be expected to counteract all neighborhood problems, they are expected to control their own behavior. Basically, police behavior that demonstrates fairness of treatment is consistent with how people believe they ought to be treated by police (Sunshine & Heuer, 2002).

Procedural Justice Model

The procedural justice model is primarily concerned with perceived fairness. With regard to the police, it contends that citizens' evaluations of the police are determined by the way police treat them during contact. The underlying assumption being that if police exercise their authority in a way that is viewed as fair, respectful, and dignified, then citizens' are more likely to hold favorable attitudes toward them (Tyler, 1990, 2001). The procedural justice model also holds that when police exercise their authority in a manner that is in line with public expectations, people are more likely to trust them and view them as legitimate. After all, in a democratic society the police are expected to dispense justice and maintain order. Simultaneously, they are expected to be fair and restrained in exercising their authority. This assumption defines the police as professionals who are to be "customer service" oriented when working with the community (Orr & West, 2007).

In one early test of the procedural justice model, Tyler and Folger (1980) assessed whether evaluations of fair treatment influenced citizen satisfaction by looking at a sample made up of individuals who had recent contact with police. The results showed that procedural fairness was associated with favorable evaluations of police performance. Citizens were more likely to be satisfied with police when officers showed concern and listened to citizens (fairness of treatment). For determining satisfaction with police, this is a case where perceptions of fairness supersede the effect of other judgments.

Tyler's (1990) ideas have been tested using data from Australia. The objective was to determine whether the connection between procedural justice and satisfaction generalizes to settings outside the United States. Hinds and Murphy (2007) argue that when the police treat people with fairness, the public becomes more trusting and has more confidence in police. They found that the relationship between procedural justice and public satisfaction with police is strong and statistically significant. Specifically, prior to making their decisions, if officers treat people with respect and fairness then participants were more satisfied with police services.

Comparative Assessment of Procedural Justice and Police Performance

The literature is unclear whether the procedural justice model or police performance model better explains citizens' satisfaction with the police. Only a few studies have comparatively assessed the police performance model and procedural justice model in terms of predicting citizens' satisfaction. Tyler and Huo (2002) hypothesized that overall evaluations of legal authorities (i.e., police and courts) were strongly linked to quality of treatment (e.g., polite, respectful, dignity, fair, and sincere) relative to judgments of police performance in combating crime (e.g., fear of crime, magnitude of crime problem, and effectiveness of police efforts). They found that individual assessments of legal authorities were dominated by issues of quality of treatment rather than police performance. More specifically, while fear of crime and magnitude of crime problem were statistically significant predictors, the effects of character of police,

do the police care, and do police harass were also statistically significant and the effect sizes were larger.

Other research also suggests that police performance is less salient relative to procedural justice in explaining citizens' satisfaction with police. Tyler and Fagan (2008) have stated that experience with the police rather than police performance influences citizens' evaluations of police. For instance, people view police as just, ethical, and trustworthy when police treat people in a fair and dignified manner during an encounter. Tyler and Fagan's analyses concluded that the effect of police performance was trivial, but procedural justice was significant and its impact on assessments of the police robust.

In addition, Gau (2010) specifically looked at the effect of procedural justice and police performance on satisfaction with police using a non-urban sample. Two key findings are worthy of attention. First, procedural justice remained stable and significant in shaping people's attitudes toward police. Positive contacts in which the police showed respect increased satisfaction with police. Second, as expected perceived effectiveness in keeping the community safe was statistically significant. In other words, procedural justice and police performance are both associated with satisfaction with police. However, procedural justice also fosters a greater belief in the police protect and deter the community from crime.

Murphy's (2009) study focused on whether procedural justice or police performance was most important across police- and citizen-initiated contacts, in predicting citizens' satisfaction with police using a sample from an Australian

jurisdiction. For police-initiated contacts, procedural justice was more salient, but for citizen-initiated contacts, police performance mattered most. When controlling for procedural justice and police performance, demographic factors played only a minor role in predicting satisfaction with police. Both procedural justice and police performance explained 63% of the variation in the dependent variable.

Current Focus

The purpose of this study is to comparatively assess the police performance model and procedural justice model to determine which of the two better explains citizens' satisfaction with police. Much of the literature provides contradictory findings. The present study uses community survey data to estimate a series of linear regression models to determine whether citizens' perceptions of police performance (e.g., perceived safety and fear of crime) are more salient than procedural justice judgments, net of statistical controls.

Methods

Data

The current study uses community survey data collected in 1999 by the Regional Community Policing Institute at Michigan State University. The sample was generated by first randomly selecting 1,250 Monroe County (MI) residents 18 years or older. These potential participants were notified about the study by personalized postcards. By doing this, 101 "bad" addresses were identified and discarded. Once valid addresses were identified, surveys were mailed to potential respondents. Non-respondents were mailed surveys multiple times. In all, four waves of the survey were distributed (see Dillman, 2000). This process resulted in

a 49 percent response rate. The final sample consisted of 563 adults. When compared to 1999 Census data, the sample consists of more whites, older citizens, and middle-income people (see Table 1).

Table 1: Sample Comparison

		<u>1990 Census</u>	<u>1999 Survey Sample</u>
Race/Ethnicity	Caucasian	86.50%	95.60%
	Minority	13.5	4.4
Age	18 to 24 yrs	11.5	0.2
	25 to 34 yrs	19	7.4
	35 to 44 yrs	23	20.4
	45 to 54 yrs	19.2	27.9
	55 to 64 yrs	11.6	17.5
	65+ yrs	15.9	26.7
Income	Less than \$9,999	11.5	3.8
	10,000 to 14,999	7.3	5.2
	15,000 to 49,999	37.6	40.3
	50,000 to 74,999	20.4	30.5
	75,000+	23.3	20.2

Source: Reisig and Cancino (1999).

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable, *satisfaction with police*, is a two-item additive scale. The first item asked respondents to report their “general satisfaction with police.” The close-ended responses ranged from 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 5 (*very satisfied*). The second question asked respondents to rate “police service within a 15 minute walk” of their home. The closed-ended responses ranged from 1 (*poor*) to 5 (*outstanding*). The correlation coefficient between these two items is 0.61 ($p <$

0.001). The scale is coded so that higher scores reflect higher levels of satisfaction with police.

Independent Variables

Tyler (2004) has argued that procedural justice matters most to citizens in predicting citizens' satisfaction with police. *Procedural justice* is a six-item additive scale that reflects citizens' judgments whether the police in their neighborhoods are "respectful", "friendly", "courteous", "usually rude" (reversed scored), "listen to people", and "show concern" (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.65$). The response set ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). This additive scale is coded so that higher scores reflect more positive procedural justice judgments. Similar procedural justice scales have been used previously (see, e.g., Reisig, Bratton, & Gertz, 2007).

Four police performance variables are included in this study. The first, *perceived safety*, is a three-item scale. Respondents were asked how safe they felt in the following situations: "when alone outside at night", "when home alone at night", and "when alone outside during the day." The close-ended response set ranged from 1 (*very unsafe*) to 5 (*very safe*) (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.86$). Higher scores reflect greater feelings of safety. *Fear of crime* is a four-item scale. Respondents were asked to rate their level of fear on a scale ranging from 1 (*least fear*) to 10 (*most fear*) for the following crimes: "being robbed by someone who has a gun or knife", "someone breaking into your house to steal things", "someone stealing your car", and "someone physically attacking you" (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.90$). As scale scores increase so too does fear of crime. *Perceived crime* is a four-item

scale. Respondents were asked to gauge how problematic the following crimes were in their neighborhood: “homes being broken into and things stolen”, “people breaking into cars”, and “people being beat up” (1 = no problem, 2 = a problem, 3 = serious problem). In addition, they were asked whether “crime is getting worse.” The response set for this item ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The alpha for this four-item scale is 0.54. Higher scores indicate more concern among participants with crime in their neighborhoods. Finally, *perceived disorder* is an additive scale that includes both physical and social disorder items. Specifically, respondents were asked to report how problematic the following were in their neighborhood: “vandalism”, “garbage/litter on the streets”, “noisy neighbors”, and “public drinking.” One additional item asked participants to report whether they agreed that “disorderly behavior is getting worse.” Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The alpha for this scale is 0.65. Higher scores reflect higher levels of perceived disorder.

Control Variables

A variety of control variables were also included in the analyses. Four of these variables are dummy coded: *Married* (1 = yes, 0 = otherwise), *Male* (1 = yes, 0 = no), *White* (1 = yes, 0 = no), and *Homeowner* (1 = yes, 0 = otherwise). *Education* ranges from “not a high school graduate” (coded as 1) to “graduate degree” (coded as 7). *Age* and *length of residence* are measured in years. Table 2 presents the summary statistics for the variables used in this study.

Table 2.: Summary Statistics and Pearson's r Coefficients

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Satisfaction with police	---												
2. Procedural Justice	0.50	---											
3. Perceived Disorder	-0.15	-0.09	---										
4. Perceived Crime	-0.13	-0.08	0.71	---									
5. Perceived Safety	0.20	0.12	-0.23	-0.22	---								
6. Fear of Crime	-0.10	-0.04	0.18	0.22	-0.25	---							
7. Male (1= yes)	-0.10	0.50	0.00	-0.05	0.22	-0.19	---						
8. Married (1= yes)	-0.13	-0.04	0.03	0.02	0.04	-0.03	0.32	---					
9. White (1= yes)	-0.05	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.08	-0.04	0.18	0.08	---				
10. Homeowner (1= yes)	-0.08	-0.06	0.00	0.03	0.03	-0.05	0.17	0.26	0.08	---			
11. Education	0.00	-0.03	0.01	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.09	0.08	---		
12. Length of residency	0.04	0.07	0.01	-0.04	-0.02	-0.09	0.06	-0.07	-0.01	0.10	-0.25	---	
13. Age	0.15	0.10	-0.08	-0.15	-0.04	-0.09	0.15	-0.16	-0.08	0.02	-0.29	0.52	---
<i>M</i> or percentage	6.67	21.21	6.62	5.42	13.12	17.55	62%	74%	93%	93%	3.26	19.56	54.24
<i>SD</i>	1.85	2.80	1.77	1.66	2.39	11.40	---	---	---	---	1.62	16.31	14.70

Analytic Strategy

Bivariate correlations (Pearson's r) are used to test the hypotheses. Because this statistical procedure cannot account for the impact third variables on a linear relationship, ordinary least-squares (OLS) regression is also used to test hypotheses. A three-step modeling strategy was employed. First, the dependent variable, satisfaction with police, was regressed onto the procedural justice scale. Next, the effects of the police performance measures on satisfaction with police were gauged. Lastly, the dependent variable was regressed onto the entire set of independent variables to determine whether the effects persist when other relevant measures are included in the model. SPSS 19.0 was used to carry out the analyses and listwise deletion was used to handle missing data.

Results

The Pearson's r coefficients between the independent variables and satisfaction with police were assessed. First, procedural justice has the strongest relationship with satisfaction with police. The relationship is also in the expected direction (positive) (see Table 2). Therefore, as procedural justice judgments increase so does satisfaction with police. Perceived safety has the second strongest relationship with satisfaction with police followed by perceived disorder, both of which in the hypothesized direction. This means that an increase in perceived disorder is related to lower satisfaction with police. In addition, residents who report they feel safer are more satisfied with police services. Of the police performance measures, fear of crime had the weakest relationship with the dependent variable; yet, it was still in the hypothesized direction (negative). The

only control variable to have a notable impact on satisfaction with police is age. That is, older adults report higher levels of satisfaction with police. These relationships were all significant at the .05 level.

In Model 1 in Table 3 procedural justice performed as expected. Procedural justice is a significant predictor of satisfaction with police. The standardized regression coefficient (β) indicates that a one standard deviation increase in procedural justice leads to a 0.50 standard deviation increase in predicted satisfaction with police. Simply put, citizens who believe police show concern and are kind rate them significantly higher on the satisfaction scale. This model is also very significant ($F = 159.7, p < .001$), which indicates that the model provides better predictions than what would be expected by chance alone. Furthermore, procedural justice accounts for 25% of the variance in the dependent variable demonstrating it as a salient predictor of satisfaction with police.

In Model 2, the satisfaction with police scale is regressed onto the police performance measures. The findings are mixed. For example, one of the police performance variables, perceived safety, reached statistical significance. In other words, those who perceive their neighborhoods as safer are more satisfied with police ($\beta = .14$). However, although the effects of perceived disorder, perceived crime, and fear of crime were in the expected direction, none of the effects were statistically significant at the .05 level. Overall, the four variables accounted for 4.5% of the variation in the dependent variable which is underwhelming when compared to the explanatory power of the procedural justice scale (see Model 1).

Table 3: The Effects of Police Performance and Procedural Justice on Satisfaction with Police

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b (SE)	β	b (SE)	β	b (SE)	β
Procedural Justice	.33** (.03)	.50	-- --	--	.30** (.03)	.46
Perceived Safety	--	--	.11** (.04)	.14	.10** (.04)	.12
Fear of Crime	--	--	-.01 (.01)	-.05	-.01 (.01)	-.06
Perceived Crime	--	--	-.06 (.07)	-.05	-.03 (.07)	-.03
Perceived Disorder	--	--	-.07 (.07)	-.07	-.04 (.06)	-.40
Married	--	--	--	--	-.32 (.19)	--
White	--	--	--	--	-.55 (.39)	--
Male	--	--	--	--	.01 (.18)	--
Length of Residence	--	--	--	--	-.01 (.01)	--
Education	--	--	--	--	.04 (.05)	--
Homeowner	--	--	--	--	-.43 (.33)	--
Age	--	--	--	--	.02** (.01)	--
F-test	159.70**		5.27*		15.32**	
R ²	.253		.045		.308	
Sample size	473		454		425	

Note. Entries are unstandardized partial regression coefficients (b), standardized partial regression coefficients (β), and standard errors in parentheses.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed test).

When examining the role of police performance and procedural justice on satisfaction with police with all the control variables, procedural justice was the strongest predictor (see Model 3). The coefficient for procedural justice was statistically significant and robust across models. Citizens who report police as

being procedurally just are more likely to be satisfied with police. Among the police performance measures, perceived safety remained statistically significant ($\beta = .12$) while the other police performance variables failed to have any impact on satisfaction with police. Citizens who reported they felt safe in their neighborhoods are more likely to be satisfied with police services. One control variable (i.e., age) had a significant effect. An increase in age is associated with an increase in satisfaction ratings. Taking into account all the variables explained about 30% of the variance. Finally, variance inflation factor values indicate that collinearity is not an issue ($VIF < 2.50$).

The regression models in Table 3 clearly show that procedural justice is the most important predictor of satisfaction with police. Citizens are strongly affected by their judgments of how police officers treat people. Indeed, this comparative assessment of procedural justice and police performance supports Tyler's (2002) argument that when assessing satisfaction with police, procedural justice is priority. These findings demonstrate that the effect of police performance measures were minor compared to the magnitude of procedural justice. Procedural justice explained almost 5 times more variation in satisfaction with police than the four police performance measures. Perceived safety does matter. However, officers treating people with respect and appearing concerned has more of an impact on assessments of satisfaction with police.

Discussion

Key Findings and Implications

This study extends prior research by examining whether the procedural justice model or the police performance model better explains citizens' satisfaction with police. Survey data from a community-based sample were used to estimate multiple linear regression equations. The findings suggest that procedural justice and police performance had independent direct effects on satisfaction with police. Overall, procedural justice exerted the most influence on satisfaction with police which lends support to national and local studies that have found citizens are satisfied with police services when police treat them in a dignified manner (see, e.g., Tyler & Huo, 2002). Although these findings are consistent with prior research, several issues require further discussion.

First, with regard to the police performance model, three of the four variables were not related to satisfaction with police. According to the police performance model, neighborhood conditions influence attitudes toward police such that residents who perceive more disorder, have high levels of fear, and view crime in their neighborhood as serious are less satisfied with police. Evidence from this study shows fear of crime, perceived crime, and perceived disorder do not influence citizens' satisfaction with police. In fact, perceived safety is the only significant measure, and its effect on satisfaction with police was relatively modest. There are two possible explanations for this observation. One is that "perceptions" are complex and vary across different areas and to each individual in a neighborhood, some crimes may be seen as more of a problem and

threatening to people's sense of safety, "when citizens are accustomed to cleanliness and order" (Gau & Pratt, 2010, p. 763). Residents exposed to more crime and disorder, by contrast, may perceive garbage/litter on the streets as not a problem. Second, it has been argued that the propositions of the police performance model are ambiguous. Skogan's (2009) study addresses these issues by asking whether people actually hold the police accountable for neighborhood conditions. Or, are perceptions of crime and disorder confounded by reassurance policing? In short, reassurance policing affords citizens' feelings of protection and security from police by being visible and accessible. As a result, police visibility is likely to lead to citizens' satisfaction with police (Hawdon & Ryan, 2003).

Second, this study's findings clearly indicate that procedural justice is a robust predictor of citizens' satisfaction with police. For example, procedural justice accounts for a considerable amount of explained variation. The way in which the police treat citizens weighs heavily on their evaluations of police services because people want their views to be considered and they want to be treated respectfully. This finding is not surprising. After all, previous research has demonstrated that procedural justice is a correlate of satisfaction with police. Given that, this study supports the work of Tyler and his colleagues (Tyler & Folger, 1980; Tyler & Huo, 2002).

Third, results from this study have some important policy implications. With regard to police-citizen relationships, procedural justice fosters trust and compliance, which can lead to citizens having more confidence in police. This conclusion is similar to recent research that contends people's assessments of the

quality of treatment during an encounter predicts a strong belief in the ability of police to keep the community safe from crime (Gau, 2010; Tankebe, 2008). Also, citizens are more likely to engage in police intervention and crime reduction programs when they report positive procedural justice judgments (Reisig, 2007). Moreover, with strained police resources and police agencies having sparse finances, procedural justice maximizes time and money. Police administrators, through training, can better control quality of service rendered rather than the structural features of neighborhoods where people reside.

Limitations

This study has limitations that have to be considered. The results are derived from cross-sectional data which means causality cannot be inferred. To accomplish this task properly, experimental research and longitudinal designs should be used to test the causal hypotheses relating to police performance, procedural justice, and citizens' satisfaction with police. This would allow for more detailed assessment of how police performance and procedural justice judgments change over time and their subsequent impact on satisfaction with police. Next, the statistical results may not generalize to other populations because the sample was drawn from a mostly rural, older, white, and middle-income area. Minority respondents were not well represented in this study. Further, after finding that perception of safety is associated with determining satisfaction with police, more reliable measures of police performance need to be included. The data did not include other factors known to be correlated with satisfaction with police which include victimization, police response time, and

vicarious experiences. There are also interactive effects that were not tested in this study (i.e., race and victimization). Future studies that overcome these limitations will help move the research forward.

Conclusion

This study is one of few that addressed the gap in the literature regarding the effects of police performance and procedural justice on citizens' satisfaction with police. The findings suggest that when putting the procedural justice model against the police performance model to predict satisfaction with police, the procedural justice model is more valid. In the end, exhibiting fair treatment and feeling safe in one's neighborhood cannot solely be relied on to improve police-citizen contact. These relationships are fragile and nuanced. Policymakers, residents, community leaders, social workers, and the police would have to collaborate and consider what is financially feasible in resolving their community's problems. Otherwise, people will maintain certain attitudes toward police. This study implies that a tangible solution is procedural justice policing.

References

- Bridenball, B., & Jesilow, P. (2008). What matters: The formation of attitudes toward the police? *Police Quarterly*, *11*, 151-181.
- Brown, B., & Benedict, W. M. (2002). Perceptions of the police: Past findings, methodological issues, conceptual issues and policy implications. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *25*, 543-580.
- Cao, L., Frank, J., & Cullen, T. F. (1996). Race, community context, and confidence in the police. *American Journal of Police*, *15*, 3-22.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York: Wiley.
- Frank, J., Smith, B. W., & Novak, K. J. (2005). Exploring the basis of citizens' attitudes toward the police. *Police Quarterly*, *8*, 206-228.
- Gau, J. M. (2010). A longitudinal analysis of citizens' attitudes about police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, *33*, 236-252.
- Gau, J. M., & Pratt, T. C. (2010). Revisiting broken windows theory: Examining the sources of the discriminant validity of perceived disorder and crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*, 758-766.
- Hawdon, J., & Ryan, J. (2003). Police-resident interactions and satisfaction with police: An empirical test of community policing assertions. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *14*, 55-74.
- Hinds, L., & Murphy, K. (2007). Public satisfaction with police: Using procedural justice to improve police legitimacy. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *40*, 27-42.

- Murphy, K. (2009). Public satisfaction with police: The importance of procedural justice and police performance in police–citizen encounters. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 42, 159-178.
- O'Connor, C. D. (2008). Citizen attitudes toward the police in Canada. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 31, 578-595.
- Orr, M., & West, D. M. (2007). Citizen evaluations of local police: Personal experience or symbolic attitudes. *Administration and Society*, 38, 649-668.
- Reisig, M. D. (2007). Procedural justice and community policing: What shapes residents' willingness to participate in crime prevention programs? *Policing*, 1, 356-369
- Reisig, M. D., & Cancino, J. M. (1999). *Findings from the 1999 Monroe County crime and criminal justice community survey*. East Lansing, MI: Regional Community Policing Institute.
- Reisig, M. D., Bratton, J., & Gertz, M. (2007). The construct validity and refinement of process-based policing measures. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 34, 1005-1028.
- Reisig, M. D., & Parks, R. B. (2000). Experience, quality of life, and neighborhood context: A hierarchical analysis of satisfaction with police. *Justice Quarterly*, 17, 607-630.
- Rosenbaum, D. P., Schuck, A. M., Costello, S. K., Hawkins, D. F., & Ring, M. K. (2005). Attitudes toward the police: The effects of direct and vicarious experience. *Police Quarterly*, 8, 343–365.
- Sampson, R. J., & Bartusch, D. J. (1998). Legal cynicism and (Sub-cultural?) tolerance of deviance. *Law and Society Review* 32, 777-804.
- Schuck, A. M., Rosenbaum, D. P., & Hawkins, D. F. (2008). The influence of race, social class, and neighborhood context on residents' attitudes toward the police. *Police Quarterly*, 11, 496-519.

- Sims, B., Hooper, M., & Peterson, A. S. (2002). Determinants of citizens' attitudes toward police: Results of the Harrisburg Citizen Survey-1999. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 25, 457-471.
- Skogan, W. G. (2005). Citizen satisfaction with police encounters. *Police Quarterly*, 8, 298-321.
- Skogan, W. G. (2006). Asymmetry in the impact of encounters with police. *Policing and Society*, 16, 99-126.
- Skogan, W. G. (2009). Concern about crime and confidence in the police: Reassurance or accountability? *Police Quarterly*, 12, 301-318.
- Sung, H. (2002). *The fragmentation of policing in American cities: Toward an ecological theory of police-citizen relations*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Sunshine, J., & Heuer, L. (2002). Deservingness and perceptions of procedural justice in citizen encounters with the police. In M. J. Lerner, M. Ross, D. T. Miller (Eds.), *The justice motive in everyday life*, (pp.397-419). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tankebe, J. (2008). Police effectiveness and police trustworthiness in Ghana: An empirical appraisal. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 8, 185-202.
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- 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? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 19, 215-235.
- Tyler, T. R. (2003). Procedural justice, legitimacy, and the effective rule of law. In Michael Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice*, (pp. 283-357). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Tyler, T. R. (2004). Enhancing police legitimacy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Science*, 593, 84-99.
- Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities? *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6, 231-276.
- Tyler, T. R., & Folger, R. (1980). Distributional and procedural aspects of satisfaction with citizen-police encounters. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology*, 1, 281-292.
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. (2002). *Trust in the law*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2005). Determinants of public satisfaction with the police. *Police Quarterly*, 8, 279-297.
- Wells, W. (2007). Type of contact and evaluations of police officers: The effects of procedural justice across three types of police-citizen contacts. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 612-621.
- Wu, Y., Sun, I. V., & Triplett, R. A. (2009). Race, class, neighborhood context: Which matters more in measuring satisfaction with police? *Justice Quarterly*, 26, 125-156.