

Restore Police Legitimacy, Social Capital, and Policing Styles to Improve Police Community Relations

Dr. John Motsamai Modise
South African Police Service

Abstract:- The article contends that effective policing techniques should be employed simultaneously with the application of social capital, legitimacy, and trust in the police in order to strengthen police community relations. Research that demonstrated the existence of trust-building in police relationships and the efficacy of different strategies is used to support the thesis. Having positive relationships with the community they serve is said to increase a police department's effectiveness in reducing crime and disorder. Public support for the police is significantly influenced by the legitimacy of the organization. Enhancing police efforts to maintain peace, provide public safety, and battle crime depends greatly on public faith in community policing. Corruption and social unrest are bred by broken relationships between a community and the police.

According to Tyler (2006), the effectiveness of law enforcement and other authorities is determined on how people perceive their intentions when they interact with people. This is what Tyler and Huo (2002: 61) refer to as "inferences about the intentions behind actions, intentions that flow from a person's unobservable motivations and character." Trust has a special relationship to citizens' perceptions of police legitimacy, plays a role in the effectiveness of law enforcement, and is frequently associated to emotions of safety (Goldsmith, 2005). Although it is crucial, faith in the police is complicated and readily betrayed (Goldsmith, 2005). The truth is that "its extent and very existence depends upon a range of factors both within and outside police control" (Goldsmith, 2005: 444). Overall, civilians give tremendous weight to understanding the officer's sincere intentions during unavoidable confrontations (Tyler, 2005; Tyler & Huo, 2002).

Numerous academics have emphasized the significance of authorities' legitimacy in winning the public's support for their policies and regulations (Tyler, 1997; Weber, 1968). According to Sunshine & Tyler (2003:514), legitimacy is "a property of an authority or institution that leads people to feel that that authority or institution is entitled to be deferred to and obeyed." Scholars have recognized that legitimacy is a feature that is not merely instrumental in nature but rather represents a social value orientation toward authority and institutions since the classic writings of Weber (1968). That is, rather than out of fear of punishment for

disobedience, individuals defer to and obey an official direction or instruction issued by legitimate institutions because they respect (and accept) the institution's right to make those decisions.

Keywords:- Community Relations, Community Involvement, Public Trust in the Police, Police Effectiveness, Procedural Justice, Police-Community Relationship, Legitimacy; Policing; Social Capital.

I. INTRODUCTION

Human activities continue to be primarily focused on policing since police actions are so entwined with the public, despite the fact that scientific advancements have fueled the evolution of social systems. Since the foundation of the entire police system is public faith in the police, a significant body of study has underlined the significance and value of public trust in the police, and many police scholars have focused on this topic. According to earlier research (Nix et al., 2015; Tyler, 1990), increasing public trust in the police tends to increase the people's cooperation with law enforcement in order to prevent crimes, apprehend offenders, lessen public fear of crime, and improve neighborhood safety. In addition, increasing public trust in the police is essential for enhancing police legitimacy (Hawdon et al., 2003). In particular, when high levels of trust between police and the public are unjustified, the overall efficacy of the police may be lowered. Police departments are less likely to have public trust, support, collaboration, and voluntary compliance if officers carry out their duties in a way that is inconsistent with residents' expectations. On the other hand, if police departments continue to have high levels of public support, people will be more inclined to follow police orders, which lowers crime and disorder levels and enhances local quality of life.

There are conceptual and empirical differences between instrumental and expressive models of public trust in the police, according to recent studies (Bradford & Myhill, 2015; Jackson & Bradford, 2009; Jackson & Sunshine, 2007; Jang & Hwang, 2014; Sun et al., 2013). According to the instrumental viewpoint, citizens assess the police based on their capacity to deter crime, catch offenders, and efficiently maintain safety. On the other side, the expressive model proposes that the public's expressive worries about neighborhood disorder and community cohesion determine their faith in the police. That is, because

people believe the police are failing to uphold the moral framework and values of the community, higher levels of crime and lower levels of social cohesion in neighborhoods tend to erode public trust in the police (Jackson & Bradford, 2009; Jackson et al., 2012; Jackson & Sunshine, 2007).

In contrast, Tyler (2001, 2005) stated that in explaining citizens' faith in the police, citizens' perceptions of fair policing play a higher influence than police performance. More specifically, Tyler's studies show that public perceptions of police trust are influenced by the quality of care. This conclusion has been examined in terms of procedural justice in normative models, where assessments of the police's impartiality are the most crucial elements in such procedures (Bradford, 2014). Furthermore, police-created intergroup context assessments about legitimacy contribute to the degree of normative compliance with the law (Stott et al., 2012). In other words, the normative concerns that police personnel treat residents fairly, respect their rights, engage with citizens with respect, and listen to and care about citizens' problems have a significant impact on public trust in the police. Despite the fact that social systems have evolved as a result of scientific advancements, human activities continue to be primarily focused on policing due to the close connection between police and the general public. Since public faith in the police supports the entire police system, a significant body of study has underlined the significance and value of public trust in the police, and many police scholars have focused on this issue. Prior research has demonstrated that increasing public trust in the police tends to increase public cooperation with police in crime prevention, arresting offenders, lowering crime fear, and enhancing community safety (Nix et al., 2015; Tyler, 1990).

But more crucially, increasing public confidence in the police is essential for enhancing their legitimacy (Hawdon et al., 2003). Particularly, where there is no justification for large levels of public trust in law enforcement, that trust may reduce overall police effectiveness. Police agencies are less likely to have public confidence, support, collaboration, and voluntary compliance if officers carry out their tasks in a manner that is inconsistent with residents' expectations. On the other hand, if police departments are able to maintain a high degree of public confidence in their work, then people will be more inclined to follow police orders, which lowers crime and disorder levels and raises overall neighborhood quality of life. Between instrumental and expressive models of public trust in the police, there are conceptual and empirical distinctions (Bradford & Myhill, 2015; Jackson & Bradford, 2009; Jackson & Sunshine, 2007; Jang & Hwang, 2014; Sun et al., 2013). From an instrumental standpoint, people assess the police based on their capacity to deter crime, catch criminals in the act, and effectively preserve safety.

On the other side, the expressive model proposes that the public's expressive worries about neighborhood disorder and community cohesion determine their faith in the police. That is, because people believe the police are failing to uphold the moral framework and values of the community,

higher levels of crime and lower levels of social cohesion in neighborhoods tend to erode public trust in the police (Jackson & Bradford, 2009; Jackson et al., 2012; Jackson & Sunshine, 2007). Tyler (2001, 2005) stated that in determining why people trust the police, perceptions of fair policing among the public matter more than actual police performance. More specifically, Tyler's studies show that public perceptions of police trust are influenced by the quality of care. This conclusion has been examined in terms of procedural justice in normative models, where assessments of the police's impartiality are the most crucial elements in such procedures (Bradford, 2014).

Additionally, perceptions of the legitimacy in the intergroup setting that the police have produced influence the degree of normative compliance with the law (Stott et al., 2012). The normative concerns that police officers treat residents fairly, respect their rights, engage with citizens with respect, and listen to and care about citizens' problems, in other words, have a significant impact on the public's faith in the police. Many studies that looked at public trust in the police used one or even two of the three most popular models (instrumental, expressive, or normative models) as theoretical frameworks to explain the empirical relationships (Bradford & Myhill, 2015; Jackson & Bradford, 2009; Jackson & Sunshine, 2007; Jang & Hwang, 2014; Sun et al., 2013; Tyler, 2001, 2005).

Due in large part to widespread awareness of police abuse and violence against minority civilians raised by viral videos, demonstrations, and media attention to the issue, there are still very high tensions between the police and members of minority communities as well as widespread scrutiny of policing (Adegbile, et. al. 2017; Epp et al., 2017). Excessive use of force, intense monitoring of minority neighborhoods, racial profiling, and other forms of prejudice and discrimination are a few examples of abuse (Epp et al., 2017; Kearns, 2017; Patterson & Swan, 2016; Sewell, Horsford, Coleman, & Watkins, 2016). Many researchers have called for community policing implementation in response to these issues of policing and civilians' distrust of the police, as both community members and police officers can come together on core concerns such as public safety, liberty, and equality (Adegbile, 2017; Barthelemy et al., 2016; Epp et al., 2017; Kahn et al., 2018).

II. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical foundation for this study is the theory of collective efficacy. Collective efficacy, defined as the social cohesion of a community's members paired with their willingness to step in for the greater good, was first proposed by Sampson et al. (1997) as a possible explanation for why there is less crime and violence in a society. According to these writers, the social and organizational qualities of a community have a significant role in explaining and forecasting variations in crime rates (Sampson et al., 1997). This is in contrast to the aggregate demographic characteristics of individual community members. The ability of community members to regulate

group-level behaviors and restrict the appearance of social disorder is crucial for preserving order in the community, according to the authors. It is a concept at the neighborhood level where residents take responsibility and develop a sense of agency for the betterment of their local community, which represents the physical space where culture is shared, resources are made available by the government, social interaction occurs, and a sense of community is frequently created (Uchida, Swatt, Solomon, & Varano, 2014).

In the words of Uchida et al., (2014) state of sense of agency appears in various kinds of official and informal social control, which forecast and affect how a community functions. The ability of a person to act on behalf of his or her group due to shared objectives, values, and interests as well as the presence of trust among group members has also been termed as collective effectiveness. Without this personal initiative, collective impotence is probably going to rise, which could be detrimental to minority populations with high crime rates (Petrosino & Pace, 2015). Sampson et al. (1997) stressed that the presence of a sense of solidarity and mutual trust within the community is a prerequisite for residents' readiness to collaborate with the community for the common good. When there is mistrust and fear, informal social control is less likely to take place, and collective efficacy is compromised.

Destabilization brought on by demographic changes, including a high rate of residential movement, may also reduce a community's ability to function as a whole. Collective effectiveness may also be impacted by macroeconomic changes brought on by deindustrialization and the emigration of middle-class residents. Low-income people, single parents, and other minorities may experience increased social isolation as a result of racial and economic segregation, which may further undermine social control on a group level (Sampson et al., 1997). Sampson et al. (1997) used data from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN) to analyze 343 neighborhood clusters from 847 census tracts to evaluate their theory of collective efficacy.

The measurements were (a) informal social control and (b) social cohesiveness and trust, each using a five-item Likert scale. According to Sampson et al., home stability was positively correlated with collective efficacy whereas immigrant concentration was adversely correlated better levels of collective efficacy were also associated with better socioeconomic position and homeownership. The results of their investigation demonstrated that neighborhood instability and violence could be mediated by collective efficacy. Collective efficacy had a favorable influence on both the peace in the community and the harmful impacts of violence. The study's primary theoretical underpinning, collective efficacy, also suggests community policing as a practical method of boosting collective efficacy. Research on the connection between neighborhood perceptions of collective efficacy and levels of community trust was also done by Nix et al. (2015).

In a random sample of 1,681 people in a medium-sized city, these researchers assessed their perceptions of neighborhood context, collective efficacy, and trust (Nix et al., 2015). They discovered that community trust, which was significant according to Nix et al. (2015), was positively correlated with levels of collective efficacy. In evaluating disorder and crime at the community level, the investigations of Nix et al. (2015) were demonstrated to support the idea of collective efficacy. Cracked windows. The theory of broken windows policing, which postulates that signs of disorder could potentially increase crime and fear, both directly and indirectly (Abdullah, Marzbali, Bahauddin, & Tilaki, 2015), is another popular theory for analyzing neighborhood-level crime and violence and contributed to the theoretical underpinnings of this study.

Wilson and Kelling (1982) proposed the theory that disorder plays a significant role in the disintegration of communities and raises crime levels in an area. The "broken windows" hypothesis was implemented as a "no-tolerance" policy, which was predicated on the idea that putting a stop to small-time crime will deter major crime (Howell, 2016). Howell discovered that because of its emphasis on punitive measures, this strategy runs the risk of disregarding the needs of the community. The author went on to say that the broken windows theory might unfairly disadvantage minorities and exaggerate the effects of the interactions between the general public and the police. In addition, a systematic review of the literature by Braga, Welsh, and Schnell (2015) revealed that other police innovations, such as community policing, third-party policing, and hot spots policing, have been found to reduce serious crime beyond broken windows policing, which has been found to have little association with decreased crime. The assessment of these studies revealed that the theory of collective efficacy made for a better framework for this investigation.

The particular police officers that are active in the community were considered to be collectively effective in this study. By applying the recommendation of Sampson et al. (1997) to add formal social control by examining the perspective of police officers and police administrators, the deployment of specific police officers builds upon the proven notion of collective efficacy. In this study, collective efficacy was examined within the framework of CP, which entails the participation of the police, local people, and other stakeholders in the development and application of crime prevention initiatives (Pandey, 2014). The next parts go into more detail on the idea, objectives, and use of CP as well as the difficulties it faces.

III. COMMUNITY-POLICE RELATIONS

The demands or expectations of the public from the police are not limited to services that are of a criminal nature. In actuality, cops serve as family counselors, obstetricians, and socialization specialists for potential offenders. According to McNamara (1967:164), the combination of enforcement and service functions leads to disputes and uncertainty, which are only partially eliminated by seeking to separate the two functions. Due to public

demand for police to do duties other than those exclusively related to and of a criminal nature, patrolmen face considerable uncertainty and disagreement regarding their position. In the words of Sir Robert Peel, "the police are the public and the public are the police" (Braiden 1992). The police should not be distinct from the community, but rather should work together in conjunction with it, as this statement illustrates. The realization that the police cannot control crime and disturbance on their own was a major driver for the shift away from traditional policing. Police and the community are expected to work together to create safe and healthy neighborhoods through community policing (Parks et al. 1981, 1982). The collaborations can and ought to enable locals to take charge of their communities. According to Kelling (1988: 2-3) "police are to stimulate and buttress a community's ability to produce attractive neighborhoods and protect them against predators".

Maintaining public safety and successful policing depend on police agencies and the communities they serve developing strong relationships based on mutual trust. In order to gather information on crime in their communities and to collaborate with the police in coming up with solutions to problems related to crime and disorder, police authorities rely on community members' involvement. In a similar vein, a community's propensity to trust the police is based on whether or not they are seen as acting in accordance with community values and with the rules of procedural fairness and legitimacy.

Agency initiatives that encourage contact and acquaintance with jurisdiction inhabitants are crucial to this relationship. The use of a variety of strategies, such as long-term placements of officers' in particular geographic areas, foot and bike patrols, mini-stations in communities, community meetings, citizen police academies, and other forms of outreach like educational initiatives in schools and volunteer programs for citizens, helps agencies build stronger relationships with the public.

To truly establish a partnership with the community, as crucial these outreach programs are for fostering a positive police-community relationship, more actions are needed. Collaborative problem solving is one essential task. In order to identify the issues a community is facing, prioritize them, and create and implement workable solutions, police and residents collaborate in collaborative problem solving, as is covered in greater depth. In a real partnership, the police and the public jointly decide on significant choices affecting agency policies, procedures, and direction. This amount of public participation in the operation of the department could take a variety of shapes for example, locals' participation in chief's advisory councils or their involvement in personnel hiring, evaluation, and/or promotion; developing agency rules; or reviewing complaints.

The quantity and quality of decentralization, which are essential to improving cooperation between the police and the public, are also influenced by the form of the police organization (Davis et al., 2003). One of the methods for

bridging the gap between police forces and the communities they serve is community-oriented policing (COP). However, the evidence supporting COP's efficacy is unexpectedly weak. One of the best reforms for fostering cooperation and fostering trust between police officers and civilians has been hailed as community policing (or community-oriented policing, or COP) (Skogan and Hartnett, 1998). By increasing the quality and frequency of interactions between the public and the police (for example, through town hall meetings), as well as by expanding local participation in policing (for instance, through neighborhood watch teams), COP is seen to strengthen police-community relations. Some supporters of COP claim that COP lowers crime because as civilians are more inclined to collaborate with the police, the police may be better equipped to discourage criminals (International Association of Chiefs of Police, 2015). COP is widely used throughout the world (Brogden and Nijhar, 2013), but its effectiveness in lowering crime and boosting public confidence in and collaboration with the police is still poorly researched and understood, particularly in the Global South.

➤ *Transparent and Accountability in the Police*

Positive ties between the police and the community depend on transparency. When a significant incident occurs, authorities should work to provide as much information as quickly as possible about it, to avoid giving the impression that information is being withheld from the community on purpose. The first information to surface after a catastrophic occurrence is preliminary, and it may alter as new information becomes available. This must be emphasized at the same time. Police chiefs should swiftly clarify any inaccurate information and tell the public and the media that preliminary information may not be reliable.

➤ *Police be Visible in the Community and keep your Attention on the Value of Collaboration*

It is important for the police to be visible in their communities and know their residents. Many people do not interact with the police outside of enforcement contexts. This can result in people developing negative associations with the police – for example, if the only contact they have ever had with police consisted of receiving a traffic citation or calling the police to report being the victim of a crime. Finding opportunities to interact with community members in a non-enforcement context helps to reduce bias on the part of community members and police officers.

Getting to know community members enables both parties to overcome prejudices and personal obstacles, and it also enables officers to identify the law-abiding and non-law-abiding individuals of a neighborhood. Police executives frequently say that law-abiding citizens in high-crime areas dislike it when police act suspiciously toward everyone there, stopping young males walking to or from work or school, for example. Mutual trust is developed via personal interactions between police officers and community residents, which is crucial for tackling local issues and lowering crime. Local government representatives, police leaders, and community people should support the active participation of cops as

participants to help keep the peace. Police officials should regard themselves as part of the community they serve. Police representatives might be encouraged to take part in peace marches, watch local athletic events, attend neighborhood barbecues, or host outdoor community "movie nights" for children, for instance.

IV. COMPREHENSING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE POLICE AND THE POPULACE

Building trust between the police and the community is dependent on positive police-community relations. Police work becomes far less successful without this trust. People could not feel protected even if police are successfully deterring crime because there is little confidence.

➤ *Consent, Trust, Confidence, and Legality Driven Policing*

Respect for the law and collaboration with the police have a significant impact on effective policing (Tyler, 2011). The use of voluntary deterrence is particularly crucial because crime is "impractical for the police to be everywhere all of the time" (Tyler, 2004: 85). Similar to this, the public's assistance in the fight against crime through the identification of suspects and the reporting of crime in general is crucial to the police. For this, the concept of "policing by consent," also referred to as "consensus policing," is essential. Robert Peel's Nine Principles of Policing, which were published in 1829 and include, among other things, the need for public support of the police, was where this idea first appeared (Police Federation, 2008). Consensus policing occurs when the majority of the populace accepts the necessity of public policing and, as a result, abides by and assists with police action and procedures, however this is rarely considered to be true of all individuals (Jones et al., 1997). It is obvious that the police are carrying out the democratic will of the people when civilians support them.

Given that it is anticipated that public are knowledgeable about policing, this calls for police transparency. Similar to this, people should have a voice in policing choices. Without these components, policing would be done against residents rather than with them (Carty, 2008). The foundation of consent-based policing is the public's belief, assurance, and credibility in the police. According to Jones (2006:581):

"Police frequently serve as the state's most prominent power brokers. The preservation of police credibility in a democracy is crucial given that the police have the power to deny citizens their fundamental right to liberty".

It is important to understand the differences between legitimacy, trust, and confidence before moving forward. Despite the fact that trust and confidence aren't always clearly distinguished in the literature, Bradford et al. (2009: 2) offer a useful distinction by stating that "trust is something you do, and confidence is something you have." In this sense, public perception of encounters with law

enforcement is included by trust. Confidence determines how people regard police actions and procedures. Two opposing notions of police legitimacy have also been discussed in the literature; the second of these concepts was chosen for the current study due to its broader conceptualization. According to the first definition of legitimacy (Tankebe, 2012), legitimacy refers to a person's evaluation of the police's ability to wield their authority while seated in an acknowledged position of privilege. As a result, police theory (such as police impartiality) and practice (such as the police's ability to discourage and identify crime) can be used to evaluate trust and confidence. The extent to which a person feels bound to approve of the use of force is likewise covered by this idea. This is a collection of public viewpoints on police use of force during interactions.

This definition takes into account how people feel about how the police deal with crime because different people have different opinions about whether or not police methods are justified. But as Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) note, this first definition mainly focuses on how the public views the authority of the police. This disregards both how police personnel see their own legitimacy and how that legitimacy changes over the course of ongoing interactions between the police and the general public. As a result, the present study complies with Bottoms and Tankebe's (2012) second definition of legitimacy. In this definition, emphasis is put on how legitimacy is perceived by the public and by the police organization. According to a "right to rule" approach, this definition also inquires as to "whether a power-holder is justified in claiming the right to hold power over other citizens" (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012: 124–125). Given that prior studies have mostly concentrated on people's perceptions of police legitimacy, it is all the more important to understand how attitudes of police officers and police personnel affect perceptions of legitimacy.

Their conceptual framework has not yet been practically examined because the current study is the first to identify and describe whether and how police legitimacy resembles a dialogic approach. The authors argue that encounters between the public and the police give the latter an impression of legitimacy. They claim that as a result, the legitimacy of the police fluctuates throughout time and space. This highlights how crucial it is to understand attitudes regarding legitimacy both within the police organization and among civilians. According to Bottoms and Tankebe (2012), it's important to consider how police officers perceive their own legitimacy. The legitimacy of the power-holder is what Bottoms and Tankebe (2012:154) allude to in this context self-assurance growth on the morality of authority bearers' rule. In this sense, police officers are viewed as possessing power since their self-assurance in their capacity to enforce the law is evident.

The key to understanding these ideas is how police officers defend their actions. These components are also essential due to the fact that "the dual and interactive character of legitimacy, which necessarily involves both power-holders and audiences, has been largely neglected"

(Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012: 119). When there is congruence, power brokers and their audience accept police claims of legitimacy. The opposite of this is incongruence, which happens when people in authority have a strong sense of internal legitimacy but their audience does not. In these circumstances, persons in positions of authority, according to the authors, will reexamine their own claims to legitimacy.

Bottoms and Tankebe's (2012) argument that research must consider how police legitimacy is understood echoes Sklansky's (2005: 1829) earlier assertion that it's crucial to pay attention not only to police and citizen interactions but also to "the various internal policies and procedures that end up shaping who the police are." Bradford and Quinton (2014) refer to this as "self-legitimacy," and it also centers on police officers' confidence in their own authority. According to Bradford and Quinton (2014), understanding how the police engage with the general population on the outside requires an understanding of organizational dynamics within the police. Both organizational justice and internal procedural justice have been researched in this regard. According to Tyler (2014: 4), it's important to comprehend the "dignity, respect, and fairness" with which police officers are treated by police officers. Similar to how decision-making fairness (how decisions are made) and interactions between police officers (including being treated with decency and respect) are covered in procedural justice, organizational justice also includes these elements (Bradford et al., 2014). Organizational justice takes into account a number of factors, including distributive justice within the police. Research has not yet focused on how officers evaluate their treatment when they engage with citizens, despite the fact that these studies acknowledge officers' conceptions of procedural justice within the police organization. Later studies show that it examined procedural fairness from the standpoint of the citizen. Therefore, it's critical to understand how cops view citizens' fairness, decency, and respect toward them throughout interactions.

Recent research imply that these internal variables might affect how the police interact with the public on the outside. Police officers who feel they are treated fairly by their force and who identify as police officers, according to Bradford and Quinton (2014), have a greater sense of their own legitimacy. Furthermore, these officers are more inclined to support democratic policing standards like protecting citizens' rights. These ideas relate to Bottoms and Tankebe's (2012) dialogic theory, which holds that police legitimacy is relational. This suggests that internal issues inside the police department have an impact on how officers deal with citizens. It is important to keep in mind that, in Bradford and Quinton's (2014) study, the police participants were the only ones to reply to survey questions about their interpersonal ties and personal authority inside the police organization. On the other hand, by taking into consideration the perspectives of citizens as well, it might be able to appreciate how internal (inside the police organization) and external (between the police and people) components both effect police legitimacy. This in turn

highlights the significance of including public and police perspectives in the same study.

Despite the fact that these ideas focus on police legitimacy in an internal sense (i.e., perceptions relating to legitimacy within the police organization), Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) argue that it is important to understand how citizens judge police legitimacy. The public's perception of the police has been the subject of a lot of research up to this point. The instrumental and normative dimensions of legitimacy, consent, trust, and confidence have all been studied, according to a survey of the literature. It is critical to remember that other factors have also been connected to legitimacy, authorization, trust, and confidence. For instance, Ericson (2007) points out that attendees of significant sporting or musical events frequently provide their approval for the use of force by the police, such as having their baggage searched. Police visibility and mainstream media coverage have also been linked to police legitimacy and dependability (Hough and Roberts, 2004).

But considering instrumental and normative elements is important since they illustrate some of the cornerstones of democratic policing. Stone and Ward (2000: 16) use the term "what people should expect from the police is some assurance of safety and to be treated decently" to convey this idea. Safety is an instrumental concern as opposed to treatment by the police, which suggests a normative concern (Sargeant and Kochel, 2016). In 1990, Tom Tyler made the first mention of instrumental and normative models. The section that follows goes into additional depth regarding these models and argues that because they have not yet been investigated as connected concepts, the possible connections between the instrumental and normative models of policing are a key gap in the research on police legitimacy. The instrumental perspective is connected to the concept of deterrence and the assumption that the harshness of the penalty influences compliance. After interactions with the police, people will judge them favorably based on the results, particularly how much discretion the officers exercise (Tyler, 1997). Legitimacy has been discussed in relation to perceptions of victimization (becoming a victim of crime and fear of crime), police performance (how well the police fight crime), risk (likelihood that wrongdoers will be discovered), and distributive justice (how resources are distributed across society, including space and people) (Sunshine and Taylor, 2003).

From this vantage point, the police are responsible for preventing crime, reducing crime rates, and fostering a sense of security among the populace (Jackson et al., 2009). According to Bradford and Myhill (2015), this has also been referred to as "getting results" in other contexts. One instance, which is described in greater depth in the following chapter, is police communication that emphasizes "success stories" connected with preventing crime. Also in accordance with this point of view, police personnel are "militaristic strong men who are effective in deterring, investigating, and solving crime" (Davies et al., 2016: 458). However, all of the studies on instrumental policing models that are offered here focus only on how the general public

views the legitimacy of the police. Instead, the importance of combining both public and police perspectives in the same study is highlighted through a dialogic approach. It is possible to examine how the connections between citizen and police opinions relate to the relational element of police legitimacy by doing this.

On the other hand, several studies that focused on the significance of normative legitimacy determinants have built on Tyler's (1990) work and developed on it. In fact, the corpus of previous research mostly supports the idea that normative models of policing improve police legitimacy more than instrumental models (Mazerolle et al., 2013). A normative paradigm includes both the moral evaluations of police conduct and people's interactions with the police. The procedural justice approach is key to this. This assumes that people will comply and have faith and confidence in the police if they treat individuals fairly during encounters. According to Mazerolle (2013) and Tyler (2014), procedural justice consists of four components centered on the nature of interactions between the public and the police.

First of all, people should be able to communicate with officers in a two-way fashion and have their voices heard when new policies are being developed. This is covered in the following chapter in relation to two-way social media interaction between the police and the public. Second, views of impartiality are taken into account when evaluating police practices. This is demonstrated by openness and impartial judgment, which are somewhat akin to distributive justice. Thirdly, "dignity and politeness" are evaluated in relation to police behavior while dealing with citizens (Tyler, 2014: 10). Fourthly, citizens evaluate the police's institutional culture, which is aired, in terms of how much they represent the interests of their neighborhood. Expectations for law enforcement and views of reliability reflect this. Ben Bradford and colleagues identified the 'expressive' and symbolic aspect of police as the fourth component. When the police are seen to embody societal values and standards, an expressive model of policing is present (Bradford and Myhill, 2015).

It is crucial to keep in mind that quantitative surveys are at the foundation of Tom Tyler's work on normative legitimacy, particularly his work on procedural justice (see, for instance, Sunshine and Tyler, 2003; Tyler and Fagan, 2006). These studies have made an effort to determine the effect of pre-defined, fairness measures, primarily through statistical analysis. According to Harkin (2015), many subtleties are missed as a result of doing this. For instance, most people only sometimes deal with the police in person. Therefore, it is possible that variables other than personal experience affect how individuals see the police. Tom Tyler's work also places a strong emphasis on how the public views and experiences the police. Instead, in order to demonstrate how legitimacy is created throughout the discourse between the police and citizens, it is crucial to capture both police and citizen viewpoints from a dialogic approach.

➤ *Communication and Engagement Understanding*

The literature (Bessonov, 2008; Burchell et al., 2009; Tyagi and Misra, 2011) contains many definitions that are contradictory, overlap, and have different meanings. This makes it difficult to draw a clear distinction between "communication" and "engagement." The exchange of data, codes, and messages is widely believed to be the definition of "communication" when used specifically. Bessonov (2008) and Strehie (2014) claim that this has to do with the Latin roots of the word "communicare," which meaning "to inform or share" and "to make common."

Engagement implies a high level of involvement, emphasizing the need for a closer bond between the parties involved. Engagement is often described using phrases like participation, consultation, cooperation, and co-creation (Pearce, 2011; Laasch and Conaway, 2015). Participation serves as an example of the relationship between engagement and communication (Maile and Griffiths, 2014). According to Rowe and Frewer (2005), the phrases "public involvement" and "public engagement" are commonly used interchangeably in literature. The information discussed in the paragraphs that follow demonstrates how public organizations are now interacting with citizens rather than speaking at them. For understanding the change toward citizen-focused policing, which is described in the next section, this provides vital context. According to Oosthuizen (1995), the positivism ideology, which was taken into consideration in research and policy as a way of controlling human behavior in the first half of the twentieth century, caused early writers to create a positivist communication style. After much debate on how the media is to blame for the breakdown of social order and the rule of law in Western culture (Oosthuizen, 1995), this occurred.

The principal strategy for providing services was endorsed as managerialism, highlighting the need for efficiency and effectiveness akin to that of a corporate model. Thirdly, since the New Labour administration, engagement and participation have been emphasized in an effort to modernize the public sector and make it responsive to shifting community needs. Engagement was seen as a way to promote "active citizenship" and make public services more responsive to the needs of the public, with "improvement" once more being crucial. The transition from NPM to New Public Service is shown in this later stage (Brainard and McNutt, 2010). In light of this theory, one method for the police to interact with the public is through social media.

A variety of social institutions have highlighted the significance of citizen engagement. Public involvement has been highlighted in each of these as a way to enhance services. This beginning has been referred to as a "sea change" in science, denoting a change from engaging citizens to obtain their knowledge to interacting with them (primarily about education) (Burchell et al., 2009: 6). The Scottish Government (2004) stated that councils in Scotland are governed by "principles of effective engagement with communities." As stated in the Research Excellence

Framework, or REF as it is more popularly known (2019), public involvement has been acknowledged in academia as being two-way, meaning that researchers may increase awareness of their work and ensure that it will have an impact (Hamlyn et al., 2015). Using their own knowledge, abilities, and experiences, citizens can contribute to research (Hamlyn et al., 2015). In other places, policy underlined the necessity for 'deliberation' with public engagement in healthcare goals in the 1990s (Abelson et al., 2003).

This was understood as "the act of considering different points of view and coming to a reasoned decision" by Abelson et al. (2003: 241). There are two types of deliberation: "within government" (among elected officials) and "outside government" (including citizens in decision-making). According to Abelson et al. (2003), this has included "citizens' juries and planning cells," "citizens' panels," "consensus conferences," and "deliberative polling." Similar to the above, the thesis investigates the function of social media in citizen and police engagement with a focus on police legitimacy.

➤ *The Growth' of Citizen Focused Policing*

In a study by Wunsch and Hohl (2009), police departments nowadays must combat crime while also fostering goodwill with the public. Since the shift toward "public engagement" in the second half of the 20th century, this has been accelerated. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that citizen-focused practices were part of UK policing prior to the 1970s, with Henry and John Fielding, for instance, advocating close cooperation (particularly information sharing) between officers and London citizens and businesses in the 18th century (Rawlings, 1995). However, from the 1960s onward, both in the UK (Bradford et al., 2009) and the USA (Perry and Wise, 1990), there was a gradual decline in public trust in the state. Given that "government is distrusted in the Anglo-American tradition," Bayley and Shearing (1996: 600) contend that "democratic societies may fear crime, but they fear authoritarianism more." As was discussed in section 2.1, this prompted attempts to increase police legitimacy through "democratic renewal, performance improvement, and community capacity building" from the 1970s onward. This is part of a larger effort to modernize policing, according to Higgins (2018).

It's significant that, around the 1970s, police organizations were perceived as becoming less responsive to communities and more removed from them (Higgins, 2018). This was partly due to fewer officers having to monitor bigger areas, and it also happened at the same time as patrols in automobiles were introduced, which decreased the number of foot patrols and, consequently, the frequency of police-citizen interactions. "Providing a (literal) barrier between citizens and the police" is how Bullock (2014: 104) defines the introduction of automobiles into police organizations. As a result of austerity measures, the UK's police force is currently facing budget cuts (Millie, 2014). As the following section analyzes how the police use social media to engage with residents, this raises concerns about how much time police officers spend in their areas

interacting with locals. Since then, these factors have shaped citizen-focused police strategies (Bayley and Shearing, 1996). This can be characterized as police tactics meant to bridge the seeming gap between the public and the police. Similar to this, Terpstra and Fyfe (2019) assert that the police are now disengaged from the public by using the phrase "abstract police."

As will be covered in more detail in the sections that follow, policing under this umbrella has included neighborhood, community, and reassurance policing (Casey, 2008). 'Community policing' is a term that is frequently used in US policy, whilst 'community engagement' is a term that is frequently used in UK policy (Myhill, 2012). The same underlying idea underpins all of these strategies: "closer relationships between the police and the community" (Casey, 2008: 22). This acknowledges the neighborhood as an "active co-participant in the solution to neighbourhood problems" (Cosgrove and Ramshaw, 2015: 81). In a similar vein, this promotes state and police response to public expectations from a consumer politics perspective (Skogan, 1994).

In the opinion of Tyler and Fischer (2014), this also implies that the police can increase their legitimacy by paying attention to community issues. This once more emphasizes the need of comprehending how citizens perceive police legitimacy on social media. This developed in England and Wales through political movements influenced by the NPM model in the 1980s, which grew stronger under the New Labour administration beginning in 1997 (Mawby, 2010a). In the latter stage, policing was subject to tighter regulation and increased scrutiny, and it was necessary to provide a service that was both cost-effective and involved in "rebuilding the foundations of a strong civic society" (McLaughlin et al., 2001: 304).

It is significant to remember that community, reassurance, and neighborhood policing are not distinct concepts because there isn't a single set of acceptable standards for each more on this later. Community policing "lacks a clear definition" and can "mean different things to different people," according to Longstaff et al. (2015: 29). As a result, the following sections go into further detail about each of these policing paradigms and point out their parallels and distinctions.

Community, neighborhood, and reassurance policing with an emphasis on citizens argues that strong ties between the police and the public help to shape public perceptions of the legitimacy, trust, and confidence in the police. However, the literature discussed in this section also casts doubt on how much both residents and police wish to interact with each other.

V. RESTORING PUBLIC TRUST IN POLICE

Trust is defined as "the belief that something one believes should be done will be done, and the belief that something one believes should not be done, will not be done, the outcome of which will be beneficial to you or

another" (Boda, Medve-Bálint, 2017: 732). It also entails having faith that one's weakness won't be exploited (Levi, Stoker, 2000: 475). Trust implies that persons in positions of authority are dependable and valuable and that they make judgments based on the proper knowledge and motive thus it may be described as the idea that those who have the power to make a vital decision pursue acceptable outcomes (Jones, 2002). Implicit or overt expectations that people will behave in a certain way are also linked to trust. According to Cao (2014), "unquestioning belief in and reliance upon a group to which one belongs or a public institution established to protect citizens" can be used to describe public trust in general.

Because the public generally lacks awareness of police procedures and the skills to assess their performance, trust is a crucial concept for police agencies. A person's faith in the police is typically based on a little amount of personal experience that says little about the intents and traits of police (Jackson et al., 2012: 1054). In the words of Hardin (2002), the notion that police have the best interests of the public at heart and are capable of acting appropriately under specific conditions is what is meant by "public trust in police." In other words, the term "public trust in the police" refers to the public's confidence in law enforcement officials' moral character and ability to fulfill expectations for service. As a result, public confidence in police officers' ability to act in the best interests of the community and uphold the law is correlated with public trust (Tyler & Huo, 2002).

When the police are unable to gain the public's trust, they are less likely to be able to keep the peace, which could have severe effects for the community. Public faith in the police is essential to effective policing because it encourages people to gladly respect the law and work with the police because perceptions of legitimacy depend on public trust in the police (Bradford, 2014). Due to the nature of their jobs, such as crime prevention and criminal investigation, the police must voluntarily impose restrictions on citizens' rights and freedoms, but those who trust the police are more likely to do so. Accordingly, it is suggested that public confidence in the police is a requirement for effective police operations (Nix et al., 2015).

The following implications of public trust in the police are more specific. First, according to Jackson et al. (2012), trust in the police may encourage residents to follow the law. When people trust the police, it is expected that they will voluntarily follow the law. Otherwise, threats of or actual use of force can be used to coerce citizens into abiding by the law. In order to focus their resources on particular cases and circumstances where compliance has not been freely attained, police should rely on comprehensive and voluntary law-abiding activities (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler & Huo, 2002). Second, if people trust the police, they may be more willing to help them out. Citizens are more likely to report crimes, share information about offenders, and take part in crime prevention initiatives when they proactively work with the police (Nix et al., 2015; Tyler, 1990). Third, the police may

gain authority as a result of public trust. Citizens' aspirations to accept police discretionary judgment are linked to the empowerment.

Police can act at their discretion since individuals have given them permission to. Fourth, civilian view of police legitimacy may be influenced by public trust in the police. According to Tyler & Huo (2002), trustworthy police are perceived by the public as being efficient, fair, and committed to the community. Theoretical frameworks such as the instrumental, expressive, and normative models were primarily used in a large number of studies on public trust in the police to explain empirical relationships (Bradford & Myhill, 2015; Chambers et al., 2020; Jackson & Bradford, 2009; Jackson & Sunshine, 2007; Jang & Hwang, 2014; Park et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2013; Tyler, 2001, 2005).

➤ *Police Integrity and Community Trust*

There should always be community trust and police integrity. "There is a respected relationship between citizens and a government agency with police and community trust" (Community Trust and Police Integrity, p.7-16) Second, one must have faith in police personnel to act morally on their own. There is pressure to use excessive force after a heinous crime has occurred because the public may want the police to solve it "no matter what they have to do" (Wilson, Police Ethics). Finally, when a negative incidence occurs, police personnel should always respond positively. According to Walker in Policing the Police, "They can learn from incidents of police misconduct and take steps to correct the policies and practices that allow misconduct to occur."

VI. POLICE LEGITIMACY

Police organizations need legitimacy in order to fulfill their duties and conduct their duties in a way that is efficient, legal, and ethical (Tyler, 2003, 2011). In times of emergency, residents who believe the police to be legitimate are more likely to defer to them, cooperate with them more, and respect the laws they uphold and, to some extent, enforce (Cheng, 2020; Radburn and Stott, 2019; Tyler and Huo, 2002).

The police claim to be acting on behalf of and in partnership with people they are policing, but in the absence of legitimacy, they turn to ever-more oppressive, force-driven tactics. According to Tom Tyler's work on the procedural justice theory, one of the most effective ways to increase the credibility of justice officials is for them to treat people with respect and fairness, pay attention to what they have to say, and make just decisions (Tyler, 1990, 2001). According to research (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012; Mazerolle et al., 2012; Terrill et al., 2016), public trust in the police and perceptions of the police as legitimate have a significant impact on people's willingness to obey the law. Therefore, in light of the COVID-19 pandemic's uncertain times, Reicher and Stott (2020) contend that it is crucial for police officers to comprehend their impact, the idea of police legitimacy, and the principles of procedural justice. They should also make significant efforts to avoid instilling us versus them mentality.

The relationship between the state, the people, and their police is critically dependent on legitimacy. The idea of police legitimacy is intertwined with policing and the police. According to Weitzer and Reiner (1985: 4-8), a "specialized body of people given primary formal responsibility for legitimate force to safeguard security" is a "police officer." Public policing is thought to have a significant and symbolic connection with politics and the state that regulates social behaviors and upholds social security, despite the fact that there are many organizations offering security services to the public, such as private security firms (Mestrovic & Fenton, 1985; Rowe, 2013). To prevent this phrase from growing to refer to all actions that help to uphold social order, Reiner (2010: 5) advised limiting the concept of policing. Reiner defines policing as "the establishment of surveillance systems coupled with the threat of sanctions for deviance that is discovered."

The public police affiliated with the state are typically considered to have the right to carry out specific actions. As a result, it's crucial to consider what legitimacy means in general and with regard to police. According to policing studies, legitimacy serves as the cornerstone of police authority (Tyler, 2004; Tyler & Fagan, 2010). According to Arendt (1970), authority is a societal quality that can be bestowed on people, organizations, and social groups. It is defined by the unwavering consent of those who must be obeyed, without the necessity for compulsion or persuasion. In accordance with the National Research Council (2004) and Tyler & Wakslak (2006), a legitimate police force has public support, voluntary compliance, and public belief that the police power is legal and can be used in a responsible manner. Tyler stated that legitimacy in policing is essentially the feeling of obligation to comply with the choices and requests of the police (Tyler & Wakslak, 2006; Tyler 2006), expanding on the Weberian notion that legitimacy is defined as the belief of people that a regime is legitimate (Grafstein, 1960). Such submission to the law is voluntary; it is not motivated by a desire to avoid punishment or by any moral obligation to do so.

The notion that police uphold the prevalent moral ideals of society is another indicator of police legitimacy (Tankebe, 2009b). According to Hough et al. (2010), the power granted to the police to use is partially derived from a feeling of shared values and the ensuing group identification (Jackson & Foucault Welles, 2015). According to Beetham (1991: 69), who holds the opinion that rules need to be justified in light of the prevailing beliefs and values in a society, rules cannot enjoy moral authority for the exercise of their power, regardless of its legal validity, and their requirements cannot be normatively binding, even if they are successfully enforced. Beetham (1991) argues that the concept of legitimacy (Weber 1922, 1978) does not adequately account for features of legitimacy that are unrelated to ideas, such as compliance with the law, and he proposes the idea of "legitimacy-in-context" (Skinns et al., 2017; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). Instead than being limited to a few particular sorts of societies, this plan incorporates a structure of legitimacy that may be used by all communities. While it has been argued that societies from different areas

and notions share the same underlying structure of legitimacy despite social-structural, political, and cultural differences (Bottoms & Tankebe, 2012; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003),

Building on this, Tankebe (2013) went on to analyze the levels of legitimacy in the context of policing, identifying the two main pillars of police legitimacy as lawfulness and shared values. Beetham, further state that Lawfulness, often known as legality, is referred to as "the first and most fundamental level of legitimacy" (Beetham 1991: 16). In a liberal democratic society, the legitimacy of police power is built in the idea of the "rule of law" (Tamanaha, 2010), which emphasizes due process and equality, with equality being given through the generality of the law (Tamanaha, 2004). As a result, the legislation gives the police the right to use force during policing operations, such as stop and search. According to Tamanaha (2004), police officers are expected to operate impartially and objectively while adhering to the letter and spirit of the law. In addition, it is crucial that the police uphold the legal rights that the law has granted to individuals. For instance, they must treat the public with respect, give them time to make statements or explanations, and make just decisions when conducting arrests (Tamanaha, 2004; Tyler, 1990, 2004; Tyler & Fagan, 2008).

➤ *Procedural Justice*

Providing the public with symbolic resources is a component of procedural justice (Lerner & Clayton, 2011). The concept of procedural justice, which was pioneered by Tom Tyler, has been the subject of a wealth of research. Instead of examining the institutions that hold the authority to exercise that power, the focus is on how they do so (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 1990, 2004; Tyler). According to research, the existence of procedural justice fosters trust (Tyler, 2011). People are more inclined to trust the police institution if they believe that when they engage with the police, they will receive fair and responsive treatment from officers who are sincere and benevolent. People must, in particular, feel that the police respect them and their rights and, if they interact with the police that those officials are acting with their best interests in mind. This means that they will try to comprehend their issues and needs and provide solutions (Tracey, Meares, and Tyler, 2014).

Tom Tyler (1990) coined the phrase "procedural justice" to describe this process, emphasizing how police must utilize their authority in a way that upholds the law and results in just outcomes. When enforcing the law, police in England and Wales are given some latitude; for instance, they are permitted to search people and vehicles without a warrant in certain circumstances. The public's support and cooperation during interactions between the police and specific citizens depend on procedural justice. Although it has been suggested that there is a disconnect between legal requirements and on-the-ground police actions (Crank, 2014), the legality of police is crucial for the public's perception of the legitimacy of police.

As a key component of the legitimation process, shared values serve a variety of practical purposes (Bradford et al., 2012; Tankebe, 2013). In a concrete setting, societal consensus on shared views and values institutionalizes the acceptable source of power and specifies the traits needed to exert that authority. Citizens only abide by the law to the extent that it represents accepted societal norms, which necessitates the consent of both those in positions of authority and those who are subject to it (Beetham, 1991; Coicaud, 2002).

Therefore, the police are regarded as a legitimate authority when they uphold the law in a manner that is acknowledged by both themselves and the people they are upholding it against. However, in a community made up of people from various backgrounds, the idea of shared values between the police and the public is problematic. People from various minority ethnic backgrounds may hold different ideas and values, and policing may be used disproportionately, which causes a variety in how they interact with the police. While attitudes and confidence toward the police have shown an upward tendency among many sociodemographic groups in recent years, confidence from black and ethnic minority groups has remained substantially and continuously lower (Bradford, 2011). Police are required to engage with and represent the values and conventions of other groups in order to garner their support, in addition to that of the white middle-class people. In this setting, public support and trust are key to increasing police legitimacy (Loader & Mulcahy, 2012; Reiner & Newburn, 2000; Weitzer & Reiner, 1985). These perceptions of police engagement with the community are a key component in garnering public support and trust.

Tyler argued that rather than adhering to instrumental requirements, people mostly obey the law for normative reasons because they believe the authorities have the right to enforce the law. Tyler supported this claim by using interviews with citizens in Chicago to investigate their attitudes, experiences, behavior, and expectations of law enforcement. Additionally, how people were treated in the criminal justice system, such as during court cases or run-ins with the police, had a significant impact on and influence on their belief in the legitimacy of authorities. As stated by Skynns et al. (2017), 603; Tyler (2011); Tyler, Fagan, & Geller (2014), this treatment also known as a "teachable moment"—is essential for creating or undermining the public's perceptions of the legitimacy of police and the consequent substance of people's cooperation and compliance.

Performance or effectiveness, which focuses on the police ability to achieve effective and robust results in combating crime and disorder and increasing the risk of sanctions for wrongdoers, is the final normative expectation arising from the idea of shared values (Tyler, 2004). The influence of legitimacy and police effectiveness on the public's compliance and cooperation with the police is frequently examined in literature that focuses on police effectiveness (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Kochel et al., 2013; Tankebe, 2008). On the one hand, legal authorities can

employ rewards to promote compliance and obedience, but on the other hand, they must demonstrate that their actions are in the best interests of society and that they fulfill a normative standard that calls for competence and effectiveness in their work (Beetham, 1991). In order to fulfill both an instrumental role and a normative requirement for increasing legitimacy based on the social contract, the police would need to demonstrate effectiveness in their policing operations, including combating crime and preventing unrest (Coicaud, 2002).

Additionally, from a utilitarian standpoint, Tankebe (2009) discovered that in poor countries like Ghana, police efficacy is strongly correlated with locals' willingness to collaborate. He proposed that in areas with high levels of violence and police corruption, the duty to follow the police—that is, the legitimacy of the police—is derived not from consent but rather from assessments of the current efficiency of the police in preventing crime. The basis of legitimacy, according to Tyler and colleagues (2007), can affect the consequences. Accordingly, compliance is not solely the result of a moral or normative foundation but also results from instrumental or utilitarian factors, such as fear or intimidation (Kochel et al., 2013). As a result, compliance does not reflect the legitimacy of the police and does not have the same impact as obedience that is founded on consent from the public (Tankebe, 2009a).

The character of police legitimacy in this situation, namely free consent, is in conflict with police effectiveness (Lipset, 1959). However, taking into account the interests of the public is crucial in separating the utilitarian consideration from the normative requirements of collaboration in terms of police efficacy, as Tankebe (2012) asserted in his later research. According to Bottoms and Tankebe (2012: 149), self-legitimacy is another aspect of police legitimacy in addition to lawfulness and shared values. They believed that the self-awareness of being legitimate and having rights to use power by police themselves are vital to strengthen police legitimacy internally. This is referred to as "power-holder legitimacy," which refers to "the self-belief that rulers have in their moral right to govern." Police self-legitimacy is a requirement for audience legitimacy, meaning that they may only assert their claims to those who are subject to their decisions when they, as the holders of authority, believe in the moral propriety of their own legitimacy (Barker, 2001). Boulding (1976) proposed that the perception of self-legitimacy, sometimes known as "internal legitimacy," may be advantageous for the stability and efficacy of authority because its loss can result in "disorganization of behavior and an inability to perform an assigned role."

According to research on procedural justice, people will obey the law when they believe the authorities to be legitimate state actors (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Murphy, 2009; Murphy & Cherney, 2012; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 2006). According to Sunshine & Tyler (2003:514), "a property of an authority that leads people to feel that the authority or institution is entitled to be deferred to and obeyed" is what is meant by legitimacy. Public perceptions

of legitimacy are best preserved when adherence to the law is motivated by an internal duty to do so, even when doing so conflicts with personal interests (Tyler, 2006; Tyler & Huo, 2002).

Tyler (2006) stated that when actors are seen to be acting in a way that is procedurally just, legitimacy is established (see also Tyler & Huo, 2002). This usually results from a balanced and mutually beneficial relationship between the public and the police, in which the latter encourage public support by encouraging public participation and by acting procedurally justly through impartial decision-making, demonstrated through nondiscriminatory and respectful interpersonal treatment (Tyler, 2006; Tyler & Huo, 2002).

According to Murphy, Mazerolle, and Bennett (2014) and Tyler (2006), citizens typically gauge procedurally just behavior during unplanned encounters with officers by evaluating the presence or absence of four process-based criteria: voice or participation during the unplanned encounter, perceived fairness of police treatment, respectful interpersonal treatment, and trust in police motivations. Overall, a substantial body of research has shown a direct connection between procedural justice and perceived legitimacy across a variety of contexts and populations, including law-abiding citizens (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Mazerolle, Bennett, Davis, Sargeant, & Manning, 2013; Murphy, 2009; Paternoster, Brame, & Bachman, 1997; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 2006; Tyler & Fagan, 2008; Tyler & Waks Additionaly, there is evidence to support the notion that some police procedures, such as stop, question, and frisk (SQF) and maintaining order policing, can diminish police legitimacy (Gau & Brunson, 2010) and increase public mistrust of the police (Fratello et al., 2013; Rios, 2011).

As there is little guidance given to specific officers, this is a result of the application of ambiguous or too broad statutes (Roberts, 1999; see also Chicago v. Morales, 1999). Officers may make judgments in these situations based on a suspect's race (Durán, 2013; Mastrofski, Reisig, & McCluskey, 2002), gender (Brunson, 2007; Brunson & Miller, 2006), attire (Miller, 1995), or the environment of the neighborhood in which the interaction occurs (Kane, 2002; Terrill & Reisig, 2003).

More importantly, as society has become more diverse, the assessment of how the public views the police as legitimate and trustworthy has changed from the "sacred" (where the police have an iconic status to maintain a well-ordered England) to the "profane" (where the state police serve as just another public service), and the public confidence is now "tentative and brittle... to be renegotiated case by case" (Reiner & Newburn, 2000z; 162). Accordingly, police legitimacy is dialogic and entails both audience responses and claims of legitimacy made by the police (Bottoms & Tankebe, 2012). In particular, the police will have to first defend the legitimacy of their use of force before being ready to make new claims of legitimacy when a relevant audience rejects all or part of their initial ones.

VII. BUILDING SOCIAL CAPITAL EFFICIENTLY

Existence or absence of social capital may also play a role in the success or failure of community policing initiatives. Social capital, also known as the networks of trust and mutual assistance between people, enables community members to access resources that lower poverty and criminal activity. According to Robert Putnam, social capital refers to "characteristics of social organizations such as networks, norms, and trust that facilitate action and cooperation for mutual benefit" (Hawdon, 2008: 189).

Social capital is more than merely interaction, as Fukuyama (1999) reminds us; interaction is what inspires collaboration. Externalities resulting from social capital can be both beneficial and detrimental. For instance, mafias and gang members cooperate with one another, but they also have a lot of bad externalities that affect society as a whole (Fukuyama, 1999). Residents have easier access to resources including education, employment, social support, and neighborhood safety because of the organized networks that make up social capital (Ginwright, 2007). To use Fukuyama's economic terminology, these would be favorable externalities. Densely structured networks increase social capital, foster trust, and lower the risk of uncertainty (Coleman, 1988, 1990). According to Hawkins and Andrew (2007), social capital lowers the transaction costs that encourage cooperative conduct.

➤ *Engagement in the Community and Social Capital*

Structure, relationships, and cognition all play a role in social capital (Leana & Pil, 2006; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). The degree of information sharing between actors is referred to as the structural component of social capital. Cooperation and mutual accountability may be improved through exchanging information (Sparrowe, Liden, Wayne, & Kramer, 2001). The trust between actors is a key component of the relational element, which deals with the interpersonal connections that members of a network have made over time (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In the absence of explicit mechanisms to promote such behaviors, developing trust improves group and collaborative activity (Coleman, 1988). The formation of a common vision is related to the cognitive component of social capital. In other words, as members of a network communicate with one another, they can establish a common set of objectives, which in turn encourages a sense of shared accountability and group action (Coleman, 1988).

People with shared values and objectives are more likely to have strong relationships, which makes them more likely to trust one another, interact frequently, and exchange information (Leana & Pil, 2006). As a result, the cognitive component of social capital both reinforces and is reinforced by the structural and relational components. Social capital theory serves as the foundation for the community engagement intervention's design and implementation. To develop social capital in a local community area, the intervention specifically attempted to encourage a paradigm shift in how the police and their partners view and interact with individuals in a local community. The police are better

positioned to build relationships with citizens if they construct a community engagement intervention that views citizens as resources to be actively harnessed in the upkeep of their environment, as opposed to passive customers to be appeased (Fisher & Ritchie, 2015). Building strong relationships should lead to citizens having more positive opinions of the police and having less fear of crime since they will feel safer in their neighborhood knowing that support is there if required (Vieno, Lenzi, Roccato, Russo, & Monaci, 2016). Based on the conviction that the community engagement intervention will provide favorable results in the region where it was applied.

➤ *Social Capital and Criminal Fear*

According to previous research (Buonanno et al., 2009; Deller & Deller, 2010; Lederman et al., 2002; Moore & Recker, 2016), social capital has a favorable impact on reducing crime. According to research conducted in the UK, there is a "perception gap" between real crime statistics and public perceptions of crime (Duffy, Wake, Burrows, & Bremner, 2008; Flatley, 2015). This suggests that public perceptions of crime may be more important than actual crime.

According to Smith (2007: 44), if crime decreases but people do not notice and feel it, their quality of life is impacted and the advantages of decreased crime are not being realized. According to empirical studies conducted outside of the UK, people are less afraid of crime in communities with higher levels of social capital (Vieno et al., 2016; Yuan & McNeeley, 2016). There isn't much actual data to date supporting this association in the UK. But Jackson and Bradford (2009) discovered a link between social cohesion (i.e., the number of people in a community known and trusted) and fear of crime, suggesting that the less people a person knows and trusts, the less likely they are to be afraid of crime.

➤ *Social Standing and Views of the Police*

Additionally, we contend that social capital will enhance public opinion of law enforcement. We specifically assess people's opinions of police community focus and their level of trust in the police. The co-production of community norms and values is likely to occur in settings with high levels of social capital (Coleman, 1988), and the co-production of community values will likely result in a tighter relationship with government service providers like the police (MacDonald & Stokes, 2006).

In the US, MacDonald and Stokes discovered a favorable correlation between people's assessments of neighborhood social capital and their faith in the police. In the UK, it has been demonstrated that low expectations of police performance are associated to worries about long-term social change in the neighborhood (such as if residents do not have a sense of belonging there) (Jackson & Bradford, 2009).

➤ *Relationships between Social Capital and Crime and Local Area Potency*

We believe that the intervention will boost the potential of the local region while also aiming to improve community engagement through fostering social capital. This claim is supported by research conducted by Gibson and colleagues in 2002, who looked at how fear of crime varied according to social integration and opinions of group efficacy in three US cities. They demonstrated that while collective efficacy was a greater predictor and mediated the association between social integration and fear of crime, social integration was still a significant initial factor in predicting fear of crime. (Kawachi & Berkman, 2000) The notions of social capital and social integration are interrelated.

Creating social capital is probably the first step in increasing local area potential. The stronger the sense of familiarity that residents should have, the more they should be able to trust one another, share information, and create a common vision for the community. We contend that people will develop a feeling of the community's strength and potential if they experience a sense of familiarity with other members of it. Because local area potency should make people feel safer and encourage them to have favorable attitudes of the police, we anticipate that it will act as a moderator in the links between social capital and project-specific outcomes. Although there isn't any concrete evidence to back up these associations, prior studies on the connections between collective efficacy and crime (such as those by Gibson et al. (2002) and Jackson & Bradford (2009) corroborate this hypothesis. According to Gibson et al. (2002), collective efficacy acted as a mediator between social integration and criminal dread. Jackson and Bradford (2009) found that in the UK, worries about views of collective efficacy were linked to worries about long-term social change in the community, which in turn predicted worries about crime and low expectations for police performance. In a US sample, Nix, Wolfe, Rojek, and Kaminski (2015) found a positive correlation between views of collective efficacy and trust in the police.

➤ *Efforts to Increase Social Capital*

According to Fisher and Ritchie (2015), public service organizations can boost their effectiveness in community involvement by building social capital in local community areas, which leads to the realization of favorable outcomes for citizens. A nine-month program of delivery is followed by training public sector employees in alternative community involvement strategies. The goal of the intervention's design is to make it possible for public service organizations to encourage and support the growth of a more civic society in local communities, where residents are encouraged to participate in creating and maintaining their environment.

VIII. MODELS AND EXAMPLES OF EFFECTIVE POLICING

➤ *Community Orientated Policing*

A good and effective method for a department to engage with its community is through the practice of community-oriented policing. According to Fisher-Stewart (2007), community-oriented policing is a model that integrates organizational change, problem-solving, and community cooperation. Instead of having a single set of rules or a predetermined checklist, a community-oriented policing program is defined by a cooperative effort between the public and the police to proactively increase community safety (Fisher-Stewart, 2007).

Police management, operations, and tactics are all governed by the philosophy of community-focused policing. The strategy lays a great emphasis on developing a relationship between the community and the police in order to manage problems that directly affect the needs of the involved community (Chappell, 2009). The policing model proposes that cooperation between the police and the community will lessen crime and fear while improving relations between the two, allowing for quicker responses to distress calls and routine service requests. Cooperation between the police and the public is one of the main objectives of community-based policing (Alpert & Dunham, 1986). Additionally, the community may evaluate problems, create solutions, and implement truly community-based services. Neighborhood policing, problem solving, and community policing are just a few of the policing strategies that are part of the Community Oriented Policing (C.O.P.) (American Law Legal Information, 2014).

The main tenet of it is that, in order to effectively carry out their duties, the police should use more resources than just traditional law enforcement, and they should use community policing in particular to reduce and prevent the problems that crimes cause (Oliver, 2007). This necessitates that the police work tirelessly to create an environment where residents willingly and actively support their law enforcement partners. Community-based police should encourage and improve organizational structures and strategies that enable the methodical application of problem-solving techniques and partnership in order to pro-actively address the urgent situations that give rise to public safety.

➤ *Democratic Policing*

According to de Mesquita Neto, democratic policing is when "the police are accountable to the rule of law and the community, respect the rights and guarantee the security of all citizens in a non-discriminatory manner" (Haberfeld & Gideon, 2008: 8). The majority of transitional countries can benefit from democratic policing. The police are the most obvious example of governmental authority, according to the OSCE (2006: 130), and they carry out the most overt, immediate, and intrusive activities to safeguard the safety of both individuals and entire communities. In accordance with David Bayley's argument in 1998, political legitimacy for all world regimes has come to be defined by representational democracy. Between democracy and human rights, there is a

strong reciprocal dependency. As a methodology that aids in restoring the legitimacy of public administration, democratic policing is frequently promoted. (OSCE, 2010: 38–39) lists the following as the fundamental tenets of democratic policing.

Democratic policing entails at least three things: (1) the police must uphold the law; (2) they must be held accountable; and (3) they must treat everyone fairly when conducting investigations. There are several subcategories that fall under each of these: attempting to foster an environment of security that supports democracy; accountable to the law, not a law unto itself; accountable to democratic structures and the community; transparent in its operations; prioritizing the safety and rights of individuals and groups and protecting human rights; offering professional and ethical services; representing the community it serves; structured to best achieve these ends; and democratic.

- *Democratic Policing Identifies Nine Dimensions that are Necessary, Including:*

✓ *Knowledge:*

Police officers are very talented at what they do and can apply their skills to higher levels of employment. Knowing what works is the foundation of good policing. Thus, the core of this dimension is capacity development to carry out a certain job function. Data are used by managers to assess policing, pinpoint successes and setbacks, and draw conclusions. Professionalism calls for expertise in a specific field, like accountancy or medical. (Evetts, 2003: 400) According to Evetts, "Professions are involved in birth, survival, physical and emotional health, conflict resolution and law-based social order, finance and credit information, educational attainment and socialization, construction and the built environment, military engagement, peace-keeping and security, entertainment and leisure, religion, and our negotiations with the afterlife.

✓ *Effectiveness and Efficiency:*

In a democratic society, effective policing is the successful upkeep of a climate of trust, safety, and order in which the general population attributes their ability to go about their everyday lives fearlessly to the quality of the services they receive. What and how much the police have accomplished in the eyes of the people ultimately determines how effective the police.

✓ *Efficiency:*

Refers to the use of resources in a cost-effective manner. A program's outputs or results are compared to its expenses in an evaluation of efficiency. Ideally, a monetary value is assigned to the benefits resulting from activities, and this is contrasted with the program's costs. The majority of the time, nevertheless, it is impossible to accurately quantify outputs and outcomes in monetary terms. In these circumstances, the evaluation of efficiency places a strong emphasis on ratios like the number of homes served per million Rand invested. When evaluating cost-effectiveness, one considers whether the advantages of the output might

have been produced for less money. The degree to which a program "achieved results at a lower cost compared with alternatives" is known as cost effectiveness. When the program is not the least expensive alternative or technique to achieve the same or equivalent outputs and outcomes, there are shortcomings in cost-effectiveness. The extent to which anything achieves the desired outcome is its effectiveness. The costs involved are not taken into account. A program could be successful but inefficient or expensive.

✓ *Ethics and Accountability:*

Police actions are moral and legal. Criminals are held responsible. Effective internal accountability measures, like as disciplinary procedures, are supported by robust external checks and balances. In order to change illegal behavior and institutional policies that support it, police hold one another accountable for disciplinary violations and criminal activity (including corruption). The policed develop trust via honest and ethical policing. In the spirit of cooperative governance, the many branches of government work together.

✓ *Rights-based:*

The principles of transparency, fairness, equality, and justice are the cornerstones upon which policing is built. Human rights are also upheld and protected. The constitution protects everyone's rights, even those of suspects. Everyone is treated equally. A key component of democratic policing is a police force that upholds, defends, and supports the human rights of all individuals, suspects and victims in particular. International law maintains a number of fundamental rights important to democratic policing, even though emphasis on certain rights may vary between nations. But recognizing fundamental rights in theory is one thing; upholding them in reality is quite another.

✓ *Police as Citizens:*

The constitution safeguards police officers' rights in their contacts with the public and with fellow officers. Police are given fair treatment. The discussion that came before was almost entirely concerned with how the public is affected by policing and what the police should or should not do to preserve the rights of individuals and groups. However, it should be noted that police officers are both State employees and citizens. The impact that police work can have on an officer's physical and mental health should also be addressed. The constitution guarantees the rights of police officers, and those rights must be upheld whenever they contact with other police officers or the general public. These realities are acknowledged, and it helps police-public relations. Where police don't think they work for organizationally just, democratic organizations, one can't expect democratic, procedurally just policing.

✓ *Objectivity:*

Police actions are impartial and unbiased. It does not favor any particular people or group. Protecting democratic political life is the responsibility of the police (together with other stakeholders). In the world of law and justice, notions like objectivity, impartiality, being unbiased, reasonableness, and rationality are closely intertwined.

Objective is defined as "expressing or dealing with facts or conditions as perceived without distortion by personal feelings, prejudices, or interpretations" in the Merriam Webster Dictionary. A police officer is required to be unbiased, treat individuals fairly and without prejudice, and to come at reasonable and logical judgments. These aspirational ideas, or values, exist because we inherently anticipate equality of treatment and do not want to be adversely affected by (unfavorable) individual or group perceptions held by police officers.

✓ *Responsivity:*

Police employ community-centered policing and are receptive to the interests of the general public and crime victims. Many proponents of "professional policing" place a strong focus on outputs as indicators of police effectiveness, including response times, arrests, and reported crime (Rossler and Terrill, 2012: 3–24). Policing is far more than these measures suggest, though. It's crucial to take into account how an officer responds to the needs that the public expresses when they deal with them (Rossler and Terrill, 2012: 3-23). A key element of democratic policing is police responsiveness (Holdaway, 2015: 588–604).

✓ *Empathy:*

Police show compassion for citizens and crime victims. Responsivity is broader than empathy. Understanding another person's circumstances is the most typical definition of empathy (Henderson, 1987: 1574). However, according to Henderson, there are three additional meanings that this word can convey: experiencing another person's emotion; understanding another person's experience or situation, both affectively and cognitively, often by putting oneself in that person's shoes; and taking action as a result of witnessing another person's distress (Henderson, 1987: 1574).

✓ *Trust:*

Police are trusted by the population. With particular regard to the variety of a population, special attention is made to how approachable and accessible the police is perceived to be. Trust implies a result linked to some form of risk to one's ultimate welfare rather than being merely a mental state. Trust in police is also influenced by perceptions of their effectiveness and competency. People will likely consider the police to be successful and have more faith in them if they are seen as competent in conducting investigations and deliver expected results in catching criminals or managing crisis situations brought on by accidents, riots, extreme weather, etc. (Boda, & Medve-Bálint, 2017). People are more likely to trust police, uphold the law without them, and collaborate with them if they perceive that they treat everyone equitably (Independent Police Commission, 2013: 32–33). Trust will erode if people think police are abusive, inept, or unprofessional. According to empirical data, views of police efficacy are positively correlated with police trust. The public is more likely to cooperate with the police and view them as genuine when they are seen as operating in a fair manner (Norman, 2009: 364–372).

➤ *Human Rights Policing*

In 2004, the UN enhanced its Pocket Book on Human Rights for the Police, making it a convenient and portable resource for law enforcement personnel. It is divided into the key human rights concerns for the police, including inquiries, custody, arrest, and the use of force. The Pocket Book begins by stating that all states and their agents, including law enforcement officers, are "obliged to know, and to apply, international standards for human rights." A human rights practice calls for the adoption of a thorough human rights policy by police organizations, the incorporation of international human rights standards into police standing orders, periodic human rights training for all police, as well as cooperation between police organizations and national and international human rights organizations. The Pocket Book also includes several other chapters, such as one against discriminatory conduct, and a chapter on ethical and legal conduct, which covers all human rights criteria.

Five interactive modules make up Amnesty International's training manual on human rights policing: a basic overview of policing, the use of force, arrest and detention, police accountability, and engaging the police. Human rights are a pillar of policing in nations that are undergoing or have undergone police reform. This is the case in Northern Ireland, where the Human Rights Act 1998's implementation in October 2000 helped to formally establish human rights-based policing in a way that hadn't been possible before.

➤ *Community Policing*

'Traditional values' are frequently used to describe community policing, which is a term that refers to the principles that guide how policing is conducted (Bullock, 2014). Community policing is frequently viewed in this way as "a particular philosophy or type of locally based policing" (Myhill, 2012: 20). Indeed, according to Myhill (2012), this is a fundamental distinction from neighborhood policing, which only refers to a particular policing program in England and Wales, despite the fact that both have similar characteristics that are highlighted. Community policing represents a philosophical departure from the idea that the police's only job is to fight crime. The police job that revolves around "order maintenance, social service, and general assistance" is instead recognized (Cordner, 2014: 434).

Community policing encourages residents to participate in "local police priorities and to develop creative solutions to community problems" (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990: 15). While community policing promotes collaboration with communities to combat crime, policing has occasionally come under fire for perceiving "the police as the experts" (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990, p. 14). "Bottom-up" accountability may result from this" (Bailey and Shearing, 1996: 596). This has a connection to Police Scotland's (2016) recent "Your View Counts" poll, which asked residents to contribute to policing priorities (mostly through social media). As a result, this

starts to demonstrate how social media can be utilized by the police to interact with the public.

Community policing is a philosophy of policing that is based on the notion that crime-related issues in the neighborhood will be lessened, the physical conditions of the community will be improved, and the residents will feel safer if the police and the citizens of the community work together strategically and creatively to prevent and fight crime (Amadi, 2014). According to Ngwu and Ahuruonye (2017), the term "community" has been used to describe people who share at least one of the following characteristics: (a) communities based on geographical areas; (b) communities based on frequency of social interaction; and (c) communities based on a common tie like social life, awareness of their homogeneity, or common norms. To ensure the success of CP, Laru-an and Beup (2015) underlined the importance of considering the community as a stakeholder.

CP has been compared to democracy in action because it involves all parties with an interest in the community's well-being, including the local government, prominent citizens and businesspeople, public and private organizations, churches, residents, schools, and hospitals (Semboja, Silla, & Musuguri, 2016). Refocused police strategy, citizen partnerships, and problem-solving are the three main components of CP (Amadi, 2014; Gill et al., 2014; Maguire, Johnson, Kuhns, & Apostolos, 2017).

- *The OSCE (2008a: 13) supports two fundamental tenets of the community policing model: the need for (greater) community integration and the enhancement of the police's credibility through policing by consent:*
 - ✓ Be observable and reachable by the general public;
 - ✓ Be well-known to the general public;
 - ✓ Attend to the needs of the community;
 - ✓ Pay attention to community concerns;
 - ✓ Activate and include local communities;
 - ✓ Accept responsibility for their actions and the results of those actions.
- *Important Methods for Putting these Ideas into Reality Include:*
 - ✓ Designating fixed-geographic neighborhoods where police personnel are employed permanently;
 - ✓ Establishing clearly visible and reachable police personnel and facilities; Refocusing patrol operations to prioritize non-emergency services and engaging communities;
 - ✓ Implementing a proactive approach to problem-solving; Including all departments and services of government;
 - ✓ Including all police divisions (Trojanowicz et al., 1998).

➤ *Problem-Oriented Policing*

Diagnose and address issues that are raising the risk of crime in locations that are typically experiencing relatively high levels of crime (i.e., "hot spots") is problem-oriented policing (POP). POP is difficult since authorities must

identify and address issues that could pertain to a variety of issues that contribute to crime. The foundation of problem-oriented policing (POP) is a thorough examination of the issues that the police attempt to solve. POP's core tenet is that the police force actively pursues collaboration with the public and the private sector. It is problem-oriented, preventive, and responsive in character. The efficacy of police performance is rigorously analyzed as one of POP's key components. The results of these examinations are made available so that the police can learn from them. Since the 1970s, POP has been marketed as an alternative to conventional techniques of policing.

➤ *Neighbourhood Policing*

Neighborhood policing is defined by the UK's National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) as policing that is carried out in close proximity to the public or to the community. Special Constables, Local Authority Wardens, and Police Community Support Officers all play significant roles. According to the NPIA, key components of neighborhood policing include access to local police through a designated point of contact, community members' ability to influence policing priorities, joint actions with partners and the public, interventions, and answers, which include feedback and solutions.

According to NPIA, neighborhood policing entails interacting with local communities to learn about their goals and concerns, to raise police visibility, and to collaborate with them to address issues that are important to them. The basic tenet is public consent, much like the community policing paradigm. A web-based national tool that assists local police forces in interacting with local communities and resolving local issues has been created and made available in the UK.

➤ *Reassurance Policing*

Martin Innes developed the theoretical foundation for the neighborhood policing strategy known as "reassurance policing." The model's main goal is to combine the indications of crime with (improving the responsiveness of) police forces. The early involvement in the escalation of crime or public annoyance is encouraged by the reassuring paradigm. The strategy is based on three key tenets: targeting "signal crimes" and "signal disorders"; high visibility patrols carried out by police officers who are well-known to the public; and informal social control used by the local communities (see, for instance, Fielding and Innes, 2006; Millie and Herrington, 2005).

A criminal incident that alters the public's behavior or sense of their security is known as a signal crime. A social disorder is a violation of social norms and may be a sign of additional dangers. These "signals" are significant because they relate to the subjective-collective feeling of unease and the early identification of a situation that is about to get worse. These could include persistent neighborhood issues like anti-social behavior, graffiti, dog feces, and criminal damage, which are disproportionately to blame for the public's perception of risk and fear despite being low-level

but highly visible to a significant portion of the community as part of their daily routine.

➤ *Citizen Focused Policing*

The goal of citizen-focused policing is to enhance public trust in the police. The National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) in the United Kingdom has amassed knowledge and best practices in the area of citizen-focused policing. It is asserted that it is crucial to acknowledge that not all community members are equally motivated to cooperate with the police. According to reports, several UK police departments have started using resource-based technology and so-called customer insight techniques to better understand the communities they serve and "segment" individuals.

There are many ways to get in touch with these communities to learn "what's up" and how they prefer to be involved, including the Partners and Communities. Together gatherings, Street Briefings, regular attendance at events like fairs and supermarkets, high-visibility patrols, and volunteer opportunities are all recommended. Engaging with residents online via social media platforms like Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, as well as interactive websites, has recently been included.

➤ *Value-Based Policing*

An antagonistic approach by police leadership would be contrary to its values, and it would attempt to refocus on ownership and a participatory model. Value-centered police leadership is built on a common understanding of ethical standards, providing the "customer" with the maximum value, and rewarding employees based on the value they bring to their organization. A code of ethics and organizational core principles are essential components of this strategy. Pre-selection screening is emphasized as being crucial in value-based policing.

Police performance can also be evaluated by the public based on the values that they uphold. Policing can be based on values. Fairness in the legal process is a crucial component of societal legitimacy. An instrumental model of police legitimacy, proposed by Sunshine and Tyler (2003: 514) contends that the public will accept the police when they are perceived as establishing reliable sanctions for offenders (risk), successfully suppressing crime and criminal activity (performance), and equitably allocating police services (distributive fairness). As it is difficult for police to carry out their regulatory job when the public is polarized, a value-based policing strategy aims to avoid unfavorable attitudes and poor trust levels. According to Sunshine and Taylor's research from 2003, citizens value a process-oriented police department that promotes procedural justice more than the instrumental legitimacy model, which is frequently promoted by politicians successful police performance.

➤ *Nodal Policing*

Local capacity, knowledge retrieval, and self-direction, according to Shearing and Wood (2003), who developed a theory of nodal policing that is primarily applied in the

context of South Africa, are crucial factors in rebuilding governance relationships in settings where there is a gulf in the level of trust that citizens have in their government. Nodal policing strategies are predicated on the idea that security is provided not just by central state authorities but also by non-central authorities, the private sector, and the unorganized sector. Not everyone has access to security services equally in nations where there are significant wealth disparities.

For instance, the UNODC believes that trade liberalization and globalization are two of the primary forces behind worldwide organized crime, including human trafficking. With the help of local field personnel, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) launched a nodal policing programme in India. These nodal officers serve as a liaison between the police and the public and have the ability to work internationally.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

There are similarities in the fundamental tenets of various policing models, such as democratic policing and community policing. Interaction, response, and ownership are examples of these overlaps. A more comprehensive model for economic development, social fairness, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, and respect for human rights and the rule of law than an ethics-focused model of police is that of human security (Den Boer & De Wilde, 2008: 10). By striving for social cohesion, identity, community, and social stability while fostering high levels of citizen engagement, this is meant to be taken positively. All of the policing models we discussed above have application in various societies, but the human rights policing, democratic policing, and nodal (as in co-production) policing models have had a positive impact on the restoration of stability, peace, order, and trust in societies that have experienced violent conflict.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abdullah, A., Marzbali, M. H., Bahauddin, A., & Tilaki, M. J. M. (2015). Broken windows and collective efficacy: Do they affect fear of crime? *SAGE Open*, 5(1). doi:10.1177/2158244014564361.
- [2]. Abelson, J. Forest, P.G. Eyles, J. Smith, P. Martin, E. Gauvin, F.P. (2003) Deliberations about deliberative methods: issues in the design and evaluation of public participation processes'. *Social science & medicine*. 57(2) pp.239-251.
- [3]. Adegbile. A. Sarpon. D. Meissner. D. 2017. Strategic Foresight for Innovation Management: A Review and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management* 14(04). DOI: 10.1142/S0219877017500195.
- [4]. Arendt, H. (1990). *On revolution*. London: Penguin Books.
- [5]. Barthelemy, J., Church, W., Changey, C., & Maccio, E. (2016). Law enforcement perceptions of their relationship with the community: Law enforcement surveys and community focus groups. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 26(3/4), 413-429. doi:10.1080/10911359.2016.1139992.
- [6]. Bayley; D. H. Shearing. C. 1996. The Future of Policing. *Law & Society Review*, Vol. 30, No. 3. (1996), pp. 585-606. *Law & Society Review* is currently published by Law and Society Association.URL: <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0023-9216%281996%2930%3A3%3C585%3ATFOP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-2>
- [7]. Bessonov, A.B. (2008) 'Communication Processes: Role, Place, Content'. *Technicheskaya Informatsiya, Seriya. 1* (7) pp.1-13.
- [8]. Boda,Z. Medve-Bálint. G. 2017. How perceptions and personal contact matter: The individual-level determinants of trust in police in Hungary. *Policing and society*, volume 27, issue 7, p. 732 – 749.
- [9]. Bradford B. (2014). Policing and social identity: Procedural justice, inclusion and cooperation between police and public. *Policing & Society*, 24(1), 22–43.
- [10]. Bradford B., Myhill A. (2015). Triggers of change to public confidence in the police and criminal justice system: Findings from the crime survey for England and Wales panel experiment. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 15(1), 23–43.
- [11]. Bradford, B., & Quinton, P. (2014). Self-legitimacy, police culture and support for democratic policing in an English constabulary. *British Journal of Criminology*, 54(6), 1023–1046. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azu053>
- [12]. Braga, A. A., Welsh, B. C., & Schnell, C. (2015). Can policing disorder reduce crime? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 52(4), 567-588. doi:10.1177/0022427815576576.
- [13]. Braiden, Chris. 1992. "Enriching Traditional Police Roles." *Police Management: Issues and Perspectives*. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, p. 108.
- [14]. Brogden, M., & Nijhar, P. (2013). *Community policing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- [15]. Burchell, K. Franklin, S. Holden, K. (2009) *Public culture as Professional science*. London: Bios.
- [16]. Burchell, K. Franklin, S. Holden, K. (2009) *Public culture as Professional science*. London: Bios.
- [17]. Cao, L. (2014), "Aboriginal people and confidence in the police", *Canadian Journal of Criminology*
- [18]. Carty K (2008) *Guidebook on Democratic Policing* (2nd edn). Vienna: Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.
- [19]. Casey, L. (2008), *Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime: A Review by Louise Casey*. London: Cabinet Office.
- [20]. Cheng T. (2020). 'Input Without Influence: The Silence and Scripts of Police and Community Relations.' *Social Problems* 67(1): 171–189.

- [21]. Cosgrove, F. and Ramshaw, P. (2015) 'It Is What You Do as Well as The Way That You Do It: The Value and Deployment of PCSOs in Achieving Public Engagement'. *Policing and Society*, 25(1), pp. 77-96.
- [22]. Davis, R. and C.Merrick (2003) 'Community Policing: Variations on The Western Model in the Developing World,' *Police Practice and Research* 4(3):285-300.
- [23]. Epp, C. R., Maynard-Moody, S., & Haider-Markel, D. (2017). Beyond profiling: The institutional sources of racial disparities in policing. *Public Administration Review*, 77(2), 168–178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12702>.
- [24]. Gau, J. M. and Brunson, R. K. (2010). 'Procedural Justice and Order Maintenance Policing: A Study of Inner-city Young Men's Perceptions of Police Legitimacy'. *Justice quarterly* 27(2), 255–279.
- [25]. Goldsmith A. Police reform and the problem of trust. *Theoretical Criminology*. 2005; 9:443–470.
- [26]. Goldstein J (1960) Police discretion not to invoke the criminal process: Low-visibility decisions in the administration of justice. *Yale Law Journal* 69(4): 401–437
- [27]. Hamlyn, B. Shanahan, M. Lewis, H. O'Donoghue, E. Hanson, T. (2015) Factors affecting public engagement by researchers: A study on behalf of a consortium of UK public research funders DECEMBER 2015. Available from: http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/stellent/groups/corporate_site/@msh_grants/documents/web_document/wtp060033.pdf. Accessed 2nd January 2022
- [28]. Harkin, D. (2015a), "The police and punishment: understanding the pains of policing", *Theoretical Criminology*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 43-58.
- [29]. Harkin, D. (2015b), "Police legitimacy, ideology and qualitative methods: a critique of procedural justice theory", *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 594-612.
- [30]. Hawdon, J. Ryan, J. 2003. Policing Tactics and Perceptions of Police Legitimacy. *Police Quarterly* 6(4):469-491. DOI: 10.1177/1098611103253503.
- [31]. Higgins, A. (2018). *The Future of Neighborhood Policing*. London: The Police Foundation. http://www.police-foundation.org.uk/2017/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/TPFJ6112-Neighbourhood-Policing-Report-WEB_2.pdf (accessed 07 January 2022).
- [32]. Hough, M. and Roberts, J., V. (2004) *Confidence in Justice: an international review* London: ICPR Institute.
- [33]. International Association of Chiefs of Police (2015). *International association of chiefs of police 2015 social media survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.iacpsocialmedia.org/wpcontent/uploads/2017/01/FULL-2015-Social-Media-Survey-Results.compressed.pdf>
- [34]. Jackson J., Bradford B. (2009). Crime, policing and social order: On the expressive nature of public confidence in policing. *British Journal of Sociology*, 60(3), 493–521.
- [35]. Jackson J., Bradford B., Hough M., Myhill A., Quinton P., Tyler T. R. (2012). Why do people comply with the law? Legitimacy and the influence of legal institutions. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 52(6), 1051–1071
- [36]. Jackson J., Sunshine J. (2007). Public confidence in policing: A neo-Durkheimian perspectives. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 47(2), 214–233.
- [37]. Jang H. (2014). Determinant of confidence in the police: Comparison between instrumental perspective and expressive perspective. *Korean Association of Public Safety and Criminal Justice Review*, 23(1), 239–262.
- [38]. Jones, T. and Newburn, T. (1997) *Policing After the Act*. London: Policy Studies.
- [39]. Kahn, K., McMahon, J., & Stewart, G. (2018). Misinterpreting danger? Stereotype threat, pre-attack indicators, and police-citizen interactions. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 33(1), 45-54. doi:10.1007/s11896-017-9233-1
- [40]. Kearns, E. (2017). Why are some officers more supportive of community policing with minorities than others? *Justice Quarterly*, 34(7), 1213-1245.
- [41]. Kelling, George L. 1988. "Police and Communities: The Quiet Revolution." In *Perspective on Policing*, no. 1 Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, and the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Reprinted in Willard M. Oliver, ed. 2000. *Community Policing: Classical Readings*, 60–70. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- [42]. Kochel, T. R. (2016). Police legitimacy and resident cooperation in crime hotspots: Effects of victimisation risk and collective efficacy. *Policing and Society*
- [43]. Laasch, O. Conaway, R.N. (2015) *Principles of responsible management: Glocal sustainability, responsibility and ethics*. Mason: Cengage.
- [44]. Lerner M and Clayton S (2011) *Justice and Self-Interest: Two Fundamental Motives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [45]. Longstaff, A. Willer, J. Chapman, J. Czarnomski, S. Graham, J. (2015) *Neighbourhood policing: Past, present and future*. The Police Foundation. pp.25-31.
- [46]. Lori Brainard. L. John G. McNutt. G. J. 2010. Virtual Government–Citizen Relations. Article in *Administration & Society* · November 2010. DOI: 10.1177/0095399710386308
- [47]. Mawby, R. (2010a) 'Police corporate communications, crime reporting and the shaping of policing news'. *Policing and Society*. 20 (1) pp.124-139.

- [48]. Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Antrobus, E., & Tyler, T. (2013). Shaping citizen perceptions of police legitimacy: A randomized field trial of procedural justice. *Criminology*, 51(1), 33-63. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00289.x
- [49]. Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E., & Manning, M. (2013). Procedural justice and police legitimacy: A systematic review of the research evidence. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 9(3), 245-274. doi: 10.1007/s11292-013-9175-2
- [50]. McNamara, J. (1967) "Uncertainties in Police Work: Recruits' Back- grounds and Training," in D. Bordua (ed.) *The Police: Six Sociological Essays*. New York: John Wiley.
- [51]. McLaughlin, E., Hughes, G. and Muncie, J. (2001). 'The permanent revolution: New Labour, new public management and the modernisation of criminal justice'. *Criminal Justice and Criminology*. 3(3) pp. 301-318.
- [52]. Mestrovic, S. G., & Fenton, S. (1985). Durkheim and Modern Sociology. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 36(4), 638.
- [53]. Millie, A. (2014a) Reassurance Policing and Signal Crimes. in Bruinsma, G. and Weisburd, D. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*. New York: Springer.
- [54]. Nix J, Wolfe SE, Rojek J, Kaminski R (2015) Trust in the police: the influence of procedural justice and perceived collective efficacy. *Crime Delinq* 61:610–640.
- [55]. Pandey, V. (2014). Community policing for conflict resolution and community resilience. *International Journal of Social Work and Human Services Practice*, 12(6), 228- 233. Retrieved from http://www.hrpub.org/journals/jour_info.php?id=92.
- [56]. Parks, Roger B., Paula C. Baker, Larry Kiser, Ronald Oakerson, Elinor Ostrom, Vincent Ostrom, Stephen L. Percy, Martha B. Vandivort, Gordon P. Whitaker, and Rick Wilson. 1981. "Consumers as Coproducers of Public Services." *Policy Studies Journal* 9 (Summer): 1001–1011.
- [57]. Patterson, G., & Swan, P. (2016). Police shootings of unarmed African American males: A systematic review. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 26(3-4), 267-278. doi:10.1080/10911359.2015.1125204
- [58]. Pearce, K. (2011) *Public engagement and civic maturity: A public dialogue consortium perspective*. Raleigh, NC: Pearce Associates.
- [59]. Perry, J.L. and Wise, L.R. (1990) 'The motivational bases of public service'. *Public administration review*. pp. 367-373
- [60]. Petrosino, C., & Pace, J. (2015). Social cohesion, collective efficacy, and the response of a Cape Verdean community to hate crime: Learning a new reality. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(13), 1681-1697. doi:10.1177/0002764215588818.
- [61]. Police Federation (2008) *The Office of Constable. The bedrock of modern day British policing*. Surrey: Police Federation
- [62]. Radburn M., Stott C., Bradford B., Robinson M. (2018). 'When Is Policing Fair? Groups, Identity and Judgements of the Procedural Justice of Coercive Crowd Policing.' *Policing and Society* 28(6): 647–664.
- [63]. Rawlings, P. (1995) 'The idea of Policing: A history'. *Policing and Society*. 5 (2) pp.12— 149.
- [64]. Rogers, E.M. (1986) *Communication technology: The new media in society*. Oxford: Maxwell Macmillan International.
- [65]. Rowe, G. Frewer, L.J. (2005) 'A typology of public engagement mechanisms'. *Science, Technology & Human Values*. 30 (2) pp.251-290.
- [66]. Rowe, M. (2013). Policing beyond Macpherson: Issues in policing, race and society. In *Policing Beyond Macpherson: Issues in Policing, Race and Society*.
- [67]. Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918-924. doi:10.1126/science.277.5328.918
- [68]. Scottish Government (2004) *Community Planning*. Available from: <https://www2.gov.scot/Publications/2004/04/19167/35261>. Accessed 1st January 2019. Scottish Government (2009) *Independent Review of Policing in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Crown Copyright.
- [69]. Sewell, W., Horsford, C., Coleman, K., & Watkins, C. (2016). Vile vigilance: An integrated theoretical framework for understanding the state of Black surveillance. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 26(3/4), 287-302. doi:10.1080/10911359.2015.1127735
- [70]. Skinns, Layla, Lindsey Rice, Amy Sprawson, and Andrew Wooff (2017) "Police legitimacy in context: an exploration of "soft" power in police custody in England." *Policing: An International Journal* 40(3): 601-613.
- [71]. Sklansky, D.A. 2005. 'Police and democracy'. *Michigan Law Review*, 103:1699-1830
- [72]. Skogan, W. and Hartnett, S., (1998) *Community Policing: Chicago Style*, Oxford University Press: New York
- [73]. Sprott J. B., Doob A. N. (2009). The effect of urban neighborhood disorder on evaluations of the police and courts. *Crime and Delinquency*, 55, 339–362.
- [74]. Stone, C and Ward, H (2001) *Democratic Policing: A framework for Action*, in *Policing and Society* Vol. 10 pp. 11-45.
- [75]. Strehie, M. (2014) 'Latin Etymologies in Communication Terminology'. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*. (7). pp.56-61.
- [76]. Sun I. Y., Hu R., Wong D. F., He X., Li J. C. (2013). One country, three populations: Trust in police among migrants, villagers, and urbanites in China. *Social Science Research*, 42(6), 1737–1749.
- [77]. Tamanaha, B.Z., 2004. *On the rule of law: history, politics, theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- [78]. Tankebe J. (2009). Self-help, policing, and procedural justice: Ghanaian vigilantism and the rule of law. *Law & Society Review*, 43, 245–270.
- [79]. Terpstra, J. and Fyfe, N.R. 2014. Policy processes and police reform: examining similarities and differences between Scotland and the Netherlands. *International journal of law, crime and justice*, 42 (4), 366–383.
- [80]. Trickner R., Tyler T. R., Goff P. (2015). *Justice from within: How a procedurally just organizational climate promotes organizational efficiency, endorsement of democratic policing, and officer well-being*. Unpublished manuscript, Yale Law School, New Haven, CT.
- [81]. Tyagi, K. Misra, P. (2011) Professional Communication. New Delhi: PHI Learning.
- [82]. Tyler T. R. (1984). The role of perceived injustice in defendant's evaluations of their courtroom experience. *Law & Society Review*, 18, 51–74.
- [83]. Tyler T. R. (2006a). Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 375–400.
- [84]. Tyler T. R. (2006b). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [85]. Tyler T. R., Fagan J. (2008). Why do people cooperate with the police? *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6, 231–275.
- [86]. Tyler T. R., Fagan J., Geller J. (2014). Street stops and police legitimacy: Teachable moments in young urban men's legal socialization. *Journal of Experimental Legal Studies*, 11(4), 751–785.
- [87]. Tyler T. R., Huo Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law*. New York, NY: Russell-Sage.
- [88]. Tyler T. R., Jackson J. (2014). Popular legitimacy and the exercise of legal authority: Motivating compliance, cooperation and engagement. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 20, 78–95.
- [89]. Tyler T. R., Jackson J., Mentovich A. (2015). The consequences of being an object of suspicion. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 12, 602–636.
- [90]. Tyler T. R., Lind E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In Zanna M. P. (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 115–191). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- [91]. Tyler T. R., Schulhofer S. J., Huq A. Z. (2010). Legitimacy and deterrence effects in counter-terrorism policing. *Law & Society Review*, 44, 365–402.
- [92]. Tyler T. R., Sevier J. (2014). How do the courts create popular legitimacy? *Albany Law Review*, 77, 101–143.
- [93]. Tyler T. R., Sherman L. W., Strang H., Barnes G. C., Woods D. J. (2007). Reintegrative shaming, procedural justice, and recidivism: The engagement of offenders' psychological mechanisms in the Canberra RISE drinking-and-driving experiment. *Law & Society Review*, 41, 553–586.
- [94]. Tyler T. R., Wakslak C. (2004). Profiling and the legitimacy of the police: Procedural justice, attributions of motive, and the acceptance of social authority. *Criminology*, 42, 13–42.
- [95]. Tyler TR (1990) Why people obey the law. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- [96]. Tyler, Tom R., Robert J. Boeckmann, Heather J. Smith, & Yuen J. Huo (1997) Social Justice in a Diverse Society. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- [97]. Uchida, C. D., Swatt, M. L., Solomon, S. E., & Varano, S. (2014). Neighborhoods and crime: Collective efficacy and social cohesion in Miami-Dade County. Retrieved from <https://www.nij.gov/topics/crime/Pages/collective-efficacy-and-socialcohesion.aspx>
- [98]. Weber, Max (1968) Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology, G. Roth & C. Wittich, eds. New York: Bedminster Press.
- [99]. Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken windows: The police and public safety. *Atlantic Monthly*, 29–38. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1982/03/broken-windows/304465>.
- [100]. Wunsch D. and Hohl K. (2009) Evidencing a good practice model of police communication. *Policing* 3(4): 331-339.