

Self-legitimacy, police culture and support for democratic policing in an English Constabulary

Ben Bradford, University of Oxford*
Paul Quinton, College for Policing

* Corresponding author: Centre for Criminology, University of Oxford, Manor Road Building, Manor Road, Oxford OX1 2UQ. Email: ben.bradford@crim.ox.ac.uk. Tel: +44(0)1865 281927. Fax +44(0)1865 281924.

Word count (including abstract, footnotes, references, tables and appendix): **11,076**

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Justice Tankebe, Nigel Fielding and two anonymous BJC reviewers for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Thanks are also due to Durham Constabulary for fielding the survey and allowing us access to their data.

Self-legitimacy, police culture and support for democratic policing in an English Constabulary

Abstract

When do police officers feel confident in their own authority? What factors influence their sense of their own legitimacy? What is the effect of such 'self-legitimacy' on the way they think about policing? This paper addresses these questions using a survey of police officers working in an English constabulary. We find that the most powerful predictor of officers' confidence in their own authority is identification with their organization, itself something strongly associated with perceptions of the procedural justice of senior management. A greater sense of self-legitimacy is in turn linked to greater commitment to democratic modes of policing. Finally, we find that this sense of legitimacy is embedded in a matrix of identities and cultural adaptations within the police organization.

Key words

Organizational justice, self-legitimacy, democratic policing.

Introduction

What influences police officers' perceptions of their own legitimacy, and when do they have confidence in the authority vested in them? While much is known about what shapes the legitimacy of the police in the eyes of the public, much less is known about the factors that may shape the 'self-legitimacy' of the police. Yet this aspect of legitimacy may have important effects on the way officers behave and, through this, on the types of policing they are able to deliver. An officer, organizational unit or force that lacked confidence in their own legitimacy might, for example, develop a very different set of values and practices, and relationships with those they police, than individuals or units more certain of the authority vested in them and, consequently, of their place within the criminal justice system and indeed wider society. More broadly, work on democracy and policing (and democracy *in* policing) has suggested that organizational configurations – officers' sense of their place in their organization and the relationships they have with both it and external stakeholders – can serve to either promote or inhibit normatively desirable modes of policing. Organizational configurations may thus have implications for the maintenance and reproduction of democratically viable modes of order maintenance (Loader and Walker 2007; Manning 2010; Sklansky 2005, 2008; Tankebe 2014).

Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) recently challenged those working on legitimacy in criminal justice settings to consider the issue of 'power-holder legitimacy', in particular "the degree of self-belief ... (law enforcement officers) have in [the] moral rightness of their own claims to exercise power" (ibid: 141). They identified a number of potential sources of such legitimacy, including: the relationships between officers themselves, between line officers and managers, and between police and public; issues of social identity; and the position of the police with broader sets of power relations. Many other factors might be added to this list, such as the idea that the legitimacy of the police stems from its legal status (as enforcer of the law), and the widespread notion, within and without the police service, that it is the 'thin blue line' separating order from chaos (Bottoms and Tankebe 2012).

In this paper we describe results from a survey designed to test some of these ideas. Officers and police staff working in Durham Constabulary were surveyed on-line in the summer of 2012, in part as a follow up to a similar study conducted a year previously (Bradford et al. 2013). Analysis suggests that, in this force at least, officers' sense of their own legitimacy was premised in a fundamental manner on the extent to which they felt a positive identification with their police organization, with such identification itself founded in assessments of organizational justice. Officers confident in their own legitimacy tended to have more positive attitudes toward procedurally just policing, and have more favourable views about the importance of suspects' rights and the use of force. By contrast, those officers who were more cynical and authoritarian in their attitudes, which we describe below as a particular cultural adaptation within the police organization, were less certain of their own legitimacy, and less inclined to support procedurally just, rights-based policing.

Our contribution in this paper is thus threefold. First, we provide one of the first empirical investigations of the correlates of self-legitimacy among police officers (see Jonathan-Zamir and Harpaz 2014 for another). Second, we begin the task of exploring the implications of self-legitimacy – specifically, in relation to its association with attitudes concerning ways of 'doing' policing. Finally, ours is one of the few studies that seek to explore police culture using surveys and, thus, complements the existing body of largely ethnographic studies on the subject.

Democratic policing and organizational justice

The huge range of tasks police undertake necessitates that officers feel confident in the authority vested in them, not least because such confidence may enable them to use their discretion to maximum effect. Police need to feel able, and willing, to utilise their extensive

powers to provide the kind of proximate solutions to the exigent, multifarious social dilemmas they face when doing their job (Bittner 1970; Manning 2010). Officers' sense of the moral basis of their authority and the rectitude of their monopolization of legitimate force, for example,¹ may be important factors shaping such confidence, providing a firm basis of justification for the often difficult decisions they must make (Bottoms and Tankebe 2012). Yet, it is important that this discretion is regulated by organizational rules, the law and wider ethical and social values. The solutions offered by the police should respect the rights of those affected; physical force should be used proportionately and only when necessary; and, as is increasingly apparent from research on procedural justice, policing should be delivered in as open, honest, and respectful a manner as possible. Not only is such policing desirable in ethical terms, it is also likely to garner greater public cooperation, deference and compliance (Jackson et al. 2012; Mazerolle et al. 2013; Tyler 2006; Tyler and Huo 2002).

The internal structures of police organizations are important because they condition the ability, and indeed desire, of officers to deliver such styles of policing, and it is argued that police organizations structured along democratic lines will be better placed to do so (Sklansky 2008). Internal democracy makes for a happier, more confident, workforce with greater support for organizational programmes and goals. Democratic processes within police organizations may also have the effect of 'teaching' police officers – encouraging them to internalize – democratic values. As Sklansky (ibid: 122-123) notes:

"The police are often placed in positions where they can actively support or actively threaten democratic activities: they can protect political protesters, for example, or they can attack them; they can help create a climate of respect for individual privacy and autonomy, or they can make privacy insecure and nonconformity difficult; they can enforce norms of tolerance, or they can reinforce bias and prejudice; they can teach citizens that authority may safely be challenged, or they can teach the opposite".

In essence, the claim here is that internally democratic police organizations will operate in ways likely to foster or reinforce democratically desirable modes of policing. This begs two questions, though. What does democratic policing 'look like' externally and what do democratic police organizations 'look like' internally?

The first question is, for present purposes, rather easier to answer than the second. Among the set of criteria provided by Manning (2010: 65-66) a number stand out. Democratic policing respects the rights of all those who come into contact with officers, and, in such a context, the latter behave in as procedurally fair manner as possible. Democratic police organizations are careful not to use excessive force, and exercise physical force proportionately and only when it is absolutely necessary to do so. They are also accountable and responsible for their actions within systems of governance based on principles of citizen participation, equity, responsiveness and a prioritisation of service, a wide distribution of power, the provision of information and clear avenues for redress (see also Jones et al. 2012).

We should note at the outset that our main interest in this paper is not 'democratic policing' in and of itself. We do not set out to explore the extent to which Durham Constabulary, or wider British police service, actually behave in the ways described by Sklansky, Manning and others. Nor do we intend to devote much attention to the theoretical and normative issues that surround the concept itself (for example the extent to which 'high' policing (Brodeur 2010) can or should be democratic). Rather we take a pragmatic approach: the types of behaviours described above seem to us beneficial in their own right, and are elements of police practice that should be encouraged if at all possible, quite aside from any

¹ For all that this monopolization may be increasingly notional (Brodeur 2010).

contribution they might make to 'democratic policing' in a wider sense (the nature and achievability of which would be the subject of a quite different type of paper).

The nature of democratic police *organizations* is much less clear. Indeed is workplace democracy possible, or even desirable, within such a hierarchical, quasi-military organization? More prosaically, it seems unlikely that British police organizations, at least, will any time soon switch to significantly flatter organizational structures, direct (democratic) employee involvement in corporate decision-making, or similar organizational configurations (Sklansky 2008). Yet, there is a significant affinity between the ideas put forward by Sklansky and others (e.g. Manning 2010), on the one hand, and research on organizational justice that has begun to receive attention in the criminological literature, on the other. Recent studies have suggested that procedural justice could be just as important *within* policing organizations as it is in the relationship between police and public. Corresponding with the wider organizational justice literature (Colquitt et al. 2001; Greenberg 2011), this work has suggested that police officers' perceptions of organizational justice² in their relationships with managers and leaders are linked to their compliance with organizational regulations and goals, and to 'organizational citizenship behaviours', which might enhance their willingness to engage with members of the public in positive and constructive ways (Bradford et al 2013; Myhill and Bradford 2013; Tankebe 2014; Wolfe and Piquero 2011; cf. Tyler 2011; Tyler and Blader 2000).

The notion of social identity is central to this literature. Just as procedural fairness indicates shared group membership to individuals when they are dealing with police officers (Bradford 2014; Bradford et al. 2014), it is claimed that organizational justice provides for a sense of value and integration among police officers, generates pride in and identification with the organization, enhances the legitimacy of internal structures and processes, and encourages positive orientations toward service-oriented policing (Bradford et al. 2013; Myhill and Bradford 2013). Furthermore, a positive social identity in relation to an (occupational) group can serve several important psychological functions for the individual, such as fostering self-worth, helping them to make sense of people and situations, and satisfying their need to belong (Blader and Tyler, 2009). A strong social identity, encouraged by positive justice perceptions, may also assist individuals in dealing with workplace uncertainty concerning outcomes, status, trustworthiness and morality, since it provides for emotional stability and a sense of mutual interest and support (Colquitt, 2008). Unfair organizations, by contrast, are unlikely to encourage such attitudes among their staff, and perceptions of *injustice* internally may lead to the development of a different set of cultural adaptations typically associated in the policing literature with occupational sub-cultures (see below).

Self-legitimacy and commitment to democratic policing

In this paper we claim that police officers' self-legitimacy may also be an important influence on their ability to do their job in socially and normatively desirable ways. Yet, what *is* self-legitimacy? Drawing on the argument developed by Bottoms and Tankebe (2012), we suggest that police officers' self-legitimacy can be seen as comprising their sense that: their role and activity as police officers is justifiable; the relation between police and policed is founded on a congruence between organizational means and ends, and those of wider society; and, as police officers, they occupy a special place in that society (see Bottoms and Tankebe's (131) discussion of Wrong, 1979).

Defining what Bottoms and Tankebe also term 'power-holder' legitimacy in this way

² Namely: the use of fair procedures; neutral, transparent and consistent decision-making; polite, dignified and respectful interpersonal interactions; transparent decision-making; and effective two-way communication (Blader and Tyler 2003, Colquitt 2001, Greenberg 2011).

positions it as the mirror image of police legitimacy from the perspective of the policed. The empirical legitimacy of the police has been theorized as comprising apprehension and validation, on the part of the public, of a shared moral, behavioural and evaluative framework that guides police activity and a set of reciprocal duties consequently placed on both police and community. That is the police have a duty to behave in a certain way and the public has a corresponding duty to support them when they do, and legitimacy pertains when both criteria are met (Beetham 1991; Jackson et al. 2012a, 2012b). Police officers' sense of their own legitimacy is likely to be an important factor in this equation. Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) argue self-legitimacy is an important aspect of the dialogue, between police and policed, by and through which the legitimacy of the police is established and reproduced. Seen in this light, legitimacy is an emergent property of the relationship between police and community, and an important component of that relationship is the claim police make to legitimacy.

Barker (2001: 24) would characterize these claims as *legitimations*, defining legitimation, distinct from legitimacy, as the set of activities in which power-holders engage while seeking to establish their right to rule, govern, or, more appositely, police. Yet, *legitimacy* is 'actual', subjectively real to the participants within a power relationship and subject to a constant process of production, challenge, and change. Legitimations, beliefs and actions that lead a power-holder to be seen – and to see themselves – as legitimate thus feed into empirical, 'actual', legitimacy as a characteristic of a particular set of social relationships.

Barker goes on to note two particularly pertinent aspects of legitimation processes. First, that there is an intrinsic link between legitimation and identification: "The principle way in which people issuing commands are legitimated is by their being identified as special, marked by particular qualities, set apart from other people" (2001: 35). Identification as police may thus be an important factor in shaping the extent to which officers view themselves as legitimate. Second, and relatedly, legitimations enable people to command, providing structure to a power-holder's decision-making processes that assist in the shift from 'raw' power to authority by acts seem non-random, coherent, and justifiable. Commands come to be seen part of a larger 'plan of action', conforming to existing norms and values when, and to the extent that, they are premised on legitimations that simultaneously position the power-holder in relation to those over whom they have authority and provide a narrative that justifies this relationship *to both parties*. The ability of police to exercise authority (as opposed to brute force) may thus be premised in large part on the success of processes of legitimation, which allow officers to conceive that their use of the power vested in them is justified, ethical, and moral. Equally, exercising power in this way is required if police are to convince the public of their claim to legitimacy.

If self-legitimacy is indeed constituted by a set of legitimations linked on the one hand to identity and, on the other, to the exercise of authority, police officers' confidence in their own legitimacy may affect the way they go about their job. Greater self-legitimacy may make them: calmer and more assured; more able to engage in difficult decisions in constructive ways; more willing to allow members of the public a say during processes of interaction; and, crucially, inclined only to use force as a last resort to re-establish order. Such policing styles also position officer activity within a particular narrative of policing. In a context such as the UK, for example, procedurally just policing that relies on reasonable use of force *is itself a claim to legitimacy*³, constituting both a particular normative account of police activity and also a claim that the police are legitimate because they behave in such a manner.

By contrast, officers who have a weaker sense of their own legitimacy may be more timid and less willing to interact with the public because this might throw up difficult questions or challenges to their authority (see Tankebe 2009: 16). Moreover, when they do

³ This is perhaps best represented by the rhetorical claims associated with the police in England and Wales not being routinely armed.

interact, these officers may not display 'coolness under fire'. They may be more sensitive to problems and provocations, and quicker to use physical force, because they lack the self-belief to assert and maintain their authority in other, less confrontational, ways. Officers who find citizens in 'contempt of cop' for challenging them (Waddington 1999) may do so because they have too *little* confidence in their authority, rather than too much.

The correlates of self-legitimacy

Theories of organizational justice, therefore, provide a conceptual bridge linking the quality of police organizational structures and processes, the notion of self-legitimacy, and officers' attitudes toward democratic modes of policing. When officers feel fairly treated by their organization, their sense of positive identification with it is enhanced (Bradford et al. 2013). Such identification may be linked not only to internalization of organizational goals (Tyler and Blader 2003) and a sense that they are supported and 'enabled' by the organization (Bradford et al. 2013), but also to a belief that they are legitimate holders of the power vested in them. Self-legitimacy may, therefore, stem from identification with the police organization and internalization of the values it represents. Officers who feel confident in their identity as members of the police service may develop a strong sense of their own legitimacy which could, in turn, influence their attitudes toward policing and, perhaps, behaviour 'on the street'.

Naturally, personal identification with their organization is unlikely to be the only source of such self-legitimacy. At least three alternatives can be suggested. The first is public support. Police may feel they are legitimate when and to the extent that they believe they have the support and consent of the policed. Relevant here may be the idea that organizations are legitimated partly via the authorization and mandate of external agencies and stakeholders (Zelditch 2006), whether by superordinate bodies (e.g. the government or parliament), partner organizations (e.g. the courts) or the public. Second, police may garner a sense of self-legitimacy in a more functional sense, from the extent to which they believe they are agents in the 'fight against crime' and the wider societal project to maintain order.

Third, police may gain legitimacy from the idea they are different and apart from others in society. The role of the police in enforcing the law serves in many ways to set it apart from the public (see Bottoms and Tankebe's (2012) discussion of Herbert's (2006) notion of separation), and a sense of legitimacy may flow from this distinction between 'police' and 'policed'. On the one hand, for example, the 'thin blue line' ideology (Reiner 2010), the seemingly widespread sense among police officers that they are a small force standing between order and chaos, suggests an affective gap between police and public: here, legitimacy might spring from the protective role of police. On the other hand, there is a legal separation between police and public that may also have important consequences for officers' conceptualization of their role and position, which may relate to the idea that the law grants the police authority. On this account, police have a legal duty, and are right, to enforce the law 'without fear or favour' irrespective of public approval.

The police occupational sub-culture

Notions of identity, around which much of the discussion has thus far revolved, have of course long held a privileged place in police sociology; and these have often been very different to the positive organizational identifications outlined above. The police occupational sub-culture has repeatedly been described as having a number of core characteristics, key elements of which include suspicion and cynicism (particularly towards the policies, procedures and leadership senior management), a clear sense of mission, prejudice, authoritarianism, as well as a rigid distinction between 'them' and 'us' coupled with in-group solidarity (Waddington, 1999; Reiner 2010). Loftus (2009: 17) has argued that the occupational sub-culture endures and that its core characteristics are "timeless qualities" which "remain virtually untouched by initiatives aimed at changing everyday assumptions and behaviours" because the police role

has remained broadly constant across time. Ironically, perhaps, these features have also been blamed for the failure to introduce police reforms, the success of which often hinge on challenging and changing aspects of traditional occupational sub-culture (Skogan 2008). To take just one example, a willingness to engage in partnership working with citizens is a fundamental aspect of community policing (Skogan 2006), yet provides a direct challenge to a worldview that defines the police role narrowly in terms of 'crime fighting' and emphasizes separation from the rest of society (Fielding 1989; Reiner 2010; Skogan 2008). The way such conflicts have tended to play out has led to the conclusion that 'the sensibilities that comprise the police identity can... undermine reform endeavors' (Loftus 2010). Such an occupational sub-culture seems likely, of course, to be inimical to the notion of democratic policing described above.

Waddington (1999) has however argued that the characteristics typically described as the enduring core of the occupational sub-culture are not neutral in tone or effect. Drawing on Chan (1996), he suggests instead that these are normative descriptions, which act as 'convenient labels' that simultaneously draw attention to, simplify and condemn the *negative* beliefs, attitudes and practices of police. Waddington also argues that the concept of a police occupational sub-culture does not help explain the complexity and fluidity of officers' views and behaviour. Fielding (1989) similarly suggests that a stereotyped view of the police occupational sub-culture has often predominated, and officers do not always think and act in the way dictated by the label. He points out that culture is not a "static entity" (ibid: 80) but is actively constituted and reconstituted by those in the organization, and his study of police socialisation highlighted that officers would variously embrace or resist prevailing norms and other influences on their attitudes and behaviour. While primacy may often be given to influences in the work setting, particularly when making decisions that are visible to others, the individual officer acts as the final arbiter and mediator of these influences (see also Fielding 1988). Thus, "the occupational culture is not itself undifferentiated but comprises several cultures formed around adjustments to the job" (Fielding, 1989: 81). This situation is further complicated as a result of differential experiences of the workplace, and by individual position and status within the organization and in relation to other communities. Nevertheless, despite these adaptations, Fielding argues that consistencies in police attitudes and practice are discernible over space and time, and that these patterns are often reflected in the descriptions of 'ideal typical' officers.⁴

The cultural adaptations officers make might shape their self-legitimacy in potentially conflicting ways. An inward looking, cynical adaptation might *strengthen* officers' sense of their own legitimacy, for example by providing a reservoir of fellow feeling and identity (Waddington 1999) that justifies the separation between police and public outlined above. Conversely, those who embrace an oppositional sub-culture might adopt a sceptical or negative stance toward the wider authority of the police. They may, for example, begin to see themselves as just 'the biggest gang on the streets': not as an institution imbued with a legitimate mandate to maintain social order, but as one of a number of bodies competing for control.

Under what conditions, then, might officers make particular cultural adaptations? While much research has concentrated on the role of informal socialisation, Fielding (1988; 1989) points to the importance of formal *as well as* informal sources of influence. Theories of organizational and procedural justice, for example, remind us that the way officers are treated in the workplace will be an important factor shaping their identities and ways of 'being' police. There may well be "reasons to think that [the existence of] unhappy police officers can be blamed in part on the rigid, top-down management of policing ... Police officers regularly

⁴ For example, Reiner's (2010) typology includes four broad categories of officer: the 'bobby'; the 'new centurion'; the 'uniform carrier'; and the 'professional'.

complain, and often bitterly, that their views are never consulted, that they are subject to arbitrary and irrational directives from above and without, and that the rules under which they operate are absurdly unrealistic (Sklansky 2008: 121). On this account, discernible patterns in officers' cultural adaptations are not *sui generis*, or formed only via peer-group interaction, but are produced and reproduced in part by their relationships with immediate supervisors and senior managers. The stereotyped features of the occupational sub-culture may therefore serve as a counterpoint to the kind of positive organizational identity described above, associated with perceptions of organizational *injustice*, low self-legitimacy, and negative orientations toward democratic policing norms.

Research hypotheses

A number of hypotheses can be adduced from the discussion thus far – see Figure 1 for a graphical representation. The first two cover the relationship between organizational justice and social identities in police organizations. As found in earlier studies, we expect that identification with the police organization will be positively associated with perceptions of organizational justice (H1). Second, we expect that organizational justice will be negatively associated with a cynical cultural adaptation (H2). In other words, when officers feel unfairly treated by their organization, they are likely to become more distrustful and inward looking.

Figure 1 near here

The second set of hypotheses cover the relationships between social identity and self-legitimacy. We expect that identification with the police organization will be positively associated with self-legitimacy (H3). We also expect to find an association between a cynical cultural adaptation and self-legitimacy (H4), although we do not at this stage suggest a direction for this relationship – as noted above, it could go either way. We also expect that self-legitimacy will be associated by a range of other attitudes: public support (H5a); the idea that the police protect the public (the 'thin blue line' ideology) (H5b); and lawful separation (H5c).

A final hypothesis relates to the association between self-legitimacy and support for the principles of democratic policing. We expect officers' sense of their own legitimacy to be positively associated with their orientations toward democratic policing (H6). When they are confident in their own authority this may facilitate positive policing modalities.

Data and methods

The study reported here is based on an on-line survey of police officers carried out in collaboration between Durham Constabulary and the College of Policing. Durham is a relatively small, non-metropolitan police force in the north of England, covering County Durham and Darlington. Durham's organizational priorities were articulated to staff in 2011 via its 'plan on a page'. Overall, the force aimed to "inspire confidence in victims and communities", which it sought to do so by "protecting neighbourhoods", "tackling criminals" and "solving problems". Underpinning these goals, there was a commitment to working together, motivating and developing staff, communicating effectively, and reinforcing a culture of "excellence".

Durham therefore had a strong interest in understanding what might motivate its staff to embrace community policing and develop service delivery. At the time of the study, however, and like many other forces in England and Wales, Durham was going through a period of significant organizational change – as a result of budget cuts – which involved a major change in structure, and an overall reduction in staff numbers. This change programme was one of the main reasons why Durham approached the College to help it develop an organizational survey. There was a concern about how the programme was perceived by

officers and staff, and how change had affected people within the organization, but also an interest in developing a focus on issues of staff motivation and the relationship between organizational structures and the way policing was delivered 'on the ground'.

While the survey was fielded to both sworn officer and police staff, only the officer data are used here. The survey was sent to all those employed by Durham Constabulary in the spring of 2012; the officer response rate was just over 30 per cent. Like the survey conducted in the previous year (Bradford et al. 2013), the achieved sample was broadly representative of the workforce at the time (see Dhani 2012). Overall, 70 per cent of respondents were Constables (compared with 77 per cent across the force) and a further 18 per cent Sergeants; 71 per cent were male (compared with 72 per cent across the force); 20 per cent were aged 26-35 and 80 per cent were aged 36-55 (there were very few younger or older officers). Finally, 20 per cent had 6-10 years service, 23 per cent 11-15 years, and 21 per cent 16-20 years.

Methods

Variables for analysis were in most cases generated via latent variable modelling in the package Mplus 7.0. Utilising a range of survey items, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used to simultaneously estimate and validate a number of measures: Appendix Table 1 gives question wordings and factor loadings. The model achieved was an adequate fit to the data, and factor scores were extracted for use in regression modelling (using Stata 12.0) to address the hypotheses outlined above. Note that full-information maximum-likelihood estimation was used, meaning that cases with some missing variables were not dropped from the analysis. This gave a final sample for analysis of 438. The variables generated are described below.

Police identities and legitimacy

Three variables covered identity and self-legitimacy. The first was a measure of *self-legitimacy*. It captured respondents' confidence in their own authority and their sense that they occupy a special position in society. The second was *organizational identity*, measured by survey items relating to attachment and loyalty to Durham Constabulary. The third was *cynical cultural adaptation*, measured by items relating to both in-group loyalty (whether officers should report colleagues) and authoritarian concern – or sense of cynicism – about declining respect. It may be more accurate to think of this variable as representing the extent to which respondents subscribed to, or agreed with, opinions stereotypically associated with the police canteen culture, rather than an identity *per se*.

Appendix Table 2 shows a correlation matrix of all the variables used in the analysis. The three identity and legitimacy measures were strongly inter-correlated. In particular, the correlation between *self-legitimacy* and *organizational identity* was very high (.87). While further analysis suggested that these were best seen as two distinct constructs⁵, the strength of this correlation is an important finding in itself. It seems respondents drew little distinction between their confidence in their own authority and the extent to which they identified with (felt proud of and attached to) Durham Constabulary. By contrast, *cynical cultural adaptation* was strongly negatively correlated with both *self-legitimacy* and *organizational identity* – officers who were cynical and inward looking tended did not tend to identify with the organization or feel confident of their own legitimacy. Retaining all three indices as separate measures, we explore these issues in more depth below; but the associations between social identity and self-legitimacy serve, at the threshold, to underline the importance of identities

⁵ Models which allowed all four observed indicators to load onto one latent factor fitted the data less well, according to the exact fit statistics, and the factor loadings of some observed indicators were unacceptably low (<.4).

within police organizations, and may be important conceptually and empirically, a point we return later in the article.

Organizational justice

Three variables represented the key organizational factors that might shape officers' identity beliefs and, through these, their authority judgements. These covered the core aspects of organizational justice, and comprised measures of respondents' assessments of: *supervisory procedural justice*; *leadership procedural justice*; and *distributive justice*⁶ within the organization. We assume, therefore, that officers make distinct assessments of the procedural fairness of their immediate supervisors and of senior managers, and that both sets of judgements are themselves distinct from perceptions of distributive justice, and the CFA model confirmed these are distinct factors

Other influences on assessments of self-legitimacy

A number of factors represented other potential influences on officers' self-legitimacy. We developed measures tapping into: (a) respondents' assessments of the extent to which the *public support* the police in a general sense; and (b) their reported experience of willing *public cooperation* while doing their job. Two observed (single-item) indicators were also used. One represented what might be termed *lawful separation* (responses to the survey item 'As long as we act lawfully, it doesn't matter what people think of us', entered as a dummy variable coded 1 if the respondent agreed with this statement); the idea here being that police may draw legitimacy from the extent that they are separate from those they police. The other represented officers' paternalistic sense that the *police protect* the public and are essential for an orderly society. This was represented by a dummy variable based on the survey item 'Without the police, there would be more crime'. Most respondents strongly agreed with this claim, and this item was coded such that one equalled strongly agree and zero equalled all other responses.

Commitment to democratic policing

Finally, three variables covered different aspects of commitment to democratic policing principles. The first, and possibly most important, represented respondents' commitment to *procedurally just policing*. These variable in a sense 'closes the circle' started by Tyler's work on public perceptions of police procedural justice. In essence, we are asking: what might encourage police officers to reportedly behave in ways that are procedurally fair? However, procedural justice is not the only aspect of police practice associated with democratic policing, and we also included attitude measures for: respect for *suspects' rights*; and *use of proportionate force*.

Respondents were, therefore, not asked specifically about their commitment to 'democratic policing'. Indeed, we doubt whether such a question would be meaningful to many. Rather, we treat this commitment as, in effect, a second order latent variable represented by the three measures outlined above, although we do not attempt to model this directly. That is, we have analytically defined commitment to democratic policing as being (partially) represented by commitment to procedurally just policing, respect for suspect's rights, and the proportionate use of force. One implication is that a respondent might score highly on these measures and be defined as being tacitly committed to democratic policing, even though they not see, or explicitly describe, themselves in these terms.

We have also, of course, measured attitudes rather than behaviours. Officers might indicate commitment to procedurally just policing in their survey response, but behave in a

⁶ The fair allocation of goods, rewards and resources within the organization.

very different way 'on the streets'. This is a significant issue with survey research, and future work might profitably explore the 'real-life' actions of officers in relation to the attitudes discussed here. At this stage, we can only realistically claim to have measured officers' *stated commitment* to styles of policing we have defined as 'democratic'.

Analytic strategy

The nature of the hypotheses put forward – as shown in Figure 1 above – and the use of latent variable modelling suggest that a structural equation model, which allowed simultaneous testing of all research hypotheses, would be a suitable way to proceed with the analysis. However the high correlations between the identity variables and self-legitimacy precluded this approach, as models which included both identity measures as predictors of self-legitimacy suffered from collinearity problems. We therefore use a series of linear regression models to explore: (i) the association between organizational justice and the identity measures; (ii) the associations between identity and self-legitimacy; and (iii) the associations between self-legitimacy and commitment to democratic policing.

Results

(i) Organizational justice and police identities

The first task was to assess the association between organizational justice and police identities. Table 1 shows results from two regression models predicting first, *organizational identity*, and second, *cynical cultural adaptation*. As in all other models below, these controlled for gender, age and rank. Taking organizational identity first, we find that there is a very strong positive association between perceptions of senior leadership procedural justice and this aspect of officers' social identities; net of this association, supervisory procedural justice and distributive justice had no significant statistical effect. From theory, and earlier work (Bradford et al 2013) we might expect all three aspects of organizational justice to have unique associations with identity – one explanation of this finding may be the change programme Durham was going through at the time of the survey. An inevitably top-down process, this may have had the effect of making the fairness of senior leaders much more salient to officers at this particular point in time than other aspects of organizational justice.

Turning to the measure of cynical cultural adaptation, we find completely the reverse. All three aspects of organizational justice were negatively associated with this measure, with senior leadership procedural justice having the largest statistical effect. It is interesting, though, that both distributive and procedural justice were significant in this model.

Few of the control variables were significant in either model, although older officers tended to express a slightly stronger organizational identity, while police constables were significantly more likely to make cynical cultural adaptations.

Table 1 near here

(ii) The correlates of self-legitimacy

Table 2 turns to examination of the correlates of self-legitimacy. Model 1 contains demographic, organizational justice and the other predictors of self-legitimacy, while Models 2 and 3 add the two identity measures in turn. (To reiterate, it was not possible to use both as predictors in the same model due to the high correlation between them.)

Model 1 shows that both senior leadership procedural justice and distributive justice were positively associated with self-legitimacy, as were: assessments of public support for the police; the extent to which public cooperation was reportedly experienced; and the belief the police were effective in reducing crime. By contrast, the lawful separation variable was not significant in the model. Older officers tended to have more confidence in their own legitimacy than their younger counterparts.

Model 2 added the measure of organizational identity, which was very strongly predictive of self-legitimacy (note that the R^2 jumps to .84). Importantly, the statistical effect of senior leadership procedural justice on self-legitimacy, seen in Model 1, appeared to be entirely mediated via organizational identity. Indeed, in Model 2, the coefficient for senior leadership procedural justice was negative, and statistically significant. At a given level of organizational identification, those who felt senior managers were fairer tended to be slightly less confident in their own legitimacy, although substantively this effect was dwarfed by the strength of the general positive correlation between the three variables. Note that the association between the other sources of self-legitimacy and the response variable were largely unchanged; other variables still had a statistical effect on self-legitimacy, despite its strong correlation with organizational identity.

When organizational identity was replaced with officer cynicism in Model 3 a strikingly congruent picture emerged. Controlling for all the other variables in the model, a cynical cultural adaptation was very strongly *negatively* associated with officers' sense of their own legitimacy; elsewhere in the model existing patterns were generally maintained. (One exception was that supervisory procedural justice attained significance, and again in an unexpected negative direction; as before, this 'residual' effect was dwarfed in substantive terms by other aspects of the model.) Note also that the association between distributive justice and self-legitimacy, seen in Model 1, appeared to be completely mediated by cynicism, reinforcing the idea that there is an important link between distributive justice and cynical cultural adaptations within the police.

To investigate the associations between the police identities and self-legitimacy further we created two new dummy variables. These were generated by splitting each of the original identity variables at the median (so all scores at the median and above were coded as 1, which then represented a positive score on the original variable). A cross tabulation showed that most respondents scored 'one' on only one of the two new variables (38 per cent for organizational identity, and 40 per cent for cynical cultural adaptation); but notable proportions scored 'one' on both measures (12 per cent) or neither (11 per cent). We could, therefore, add both to the same regression model, as shown in Model 4 in Table 2. The results showed that organizational identity was still positively and significantly associated with self-legitimacy, while officer cynicism retained its negative association with the response variable. However, the coefficient for organizational identity was twice as large, which suggested it may be the dominant aspect of identity in terms of its relationship to, and influence on, self-legitimacy.

In sum, the key messages from Table 2 are that: (a) identity judgements were key predictors of perceptions of self-legitimacy, with organizational identity arguably the more important; (b) most of the statistical effect of organizational justice judgements on self-legitimacy were mediated by identity judgements; and (c) despite the strong link between identity and legitimacy, the police were also found to draw on 'external' factors when thinking about their own authority, most notably perceptions and experiences of public support.

(iii) Self-legitimacy and support for democratic policing

Finally, Table 3 shows models that examine the associations between self-legitimacy and support for democratic policing. Three models predicted respondents' attitudes toward suspects' rights, use of force, and procedurally just policing. We found that self-legitimacy had broadly similar, positive associations with all three response variables; the associations between self-legitimacy and support for suspects' rights and procedurally just policing appeared to be particularly strong.

Table 3 near here

Elsewhere in the models, we found rather inconsistent associations between the organizational justice variables and commitment to democratic policing styles. Perplexingly, distributive justice was negatively associated with respect for suspects' rights, while senior leadership procedural justice was negatively associated with support for procedurally just policing. However, further analysis suggested these negative associations only emerged once self-legitimacy was included in the models. Again, these associations can be seen largely as 'residual' statistical effects that only emerged once we conditioned on self-legitimacy (the positive effect of which was found to be far more important). Finally, note that constables scored consistently lower on all three measures of democratic policing than more senior officers.

Discussion

Returning to the hypotheses laid out above, we can conclude, first, that strong support was found for H1 and H2. Identification with the police organization was positively associated with perceptions of organizational justice, and organizational justice was negatively associated with a cynical cultural adaptation (H2). Second, identification with the police organization was positively, and very strongly, associated with self-legitimacy; hypothesis H3 found overwhelming support. When it came to H4, concerning the potential association between officer cynicism and self-legitimacy, we found equally overwhelming support for a negative association between these variables.

Self-legitimacy also appeared to be influenced by a range of other factors, and was not determined by organizational identity. Most notably, officers who felt they had the support of the public consistently expressed more confidence in their own authority (H5a). There was also some support for the suggestion that police draw a sense of legitimacy from the idea they are essential in the fight against crime (H5c). By contrast, we found little support for the notion that separation between police and public is a source of legitimacy (H5b).

The final hypothesis (H6) related to the association between self-legitimacy and support for democratic policing styles. We found strong support for this hypothesis – officers who were more confident in their own authority were more likely to indicate their support for procedurally just policing, were more supportive of suspects' rights, and were less likely to support an increase in the use of force in policing.

Our analysis supports the idea that self-legitimacy is implicated in a nexus of police identities and cultural adaptations, being strongly associated with organisational identification and strongly negatively associated with a cynicism. This nexus will almost certainly be multi-dimensional, in that police officers are likely to have multiple, cross-cutting and possibly contradictory identities and beliefs (one reason for keeping the three identity measures separate). The nexus may also be conceptualised as a continuum – with negative aspects of the police occupational sub-culture at one end, and positive organizational identity and a strong sense of self-legitimacy at the other. While we have given privileged status to the notion of 'self-legitimacy' in this paper, as it seems to offer a theoretically plausible way of explaining *why* commitment to democratic policing may vary across a police organization, (positive) organizational identities may themselves be equally important factors (c.f. Bradford et al. 2013; Myhill and Bradford 2013).

Taken together, these findings provide significant support for the idea that, when police officers feel fairly treated by their organization, they identify more strongly with it and, consequently, establish a firmer sense of their own legitimacy. These factors may facilitate positive policing modalities. By contrast, an oppositional, cynical and inward-looking stance was strongly associated with experiences of organizational *in*justice and a diminished sense of self-legitimacy, as well as with weaker commitment to democratic policing. Moreover, it

seems police draw a sense of legitimacy from the extent to which they believe the public supports them and experience public cooperation while doing their job. These relationships point to the possibility of a 'positive feedback loop', whereby more democratic and procedurally just styles of policing generate public cooperation, which in turn enhances officers' sense of authority, and results in the styles of policing being reinforced and reproduced. Alternatively, when public cooperation is fragile, police self-legitimacy may be undermined. This has the potential to result in a downward spiral, with officers disengaging from positive informal contact with the public and adopting more confrontational styles, that in turn triggers further public resistance and the withdrawal of their consent.

The analysis presented here has also generated some significant questions. Perhaps most importantly, we barely found a distinction between officers' occupational identities and their sense of their own legitimacy. While we have retained organizational identity and self-legitimacy as separate constructs, it would have been possible – at least statistically – to combine them into one measure. What, though, would such a measure have represented? There is a clear conceptual distinction between organizational identification and self-legitimacy, and it seems reasonable to suggest the former in some sense shapes the latter. To use the language of Barker (2001), it may be that organizational justice and social identity constitute and mediate processes of *legitimation*, which lead to the 'condition' of *legitimacy* as subjectively experienced by police officers; this is, in essence, the argument we have advanced here. Future research might profitably address this issue in more depth, both by fielding more detailed banks of survey items and using research designs – longitudinal or experimental – that allow better identification of causal processes, and by exploring these issues ethnographically.

Yet, while the idea that social identities and cultural adaptations are shaped by organizational justice, and in turn shape self-legitimacy, is appealing both analytically and normatively, one could equally argue that these should, in fact, be seen as two aspects of the same thing (meaning the distinction maintained in this paper is false). Perhaps it is simply 'being' a police officer – in as much as this is expressed via positive identification with the organization – that makes people feel they are legitimate power-holders. Indeed, this is an alternative reading of the argument put forward by Barker (2001: 34), who sees identification and legitimation as "inextricably linked".

If this latter idea finds purchase, there follow some intriguing, and not entirely reassuring, implications. Most notably, if legitimacy in policing is 'inextricably' linked to social identity, then self-legitimacy may attach not to the role of 'police' in a general sense (engagement in normatively justifiable formal social control activity) but to local, specific forces or agencies focused on maintain their own identities (Giacomantonio 2013). Could there therefore be structural differences in assessments of legitimacy between police organizations in the same jurisdiction? Are there competing 'versions' of legitimacy across different police organizations within and across jurisdictional borders? Similarly, while we found here that organizational identification and self-legitimacy have positive antecedents (organizational justice) and consequents (greater commitment to democratic policing), will this necessarily be the case elsewhere? Police officers' sense of their own legitimacy in other contexts might be shaped by other, less desirable criteria and processes; and in particular, identification with the organization might be linked with destructive forms of self-legitimacy that diminish, not promote, democratic policing practice. Finally, a strong sense of self-legitimacy might encourage officers to react not positively, but negatively, to challenges to their authority that may equally be challenges to their identities as police officers (increasing the use of 'contempt of cop' (Waddington 1999)) – self-confidence here may imply the confidence to act *more* aggressively, not less.

These questions retain pertinence whichever formulation of the social identity/self-legitimacy association finds most conceptual and analytic purchase, although they would

seem to be particularly acute if these factors do indeed collapse into one another. We should note that these issues did not seem particularly salient in Durham. In this particular context, a positive identification with the force, predicted by organizational justice, seems to have promoted officers' confidence in themselves and, perhaps, that their organization is 'doing the right thing'.

Weaknesses of the present study

This paper has, inevitably, a number of shortcomings. Like much other work in this area, it is reliant on a cross-sectional 'snapshot' survey and, thus, can only uncover statistical associations rather than causal processes. We also have little idea of processes of change in a more general sense. We have discussed at some length the limited nature of the survey items available which may, for example, have caused us to over-estimate the correlations between the police identity and self-legitimacy measures (or indeed under-estimate it). Finally, in terms of the ultimate response variables, we have measured only stated commitment to democratic policing styles, rather than behaviour.

Some weaknesses are more specific to the issues at hand. Perhaps most importantly, given the centrality here of both social identity and ethical beliefs (in relation to the 'right way' do do policing), we have no measures of the identities and ideals that officers brought with them into the organization. How were these altered or modulated by, for example, organizational justice? Conversely, our measure of cynical cultural adaptation includes one survey item which is essentially a measure of conservative authoritarianism that may not be amenable to influence via organizational processes. Another issue is that we have little idea about the concrete or instrumental factors that may have been affecting officers' attitudes. Was the threat of disciplinary action for treating suspects unfairly, for example, a factor? Longitudinal surveys, linked to administrative data, would be one important way to address these and related issues.

A final set of weaknesses in this paper stem from our treatment of the police organization, which we have treated as a broadly homogeneous. While it is true that most officers are based in community, response or managerial roles – implicitly, those which have concerned us here – there are important components of police organizations which may be very different. Most pertinently officers with intelligence, investigative or public order roles may have different relationships with the organization and hold different views on 'democratic policing' as we have defined it. How do they think about their authority as police officers, and how might a sense of confidence in this authority find expression in their work? These are important, and open, questions.

Conclusion

In this paper we have shown that organizational justice seems to be an important factor shaping police officers' assessments of their own legitimacy. Officers who felt fairly treated were more likely to identify with the organization, and more likely to be confident in their own authority and in their position as authority figures in society. These officers were also more likely to express commitment to democratic modes of policing. When officers experienced a sense of organizational *injustice* these positive associations were weakened and, conversely, they tended to express cynical and authoritarian attitudes. This, in turn, appeared to weaken their sense of their authority as police officers, and they tended to be less committed to democratic modes of policing.

As noted, the limitations of the data mean the analysis presented in this paper can only describe associations between variables. Notwithstanding this issue, we have traced a plausible path from organizational justice, through identity, to self-legitimacy and commitment to different policing styles. The analysis suggests a set of antecedents and consequents of Bottoms and Tankebe's (2012) notion of self-legitimacy, and positions self-

legitimacy at the centre of an on-going process of negotiation within the police organization. To reiterate a point made earlier, this negotiative process is likely to operate at a tacit level. Yet while police officers will not spend much time reflecting on their legitimacy, many will have an acute sense of how fairly they are treated and strong feelings about how the public should be policed.

Our findings suggest an important role for organizational practices and processes in shaping such officer commitment. This seems to stem from, first, a strong organizational emphasis to 'doing' policing in an ethically desirable way and, second, by promoting organizationally just practices that encourage officers to adopt positive workplace identities, internalize organizational priorities and goals, and (potentially) behave in procedurally fair ways. If officers are to internalize desirable means and ends, they need to know what these are, and it seems likely that both a clearly expressed central mandate (e.g. Durham's 'Plan on a page' and the Codes of Ethics) and fair and open management practices will be needed in order to promote democratic policing and external procedural justice.

Naturally, this is a desirable goal for which to aim. Yet the Durham data also contain two important warnings. First, unfair policies and practices – some of which may be outside the immediate control of the organization – may encourage oppositional sub-cultural identities inimical to democratic policing. The way officers are treated by their managers may find negative, as well as positive, echoes in their behaviour on the street. Second, it seems self-legitimacy in policing contexts may be intimately, and possibly intrinsically, linked with identity. While this is, by and large, a positive in a place like Durham, this may be much less so in other contexts where the idea that the police serve the public, and should do so according to principles of fairness and justice, is less well established. In other contexts self-legitimacy, if it so closely caught up with identity, may take very different forms and have different consequences.

References

- Barker, R. (2001), *Legitimizing Identities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beetham, D. (1991), *The Legitimation of Power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bottoms, A. and Tyler T.R. (2003), 'What Constitutes Fairness in Work Settings? A four-component model of procedural justice', *Human Resource Management Review*, 13: 107-126.
- Blader S. and Tyler T.R. (2009), 'Testing and Extending the Group Engagement Model: Linkages Between Social Identity, Procedural Justice, Economic Outcomes, and Extrarole Behavior', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94(2): 445-464.
- Bottoms A. and Tankebe, J. (2012), 'Beyond Procedural Justice: A Dialogic Approach to Legitimacy in Criminal Justice', *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 102(1): 120-170.
- Bradford, B. (2014), 'Policing and Social Identity: Procedural Justice, Inclusion and Cooperation Between Police and Public', *Policing and Society* 22(1): 22-43.
- Bradford, B., Quinton, P., Myhill, A. and Porter, G. (2013), 'Why Do 'the Law' Comply? Procedural Justice, Group Identification and Officer Motivation in Police Organizations', *European Journal of Criminology* 11(1): 110-131.
- Bradford, B., Murphy, K. and Jackson, J. (2014), 'Officers as Mirrors: Policing, Procedural Justice and the (Re)production of Social Identity', *British Journal of Criminology* Advance Access.
- Chan, J. (1996), 'Changing Police Culture', *British Journal of Criminology* 36 (1): 109-134.
- Colquitt, J. (2001), 'On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(3): 386-400.

- Colquitt, J., Conlon, D., Wesson, M., Porter, C. and Ng, K. (2001), 'Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 years of Organizational Justice Research', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86: 425-445.
- Colquitt, J. (2008), 'Two Decades of Organizational Justice: Findings, Controversies, and Future Directions', in: Cooper C, Barling J (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Behavior*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 73-88.
- Dhani, A. (2012), *Police Service Strength England and Wales, 31 March 2012*. Home Office Statistical Bulletin 09/12. London: Home Office.
- Fielding, N. (1989), 'Police Culture and Police Practice', in: Weatheritt, M. (ed) *Police Research: Some Future Prospects*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Fielding, N. (1988), *Joining Forces: Police Training, Socialization and Occupational Competence*. London: Routledge.
- Foster, J. (2003), 'Cop Cultures', in Newburn T (ed.) *The Handbook of Policing*. Cullompton, Devon: Willan.
- Foster, J. and Jones, C. (2010), "'Nice to do' and Essential: Improving Neighbourhood Policing in an English Police Force", *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 4(4): 395-492.
- Greenberg, J. (2011), 'Organizational Justice: The Dynamics of Fairness in the Workplace', In Sheldon, Z. (ed.) *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 3: Maintaining, Expanding, and Contracting the Organization*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 271-327.
- Herbert, S. (2006), 'Tangled up in Blue: Conflicting Paths to Police Legitimacy', *Theoretical Criminology* 10(4): 481-504.
- Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., Myhill, A., Quinton, P. and Tyler, T.R. (2012), 'Why Do People Comply with the Law? Legitimacy and the Influence of Legal Institutions', *British Journal of Criminology*, 52 (6): 1051-1071.
- Jonathan-Zamir, T. and Harpaz, A. (2014), 'Police Understanding of the Foundations of Their Legitimacy in the Eyes of the Public: The Case of Commanding Officers in the Israel National Police', *British Journal of Criminology*, 54(3), 469-489.
- Jones, T., Newburn, T. and Smith, D.J. (2012), 'Democracy and Police and Crime Commissioners', pp. 219-245 in Newburn T and Peay J (eds) *Policing: Politics, Culture and Control*. Oxford: Hart.
- Lind, E.A. and Tyler, T.R. (1988), *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. New York: Plenum.
- Loftus, B. (2009), 'Police occupational culture: Classic themes, altered times', *Policing and Society* 20(1): 1-20.
- Manning, P.K. (2010), *Democratic Policing in a Changing World*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Mazerolle, L., Antrobus, E., Bennett, S., & Tyler, T. R. (2013), 'Shaping Citizen Perceptions of Police Legitimacy: A Randomized Field Trial of Procedural Justice', *Criminology* 51(1): 33-63.
- Myhill, A. and Bradford, B. (2013), 'Overcoming Cop Culture? Organizational Justice and Police Officers' Attitudes Toward the Public', *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*.
- Reiner, R. (2010), *The Politics of the Police (4th edition)*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Sklansky, D.A. (2005), 'Police and Democracy', *Michigan Law Review* 103:1699-1830.
- Sklansky, D.A. (2008), 'Work and Authority in Policing', pp. 110-135 in Dubber, MD and Valverde M (eds) *Police and the Liberal State*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Skogan, W. (2006), 'The Promise of Community Policing', pp. 27-43 in Wesiburd D and Braga AA (eds) *Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skogan, W. (2008), 'Why Reforms Fail', *Policing and Society* 18(1): 23-34.

- Smith, H.J., Tyler, T.R., Huo, J., Ortiz, D.J. and Lind, E.A. (1998), 'The Self-relevant Implications of the Group-value Model: Group Membership, Self-worth, and Procedural justice', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 34: 470-493.
- Tankebe, J. (2014), 'The Making of 'Democracy's champions': Understanding police support for democracy in Ghana', *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 14(1): 25-43.
- Tyler, T.R. (2006), *Why People Obey the Law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T.R. (2011), *Why People Cooperate: The Role of Social Motivations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T.R. and Blader, S. (2000), *Cooperation in Groups: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Behavioral Engagement*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Psychology Press.
- Tyler, T.R., Blader, S. (2003), 'Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Cooperative Behavior', *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 7: 349-361.
- Tyler, T.R., Degoe, P. and Smith, H. (1996), 'Understanding Why the Justice of Group Procedures Matters: A Test of the Psychological Dynamics of the Group-Value Model', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70(5): 913-930.
- Tyler, T.R. and Huo, Y.J. (2002), *Trust in the Law: Encouraging Public Cooperation with the Police and Courts*. New York: Russell-Sage Foundation.
- Waddington, P.A.J. (1999), *Policing Citizens: Authority and Rights*. London: University College Press.
- Wolfe, S.E. and Piquero, A.R. (2011), 'Organizational Justice and Police Misconduct', *Criminal Justice and Behaviour* 38(4): 322-353.
- Wrong, D.H. (1979), *Power: Its Forms, Bases and Uses*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zelditch Jr, M. (2006), 'Legitimacy theory', In P. J. Burke (Ed.), *Contemporary social psychological theories*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Figure 1: Map of the conceptual relationship between perceptions




Table 1: Linear regression models predicting police identities

	Organizational identity		Cynical cultural adaptation	
	B	se(B)	B	se(B)
Gender (ref: male)				
Female	0.1	-0.05	-0.07	-0.04
Age (Ref: 18-35)				
36-45	0.07	-0.06	-0.03	-0.05
46-65	0.17*	-0.07	-0.1	-0.05
Rank (Ref: Senior)				
Constable	-0.04	-0.07	0.14**	-0.05
Sergeant	0.12	-0.08	-0.01	-0.06
Organizational justice				
Supervisory procedural justice	0.02	-0.03	-0.07**	-0.02
Leadership procedural justice	0.60***	-0.04	-0.28***	-0.03
Distributive justice	0.02	-0.04	-0.16***	-0.03
Constant	-0.09	-0.08	-0.04	-0.06
R^2	0.49		0.50	
n	438		438	

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 2: Linear regression models predicting self-legitimacy

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	B	se(B)	B	se(B)	B	se(B)	B	se(B)
Gender (ref: male)								
Female	0.01	-0.04	-0.05*	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03
Age (Ref:18-35)								
36-45	0.05	-0.05	0.03	-0.03	0.04	-0.04	0.03	-0.04
46-65	0.18***	-0.05	0.09**	-0.03	0.14**	-0.05	0.13**	-0.04
Rank (Ref: Senior)								
Constable	-0.07	-0.05	-0.05	-0.03	0	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04
Sergeant	0.04	-0.07	-0.04	-0.04	0.02	-0.05	0	-0.05
Organizational justice								
Supervisory procedural justice	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	-0.07**	-0.02	-0.05*	-0.02
Leadership procedural justice	0.26***	-0.04	-0.07**	-0.03	0.10**	-0.03	0.11***	-0.03
Distributive justice	0.15***	-0.03	0.15***	-0.02	0.04	-0.03	0.11***	-0.03
Factors shaping self-legitimacy								
Public cooperation	0.18***	-0.04	0.09***	-0.02	0.14***	-0.03	0.14***	-0.03
Public support	0.21***	-0.05	0.15***	-0.03	0.22***	-0.04	0.19***	-0.04
Lawful separation	0.03	-0.04	-0.03	-0.02	-0.07*	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03
Police protect	0.15**	-0.05	0.05	-0.03	0.10*	-0.04	0.05	-0.04
Police identities								
Organizational identity			0.63***	-0.02				
Cynical adaptation					-0.63***	-0.04		
<i>Dummy variables</i>								
Organizational identity (ref: no)							0.42***	-0.04
Cynical adaptation (ref: no)							-0.22***	-0.04
Constant								
	-0.18*	-0.08	-0.03	-0.05	-0.12	-0.06	-0.15*	-0.07
R ²	0.59		0.84		0.72		0.72	
n	438		438		438		438	

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 3: Linear regression models predicting commitment to democratic policing

	Suspects' rights		Use of force		Procedurally just policing	
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Gender (ref: male)						
Female	0.10*	-0.05	0.11	-0.07	0.07	-0.04
Age (Ref: 18-35)						
36-45	-0.03	-0.05	0.06	-0.08	-0.04	-0.05
46-65	-0.02	-0.06	0.03	-0.09	-0.01	-0.06
Rank (Ref: Senior)						
PC	-0.18**	-0.06	-0.19*	-0.08	-0.11*	-0.05
Sergeant	-0.05	-0.07	-0.07	-0.1	-0.07	-0.07
Organizational justice						
Supervisory procedural justice	0.05	-0.03	-0.07	-0.04	0.06*	-0.03
Leadership procedural justice	0.02	-0.04	0.28***	-0.06	-0.16***	-0.04
Distributive justice	-0.12**	-0.04	0.04	-0.05	0.01	-0.03
Self-legitimacy	0.52***	-0.05	0.24***	-0.07	0.66***	-0.04
Constant	0.14*	-0.07	0.10	-0.1	0.09	-0.06
R ²	0.35		0.24		0.46	
n	438		438		438	

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Appendix Table 1: Latent constructs and measures

	Factor loadings
Supervisory Procedural Justice	
My supervisor listens to my opinions about decisions that affect me	0.91
My supervisors decisions are based on the facts	0.93
My supervisors treats me with respect	0.91
Leadership Procedural Justice	
I'm happy with the level of communication I receive from senior managers	0.78
Senior managers are open and honest with staff	0.91
Decisions are made fairly by senior managers in Durham Constabulary	0.94
Distributive justice	
I am rewarded fairly for the work I do	0.90
The amount of work I am expected to do is fair	0.65
Cynical cultural adaptation	
Nobody has respect for people in authority these days	0.56
If you want to get by in the police, you should report a colleague for doing something wrong (reversed)	0.54
Organizational identity	
I have no emotional attachment to the force (reversed)	0.77
I feel a sense of loyalty to Durham constabulary	0.90
Public cooperation	
The people I deal with tell me about suspicious activity	0.66
The people I deal with willingly provide me with information about suspects	0.93
The people I deal with willingly assist me when asked	0.77
Public support	
The public agree with the tactics we use	0.70
The public think we go about the job in the right way	0.70
Self-legitimacy	
I am confident in using the authority that has been vested in me as a police officer	0.71
As someone who works for the police, I believe I occupy a position of special importance in society	0.43
Suspects' rights	
People lose the right to be treated with respect by the police when they decide to break the law	0.61
The ends justify the means when we know someone is clearly guilty of a serious offence	0.71
We should be fair to people suspected of committing a crime (reversed)	0.61
Use of force	

Overall, the police should use more physical force to control members of the public	0.81
The police should be allowed to use greater force to deal with confrontational situations	0.79

Procedurally just policing

It's important for the police to take the time to explain decisions to members of the public	0.65
We should allow members of the public to voice their opinions when we make decisions that affect them	0.55
We should treat everyone with the same level of respect by the police regardless of how they behave	0.70

Model fit statistics

Chi square	499.1
Degrees of Freedom	268
P-Value	<.00005
RMSEA	0.04
CFI	0.98
TLI	0.98

Results from an 11 factor solution with no cross-loadings

Appendix Table 2: Correlation matrix of key variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Supervisory PJ (1)	1										
Leadership PJ (2)	0.44	1									
Distributive justice (3)	0.44	0.65	1								
Public cooperation (4)	0.18	0.28	0.20	1							
Public support (5)	0.32	0.59	0.56	0.56	1						
Organizational identity (6)	0.31	0.68	0.47	0.36	0.53	1					
Cynical adaptation (7)	-0.39	-0.64	-0.60	-0.28	-0.48	-0.80	1				
Self-legitimacy (8)	0.30	0.63	0.58	0.45	0.64	0.87	-0.76	1			
Suspects' rights (9)	0.19	0.35	0.24	0.30	0.21	0.56	-0.86	0.56	1		
Use of force (10)	0.13	0.43	0.33	0.16	0.35	0.51	-0.80	0.41	0.72	1	
Procedurally just policing (11)	0.21	0.32	0.36	0.31	0.24	0.44	-0.61	0.65	0.73	0.41	1