

MICHIGAN STATE
U N I V E R S I T Y

**How Democratic is Policing in Post-Colonial
Democracies: The Impact of Procedural Fairness,
Corruption, and Fear of Crime on Citizen Trust and
Satisfaction of Police in India**

Mahesh K. Nalla
School of Criminal Justice,
Michigan State University
560 Baker Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824-1118
E-mail: nalla@msu.edu

Presented at Fourth Annual Meeting of the Institute of Security Studies at
Johannesburg, South Africa, August 21-22, 2013.

Abstract

- The aim of this study is to examine citizens' satisfaction with police in India, a democratic republic and a former British Colony which became independent in 1947.
- More specifically, we examine if citizens' conceptions of various dimensions of democratic policing such as procedural fairness, integrity, fear of crime, and contact explain their trust and satisfaction with police using contributions on Legitimacy and neo-Durkheimian perspectives.
- Data for the study was drawn from a survey of two regions in India using two different methodologies and was collected in the summer of 2010.

Introduction

- Legitimacy is a structural characteristic of all democratic political systems
- Main source of legitimacy comes from institutions that remain integrated as political entities emerge
- Legitimacy of the state comes from the endorsement of its citizens and state's right to hold political authority
- People judge democracy more by 'political goods' such as accountability, equal rights, and citizen empowerment rather than national or household income (Chu et al 2008)
- There is growing citizen interest in governance, democracy, civil society, rule of law, and their institutions, including policing particularly in emerging nations such as India.
- Even after achieving independence and in some instances making efforts to transform policing, many countries have not witnessed transition from regime style policing to a more democratic service (Joshi, 2003), as is the case in India.

Ranking of Asian Countries on the democracy Scale (N=24)

	Rank ¹	Overall Score ²	Electoral Process and Pluralism ²	Political Participation ²	Political Culture ²	Civil Liberties ²	Government Effectiveness ³	Corruption Control ³	Political Rights ⁴
Full Democracy²									
Japan	21	8.08	9.17	6.11	7.50	9.41	1.35	1.50	1
South Korea	22	8.06	9.17	7.22	7.50	8.53	1.23	0.45	1
Flawed Democracies									
Taiwan	37	7.46	9.58	5.56	5.63	9.41	1.17	0.90	1
India	39	7.30	9.58	5.00	5.00	9.41	(0.03)	(0.56)	2
Timor-Leste	42	7.22	8.67	5.56	6.88	8.24	(1.13)	(1.05)	3
Sri Lanka	57	6.58	7.00	5.00	6.88	7.94	(0.08)	(0.42)	5
Thailand	58	6.55	7.83	5.56	6.25	7.06	0.10	(0.37)	4
Indonesia	60	6.53	6.92	5.56	5.63	7.06	(0.24)	(0.68)	2
Mongolia	69	6.23	8.33	3.89	5.00	8.24	(0.62)	(0.68)	2
Malaysia	71	6.19	6.50	5.56	6.25	5.88	1.00	0.00	4
Philippines	75	6.12	8.33	5.00	3.13	9.12	0.00	(0.78)	3

() = Negative

¹ 167 nations were ranked, 1=most democratic, 167=least democratic; Source: Economist Intelligence Unit, Democracy Index 2011.

² Scored: 1=least democratic, 10=most democratic, with the mean overall score for Asian and Australia is 5.51; Source: Economist Intelligence Unit, Democracy Index 2011.

³ Data from 2011, range from (-2.5, 2.5) with high score representing greater government effectiveness or greater corruption control; Source: Kaufmann, Kraay, & Mastruzzi. (2012).

⁴ Scored: 1=Most Free, 7=Least Free; Source: Freedom in the World (2012)

Ranking of Asian Countries on various measures of democracy

	Rank ¹	Overall Score ²	Electoral Process and Pluralism ²	Political Participation ²	Political Culture ²	Civil Liberties ²	Government Effectiveness ³	Corruption Control ³	Political Rights ⁴
Hybrid Regimes									
Hong Kong	80	5.92	3.50	4.44	6.88	9.41	1.70	1.84	N/A
Singapore	81	5.89	4.33	2.78	7.50	7.35	2.16	2.12	4
Bangladesh	83	5.86	7.42	5.00	4.38	7.06	(0.85)	(1.00)	3
Cambodia	101	4.87	6.08	2.78	5.00	4.41	(0.75)	(1.10)	6
Bhutan	104	4.57	6.25	3.33	4.38	3.53	0.62	0.74	4
Pakistan	105	4.55	5.17	2.22	4.38	5.29	(0.82)	(1.00)	4
Nepal	108	4.24	1.83	3.89	5.63	5.59	(0.79)	(0.77)	4
Authoritarian Regime									
China	141	3.14	0.00	3.89	5.63	1.18	0.12	(0.67)	7
Vietnam	143	2.96	0.00	2.78	6.25	1.47	(0.28)	(0.63)	7
Afghanistan	152	2.48	2.50	2.78	2.50	3.82	(1.46)	(1.55)	6
Laos	156	2.10	0.00	1.11	5.00	1.18	(0.91)	(1.06)	7
Myanmar	161	1.77	0.00	0.56	5.63	0.88	(1.64)	(1.69)	N/A
North Korea	167	1.08	0.00	1.67	1.25	0.00	(1.87)	(1.38)	7

() = Negative

¹ 167 nations were ranked, 1=most democratic, 167=least democratic; Source: Economist Intelligence Unit, Democracy Index 2011.

² Scored: 1=least democratic, 10=most democratic, with the mean overall score for Asian and Australia is 5.51; Source: Economist Intelligence Unit, Democracy Index 2011.

³ Data from 2011, range from (-2.5, 2.5) with high score representing greater government effectiveness or greater corruption control; Source: Kaufmann, Kraay, & Mastruzzi. (2012).

⁴ Scored: 1=Most Free, 7=Least Free; Source: Freedom in the World (2012)

What is Democratic Policing?...1

- The meaning of democratic policing has seen a variety of interpretations (Goldstein, 1977; Bayley, 2006; Sklansky, 2008),
- For instance - the current image of democratic policing within the United States is the product of a series of reforms following the riots of the early 1960s (Goldstein, 1977; Weisburd & Braga, 2006).
- Police of the 1950s were beat cops working with the community and patrolling the streets with a mandate broader than that which is delegated to officers today (Nalla, 2009).
- The 1960s and 70s upsurge of crime control &, 1980s popularity of community policing (Slansky, 2008; Weisburd & Braga, 2006) and public desire for a transparent and accountable system (Slansky, 2008).
- High level of corruption decreases trust in government al institutions (Chang and Chu 2006)

Democratic Policing..2

- In a democracy police force theoretically should uphold the following objectives (Goldstein, 1977; Bayley, 2001; Marx, 2001):
 - function to primarily serve the public through crime prevention and sustaining order
 - police service be directly dependent on public approval of the organizations existence;
 - law enforcement tries to obtain public approval but ultimately is unbiased in services delivered;
 - police interfere in the lives of citizens to the extent necessary to uphold objectives and also with respect to the limitations outlines by the law;
 - police use of force is respective to the law and what is considered necessary to restore order;
 - police mirror the characteristics of the community in which their jurisdiction resides;
 - police are integrated within the community rather than considered a separate entity;
 - and police are held accountable to the public in which they serve.

Legitimacy (Tyler; Tyler and colleagues work)

- Legitimacy refers to a social value orientation toward authority and institutions (Weber 1968)
- Legitimacy is a property of an authority or institution that leads people to feel that the authority of institution is entitled to be deferred to and obeyed.
- It represents “acceptance by people of the need to bring their behavior into line with the dictates of an external authority” (Sunshine & Tyler 2003:25).
- Instrumental models: Willingness to obey is related to police performance and judgments of effective crime control
- Procedural justice model: Legitimacy linked to public judgments of fairness of processes through which police make decisions and exercise control.
- Determinants of legitimacy: people’s reactions to their personal experiences with police – positive police contact (Skogan 2006); courteous behavior of officers, perceived integrity, professionalism, etc.

Legitimacy and Citizen Satisfaction with Police

- The nature of police work creates propensity for citizen' s dissatisfaction
- Citizens are inherently self-interested and look for favorable decisions and outcomes of criminal justice actors (Tyler & Hao 2002)
- When police officers choose OR required by law to impose some limits on citizens, officers' authority may become unwelcome.
- Legitimacy is key to the success of legal authorities (Tyler 1990); and, Procedural justice model gains public cooperation because procedural practices can be assessed as fair, in ways that are “distinct,” although not independent, from outcome (Tyler and Huo 2002) .
- When citizen dissatisfaction with the police emerges due to what ever the circumstances (corruption; police brutality & excessive force; ineffective policing, etc.) people' s confidence in the effectiveness of its democracy decreases.

Societal Values and Citizen Satisfaction with Police

A Neo-Durkheimian Perspective

- Drawing off Rock's work (1998) Jackson (2004) argued that confidence in policing is driven by diagnosis of social and moral order – as measured by fear of crime and social cohesion.
- Jackson and Sunshine (2007) argue that it is not that institutions function and shape society in ways consistent with Durkheim's theory: It is rather public perceptions about crime and deviance that can be explained by neo-Durkheimian theory.
- Public concerns of crime are wrapped up in concerns about community cohesion.
- Police are representatives of community values and morals (Sunshine and Tyler 2003) and public concerns of crime are wrapped up in concerns of social cohesion.
- Disorder and incivilities evoke anxieties of about crime AND Risk perceptions are shaped by every day evaluations of social order (policing)

India – Context .1

Land : 3,287,590 sq km - A little more than 1/3rd of the U.S. landmass

Population: 1.2 billion

Age distribution: (2008 est.)

0-14 years: 31.5%

15-64 years: 63.3%

65 years and over: 5.2%

Median Age: 25.1 years

Religion:

Hindu 80.5%,

Muslim 13.4%,

Christian 2.3%,

Sikh 1.9%,

other 1.8%,

Languages: 21 Official languages

Territories: 28 states and 7 union territories

Delhi, the capital is a union territory

Legal system: Based on English Common Law



Police History in India

(Joshi 2005)

- The police came into existence with the Police Act of 1861.
- Section 3 of the 1861 Police Act vested the superintendence of the state police forces in the state governments.
- As a former colony of the the British, the main goal was:
 - To perpetuate rule in India through the police force that was totally subservient to the executive.
 - Authoritarian police force to support the colonial government.

Police History in India....

(Joshi 2005)

- Reform efforts: Various commissions were set up to address police reforms. However, the recommendations to a large extent were not implemented.
- 2007 - The Indian Supreme Court called for police reforms at the Central and State levels:
- Some of the State Governments were unhappy
- Primary goal of these reforms is to minimize political interference and corruption.
- Initiatives include:
 - Fixed tenures for police officers
 - Procedures for selection of higher ranking police officials
 - Separate investigation and law and order functions
 - Police complaint authority (accountability)

INDIAN POLICE SERVICE – Brief Background

- Police are a civil authority – Home Ministry
- The levels of police – Union (or central) and States
- Union Police include
 - Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI)
 - Border Security Force (BSF)
 - Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF)
 - Central Industrial Security Force (CISF)
 - Indo-Tibetan Border Police (ITBP)
 - Railway Protection Force
 - National Security Guards
 - Narcotics Control Bureau
 - Bureau of Civil Aviation Security
 - National Emergency Force and Civil Defense

Indian Police Service.....

- Each state has its own police force
- There are 28 states and 7 Union Territories
- Each state and Union Territory has its own police force
- Each Metro area has a commissioner of police

Number of Police Units

Zones	64
Ranges	157
Districts	635
Sub-divisions	1481
Circles	2452
Police Stations	12248
Police Out-posts	6980

Some numbers on Police Personnel

- In 2008 -- 2.5 million police personnel are involved in law and order maintenance and security
- 2005 – Civil police (excludes some of the Union Police Personnel) including district armed personnel 1,046,575
- Officers per Square KM – 2
- Officers per 100,000 population: 2000 -691; 2005 – 701
- Number of police stations: 13,000
- Number of outposts in 2005: 7,284
- Women Police Officers:
 - Women police officers were first introduced in 1972
 - Women police officers constitute about 30,000
 - but constitute 1.8% of all police personnel

Police Citizen Relations

- People generally hesitate to approach the police; they do so only when their need is acute or contact unavoidable
- Police of independent India do not appear to have significantly transformed the public's suspicion.
- The view of a former police commission is probably as true today as it was in 1903: the police “.. is generally regarded as corrupt and oppressive; and it has utterly failed to secure the confidence and cordial cooperation of the people” (Bayley, 1971: 2288)
- Images of inability to provide a sense of confidence in people are widespread in the media and popular culture.

Citizen Dissatisfaction with Police Services

(Menon 2002)

- Police are the primary law breakers as they can get away with it (22,389 departmental proceedings pending against policemen [BPRD 2005])
- Police and criminals are “in league”
- Police are rude, contemptuous of courts and human rights;
- Police are corrupt (62% citizens have first hand experience of paying bribes [BPRD 2005])
- Treat people in position and power differentially;
- police are not well trained in procedural law or human rights;
- police lack accountability;
- police are unprofessional and insensitive to victims.

Citizen Dissatisfaction with Police Services ...

- Increase in deaths in police custody
- The term “killed in police encounter” is used often raising questions about use of deadly force
- Senior Officer cadre as opposed to police constables responsible for police-politician-criminal nexus (Verma 2005)
- Not easy to register crimes: Some states have more crimes per person registered than others: Reason – it is easy to register a case in some states compared to others

Prior Research in India

- There is lack of scholarly examination on the police culture in India [Verma, 1999: 266]
- Furthermore, there is no systematic evaluation of citizens' perceptions of police in India studied from a scholarly perspective, albeit some journalistic accounts exists about the Indian police organizational culture.
- A pilot study was undertaken in 2008 (Nalla and Madan accepted in the Indian Journal of Social Work) to study these issues which becomes the basis for the current study.
- A small sample of 204 found contact to have no significance on satisfaction with police. However, professionalism, corruption, and Fear of crime positively influenced their satisfaction with police.

Current Study

- The aim of this paper thus is to broaden the focus of police research in India. Using individual-level and contextual variables employed in past research, coupled with scales suited to the Indian cultural context, yet grounded in a theoretical framework of legitimacy and new-Durkheimian perspectives, this study attempts to analyze citizen's satisfaction with police.
- Particularly, we shall examine the relationship between citizen's contact with police, their perceptions about professionalism, integrity, fairness, fear of crime and their satisfaction with police

Survey Instrument (1=SA 5=SD)

- A survey was developed based on prior research conducted on exploring relationship between the public and police. Further, most items were adjusted for the Indian context.
- Nine research variables were used in this study to examine citizens' perception of police work. The variables include four individual level-community demographic variables and six contextual-perception variables.
- The demographic variables are respondents' age, gender, education, and estimate of gross family income salary. Contextual variables include contact in the past twelve months, views on professionalism, integrity, fear of personal and property crime; procedural fairness.
- Originally, each contextual perception bases item incorporated a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. All items were reverse coded to a scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree to assure that high values indicated higher support.

Data Collection

- The data was collected in the summer of 2010
- First Sample: Convenient sample of passengers traveling by long distance trains. Some passengers spend over 10 hours in the train. Passengers were approached with the surveys. After a brief introduction passengers were asked if they would be interested in filling the surveys.
- Second Sample consisted of sample of graduate students in an a business school which was a non-residential program (no dormitories). Students in this school live in the city as renters or paid guests in homes. Each student participated in the survey in the school and in turn had administered the survey to 10 other households in their neighborhoods.



Interesting Parallel to this methodology

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?
feature=player_embedded&v=bBXV-LXzeig#at=106](https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=bBXV-LXzeig#at=106)

Variables

➤ Independent Variables

- Individual: Age, Gender, Police contact, education, income, relatives or friends in police
- Contextual: professionalism, integrity, procedural fairness, trust in police work (single item), Positive contact; Fear of crime-personal; and, fear of crime – property.

➤ Dependent Variables (Satisfaction with police; trust in police)

Table 1. Distributions and Descriptive Statistics of Respondents in India Study
(N=1236)

Variable	Description	All (N/%)	North (N/%)	South (N/%)
Demographic Characteristics				
Age	1 = ≤ 25 years	602/48.7	312/36.9	290/74.2
	2 = 26 - 35 years	305/24.7	256/30.3	49/12.5
	3 = ≥ 36 years	329/26.6	277/32.8	52/13.3
Gender*	1 = Male	863/71.5	651/79.2	212/55.1
	2 = Female	344/28.5	171/20.8	173/44.9
Education	0 = College and Less	769/62.3	709/84.0	60/15.4
	1 = University Degree	466/37.7	135/16.0	331/84.7
Estimate of Gross Family Income Salary (INR)	1 = ≤ 100,000	264/25.8	170/25.3	94/26.9
	2 = 100,001 - 400,000	412/40.3	223/33.2	189/54.0
	3 = ≥ 400,001	346/33.9	279/41.5	67/19.1
Contact: Police Behavior	1 = Courteous	305/46.7	196/42.3	109/57.4
	2 = Impolite	167/25.6	146/31.5	35/18.4
	3 = Neutral/Can't recall	181/27.7	121/26.1	46/24.2
Scales on Contextual Characteristics				
	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Satisfaction with Police	7.63	3.07	1	15
Procedural Fairness	19.56	6.30	1	40
Police Integrity	22.80	5.78	1	30
Personal Safety	8.72	3.08	1	15
Property Safety	3.99	2.06	1	10
Police Professionalism	13.84	4.56	1	25

Independent Variables: Table 2 Continued

Table 2. Mean Differences in Citizens' Perceptions of Police between South and North regions of India

	South (N=391)				North (N=845)				
	D/SD^	Neutra 1	A/SA^ ^	Mean/S.D	D/SD^	Neutra 1	A/SA^ ^	Mean/S. D	F
	%	%	%		%	%	%		
Procedural Fairness (Cronbach Alpha=0.75)									
Police officers perform politely in handling traffic accidents or violations	39.7	25.2	35.1	2.9/1.2	52.7	14.2	33.1	2.8/1.2	6.07*
Police persons handle calls for assistance with politeness	36.9	32.6	30.5	2.9/1.0	56.2	16.3	27.4	2.6/1.2	14.28**
Police in my neighborhood are kind and helpful even when consulted on a case that is not under their jurisdiction	41.7	31.0	27.3	2.8/1.1	53.8	20.5	25.7	2.6/1.2	4.38*
Police officers in my neighborhood investigate in a fair manner regardless of the difference of social status of victims	37.5	35.9	26.5	2.8/1.1	60.5	16.4	23.1	2.5/1.2	21.13**
Police are very attentive when a victim reports a crime	31.4	32.2	36.4	3.0/1.1	51.8	18.3	29.9	2.7/1.2	18.44**
Police are more likely to follow up with the victim's complaints/reports without bribing	64.6	24.1	11.3	2.2/1.0	65.7	12.9	21.4	2.3/1.2	2.07
Police are more likely to follow up with the victim's complaints/reports irrespective of your social/political influence	71.4	19.9	8.8	2.1/1.0	78.4	8.5	13.2	2.0/1.1	0.65
Police cites citizen for a traffic violation equally (irrespective of the size of the car)	47.1	31.1	21.8	2.6/1.2	50.3	12.3	37.4	2.8/1.4	4.25*

Table 2. Mean Differences in Citizens' Perceptions of Police between South and North regions of India

	South (N=391)				North (N=845)				F
	D/SD^	Neutral	A/SA^^	Mean/S.D	D/SD^	Neutral	A/SA^^	Mean/S.D	
	%	%	%		%	%	%		
Police Corruption (Cronbach Alpha=0.85)									
Police officers take bribes in handling traffic accidents or traffic violations	9.9	13.0	77.1	4.1/1.1	12.1	9.4	78.5	4.0/1.1	3.46
Police take bribes in connection with their handling of criminal cases (theft, robbery, investigation etc.)	6.0	16.7	77.3	4.1/0.9	11.8	11.8	76.4	4.0/1.1	3.30
Police personnel allow illegal operation of shops and other businesses to operate in areas they are not allowed to operate	14.7	23.9	61.3	2.3/1.1	13.5	10.4	76.1	2.1/1.1	5.32*
It is very easy to bribe a police person these days	8.7	18.5	72.8	4.0/1.0	10.9	9.7	79.4	4.0/1.1	0.06
People often get away by bribing a police person instead of being given a citation/ticket	7.2	18.7	74.1	4.0/1.0	15.4	8.7	75.9	3.9/1.1	3.52
When a policeman approaches me, I am very concerned that he will end up asking for a bribe in order to letting me go	12.1	15.6	72.3	3.9/1.1	23.9	12.2	63.9	3.6/1.2	16.21**

Table 2. Mean Differences in Citizens' Perceptions of Police between South and North regions of India

	South (N=391)				North (N=845)				F
	D/SD^	Neutral	A/SA^^	Mean/S.D	D/SD^	Neutral	A/SA^^	Mean/S.D	
	%	%	%		%	%	%		
Fear of Crime - Personal (Cronbach Alpha=0.72)									
I feel very safe in your neighborhood after dark	12.8	25.1	62.0	3.2/1.2	14.7	14.2	71.1	2.8/1.3	27.33***
I feel safe walking alone at night in my neighborhood	40.1	16.5	43.5	3.1/1.2	50.4	11.2	38.4	2.8/1.3	6.89**
I feel safe when I see police persons around	24.6	28.3	47.1	3.2/1.1	34.4	20.7	45.0	3.2/1.2	4.62*
Fear of Crime - Property (Cronbach Alpha=0.84)									
I do not worry of my car/scooter being stolen while parked in front of my house	63.6	19.5	16.8	2.3/1.1	70.0	18.8	11.2	2.1/1.1	6.22*
I do not worry of my things/car accessories being stolen from my car parked in front of my house	57.0	23.6	19.5	2.4/1.1	81.2	12.2	6.5	1.9/0.9	72.90***
Police Professionalism (Cronbach Alpha=0.77)									
Police persons are well-educated	28.9	30.7	40.4	3.2/1.1	46.6	16.3	37.1	2.9/1.2	12.42**
Police persons are well-trained	16.3	22.7	61.0	3.6/1.0	42.3	17.8	39.9	3.0/1.2	65.67**
Police persons, in general, are able to handle complex situations	23.1	32.2	44.7	3.3/1.0	18.1	18.1	29.2	3.0/1.2	17.19**
Police persons are generally helpful	28.1	33.1	38.8	3.1/1.1	41.1	19.7	39.2	3.0/1.3	4.86*
Police persons are generally honest	55.2	28.5	16.3	2.4/1.1	72.4	13.6	13.6	2.2/1.2	14.81**

Table 3. Ordinary Least Squares (Citizen Satisfaction with the Police Regressed on Demographic and Contextual Variables)

<i>Variables</i>	North (N=845)		South (N=391)	
	β /SC (SE)	<i>t</i>	β /SC (SE)	<i>t</i>
Socio-demographic Characteristics				
Age	0.17/0.05 (0.12)	1.44	0.21/0.05 (0.16)	1.31
Gender	-0.04/-0.01 (0.25)	-0.16	0.21/0.04 (0.22)	0.97
Education	-0.20/-0.20 (0.27)	-0.77	0.30/0.04 (0.31)	0.97
Income	0.10/0.02 (0.13)	0.79	-0.19/-0.05 (0.16)	-1.17
Contextual Factors				
Professionalism	0.15/0.21 (0.03)	5.47***	0.20/0.30 (0.03)	6.16***
Procedural Fairness	0.20/0.37 (0.03)	7.83***	0.22/0.39 (0.03)	7.65***
Trust in Police	0.62/0.25 (0.10)	6.33***	0.50/0.22 (0.10)	4.93***
Police Corruption	-0.01/-0.01 (0.02)	-0.39	0.08/0.14 (0.03)	3.04***
Fear of Crime - Personal	0.08/0.08 (0.03)	2.32*	0.08/0.08 (0.04)	1.84*
Fear of Crime - Property	0.09/0.06 (0.05)	1.73 [†]	0.07/0.05 (0.05)	1.23
Contact Characterization- Courteous	0.28/0.04 (0.22)	1.28	0.10/0.01 (0.24)	0.43
R ²	0.56		0.50	
Adjusted R ²	0.55		0.48	

¹Represents unstandardized regression coefficient, Beta (β), Standardized Regression Coefficient (SC), and Standard Error (SE).

² t-value is the t-statistic and the levels of significance are marked as below.

Note: [†]p≤.1, *p≤.05, **p≤01, ***p≤.001,

Table 4. Ordinary Least Squares (Citizen Trust in Police with the Police Regressed on Demographic and Contextual Variables)

<i>Variables</i>	North (N=845)		South (N=391)	
	β /SC (SE)	<i>t</i>	β /SC (SE)	<i>t</i>
Socio-demographic Characteristics				
Age	.07/.04 (0.06)	1.22	-.17/-1.0 (.09)	-1.91*
Gender	.24/.08 (0.11)	2.08*	-.09/-0.04 (0.12)	-0.72
Education	.08/.02 (0.12)	0.68	-0.18/-0.05 (0.17)	-1.04
Income	.05/.03 (0.06)	0.91	0.19/0.11 (0.16)	-1.17
Contextual Factors				
Professionalism	.05/.17 (0.01)	3.83***	.09/.29 (0.02)	5.12***
Procedural Fairness	0.10/.49 (0.11)	9.93***	0.04/.16 (0.02)	2.59**
Police Corruption	0.01/.03 (0.03)	0.78	-0.03/-0.11 (0.01)	-2.05*
Fear of Crime - Personal	0.04/.11 (0.02)	2.86**	0.04/0.10 (0.02)	1.94*
Fear of Crime - Property	-0.00/-0.01 (0.02)	-0.31	-0.06/-0.11 (0.03)	-2.14*
Contact Characterization- Courteous	0.01/.02 (0.10)	0.54	-0.15/-0.06 (0.13)	-01.15
R ²	0.41		0.24	
Adjusted R ²	0.40		0.22	

¹Represents unstandardized regression coefficient, Beta (β), Standardized Regression Coefficient (SC), and Standard Error (SE).

² t-value is the t-statistic and the levels of significance are marked as below.

Note: [†]p≤.1, *p ≤.05, **p≤01, ***p≤.001,

Discussion, Limitations, and Future Directions

AND

QUESTIONS

Mullover – data pre-massive anti-corruption/civil society
By Anna Hazare in 2011 which was mobilized entirely on
Media, twitter, and facebook

MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

- Contact – Positive is not significant. However, when I dropped Procedural Fairness from the model, positive becomes significant in the right direction. This adds to Skogan's observation (2006) about contact: People are more oriented to procedural fairness than to outcomes such positive experiences with police which they may consider as one time event.