

Spring 6-2017

Procedural Justice and Citizen Compliance: Police Officer Demeanor and Crime Severity

Shiny Sharma

CUNY John Jay College, shiny.sharma@jjay.cuny.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_etds

 Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), and the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sharma, Shiny, "Procedural Justice and Citizen Compliance: Police Officer Demeanor and Crime Severity" (2017). *CUNY Academic Works*.

http://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_etds/24

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice at CUNY Academic Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Theses by an authorized administrator of CUNY Academic Works. For more information, please contact AcademicWorks@cuny.edu.

Procedural Justice and Citizen Compliance: Police Officer Demeanor and Crime Severity

Shiny Sharma

John Jay College of Criminal Justice-City University of New York (CUNY)

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Police Legitimacy and Procedural Justice.....	4
Procedural Justice, Citizen Compliance, and Crime Severity.....	8
Police Legitimacy and Citizen Willingness to Assist Police.....	11
Prior Dispositions and Citizen Compliance.....	12
Present Study.....	13
Method.....	14
Research Design.....	14
Participants.....	14
Materials.....	15
Measures.....	15
Procedure.....	17
Results.....	18
Discussion.....	22
References.....	27
Appendices.....	30

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Abstract

Little is known about how police officer demeanor impacts citizen compliance under specific conditions such as the severity of a crime. Using a sample of 141 college students, we randomly assigned vignettes that manipulated crime severity type (e.g., petty theft or armed robbery) and police officer demeanor (e.g., procedurally just or not procedurally just) to gain a better understanding of this nuanced relationship. Participants were more likely to report suspicious behavior, regardless of crime severity, if the officer demeanor was procedurally just. Additionally, participants were more likely to consent to a search and report a suspicious person in the procedurally just with a severe crime condition when compared to the less procedurally just with a less severe crime condition. There were no significant relationships between crime severity, officer demeanor, and participant's likelihood of providing identification to the officer. The results of this study show the significance of implementing policing strategies that foster aspects of procedural justice, as it may be beneficial for the police in receiving compliance and assistance from the public.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Introduction

One goal of police officers is to attain citizen compliance. Citizen compliance can be enhanced by increasing procedural justice (i.e., the fair and respectful treatment of an individual during a police-citizen encounter) and improving citizens' perceptions of police officers (Antrobus, Bradford, Murphy, & Sargeant, 2015; Hawdon, Ryan, & Griffin, 2004). In prior research, procedural justice and citizen compliance have been found to vary by crime type (Mastrofski, Snipes, & Supina, 1996). However, other studies do not find this relationship (McCluskey, Mastrofski, & Parks, 1999). The majority of these studies use observational or survey methodologies. Using an experimental framework, the current study seeks to shed light on the relationships between procedural justice, crime type, and citizen compliance.

Beyond the individual encounter, perceptions of police are also related to community contexts and characteristics. Neighborhood aspects, such as social control, fear of crime, and concerns about neighborhood disorder, are all linked to perceptions of police legitimacy, effectiveness, and fairness. More specifically, research findings suggest that when individuals perceive their community in a positive light (i.e., social control and order is maintained), they are more likely to have positive perceptions of the police (Antrobus et al., 2015). However, it is less clear whether certain neighborhood aspects, such as neighborhood disorder and fear of crime, are associated with belief in the criminal justice system, compliance with authority, and attitudes towards police. In the current study, we will explore these relationships.

Police Legitimacy and Procedural Justice

Police legitimacy and procedural justice are mechanisms for attaining citizen compliance (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). Legitimacy is defined as "a property of an authority or institution that leads people to feel that the authority or institution is entitled to be

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

deferred to and obeyed” (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003, p. 514). Specifically, police legitimacy is the view that the police have appropriate authority to enforce laws of individual behavior, maintain public order, and make decisions that are right for the community (Wolfe, Nix, Kaminski, & Rojek, 2015). Such legitimacy leads people to feel obligated to obey and trust the police.

Theoretically, police legitimacy consists of two perspectives -- instrumental and normative (Hinds & Murphy, 2007). The instrumental perspective focuses on how effectively the police are able to control crime and disorder in a community (Hinds & Murphy, 2007). Conversely, the normative perspective relates to the manner in which the police exercise their authority and make decisions (Mazerolle, Bennett, Davis, Sargeant, & Manning, 2013). While the instrumental aspect is salient in understanding police-citizen interactions, the primary interest of this paper is the normative perspective, because it shapes individual perceptions of the police and enhances greater citizen satisfaction with police (Mazerolle et al., 2013).

An important mechanism of attaining police legitimacy is employing procedurally just behaviors. Procedural justice typically includes four key components: citizen voice, neutrality, respect, and trustworthiness. These four factors are related to the process of a police-citizen encounter, rather than the ultimate outcome of an encounter. For instance, encouraging citizen participation in reaching a decision, showing neutrality in the decision-making process, and conveying respect and trust during an interaction can increase citizen satisfaction and compliance with police (Mazerolle et al., 2013). Indeed, procedural justice tactics convey a message to individuals that they are valued and respected members of society; conversely unfair and disrespectful treatment of individuals communicates a message that they are devalued members of society (Murphy & Cherney, 2012). Police legitimacy can be achieved by implementing such procedurally just tactics, thus making fair and respectful treatment of a citizen during an

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

encounter an important aspect of the citizen's obligation to comply with the police (Wolfe et al., 2015).

There is a large body of research examining the connections between police legitimacy and procedural justice (Wolfe et al., 2015; Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). However, there are only a few studies that examine this relationship under varying circumstances. For instance, Wolfe et al. (2015) explored the generalizability of the procedural justice theory on police legitimacy evaluations. More specifically, their study tested whether procedural justice effects on police legitimacy were invariant across demographics (e.g., gender, race, and age) and situational differences (e.g., neighborhood disorder, prior contact with police, and victimization experiences). Using a random sample of 1,681 mail survey respondents, Wolfe et al. (2015) found that procedural justice effects on the citizen's obligation to trust and obey police were largely invariant across individual and situational differences. In other words, procedural justice has an effect on perceptions of police legitimacy, regardless of individual and situational characteristics. It was also found that among those with prior victimization experiences, procedural justice had a larger positive influence on trust in law enforcement. Stated differently, if victims had more positive experiences with police in the past, they were more likely to trust law enforcement in the future.

Similarly, Wells (2007), using survey data from an evaluation of the Lincoln Nebraska Police Department Quality Service Audit, assessed citizen evaluations of police performance based on three specific types of police-citizen encounters; citation-based, driver in accident, and crime victim. In accordance with his hypothesis, Wells (2007) found that procedural justice effects were significant across all three types of contacts; when officers showed procedurally just behaviors during an encounter, they were more likely to receive favorable ratings from citizens.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Procedurally just behaviors were also more significant than outcome-orientated behaviors (e.g., officer professionalism and competence) across all three types of contacts. In contrast to the Wolfe et al. (2015) results, for crime victims, procedurally just treatment by the officer mattered the least.

Internationally, the importance of procedural justice in predicting citizen's perceptions of police legitimacy is also supported (Mazerolle et al., 2013; Hinds & Murphy, 2013). Research conducted in Australia and England, using survey data, found that procedural justice plays a significant role in the public's evaluations of police legitimacy and satisfaction with police (Mazerolle et al., 2013). Hinds and Murphy (2007) conducted a study in Australia, using a self-report survey, that measured levels of satisfaction with police, perceptions of police responsiveness, and police effectiveness in dealing with crime. The results of the study indicated that residents were more likely to view the police as legitimate when police exercised their authority using procedurally just tactics.

The studies discussed previously have demonstrated the importance of police legitimacy and procedural justice and pointed to its complexity (i.e., other factors, such as context of the interaction, and climate of police-community relations influence individual perceptions of police legitimacy). However, the above studies were all cross-sectional and used survey data, making it difficult to address potential confounds. New research using experimental paradigms are needed to determine the specificity of procedural justice, police legitimacy, and compliance. The present study will add to the current line of research by examining the effects of procedurally just behaviors (through the use of police officer demeanor) on citizen compliance and determining whether these effects vary by two types of crime severity levels (e.g., petty theft and armed robbery). Further, we will explore whether an individual's prior dispositions (e.g., concerns

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

about neighborhood disorder, fear of crime, and belief that the criminal justice system “works”) influence citizen compliance.

Procedural Justice, Citizen Compliance, and Crime Severity

Theoretically, an important outcome of police legitimacy and procedural justice is citizen compliance, which is defined as “conforming behavior to a standard of conduct that is set by normative or political means” (Mastrofski et al., 1996, p. 270). The police are one of the most visible authority figures to seek compliance from the public (Hawdon, Ryan, & Griffin, 2003). Community policing tactics, such as “getting to know” the community and accepting citizen input to reach a decision, used by law enforcement allow for increased perceptions of police legitimacy (Hawdon et al., 2003). Similar to the four components of procedural justice, a key aspect of effective policing is trust between police and citizens. By having a high level of trust in police, citizens view police as legitimate and become more willing to comply with police requests and the law (Hawdon et al., 2003).

A few studies have examined the effects of procedurally just behaviors on citizen compliance with police requests and the law. Dai, Frank, and Sun (2013) conducted an observational study that investigated whether procedurally fair behavior by the police (e.g., police care, disrespect, and use of force) affected citizen (dis)respect towards police and (non)compliance with police requests. While prior research indicates that perceptions of procedural justice affect a citizen’s willingness to comply with police requests, the results of this study found that not all procedurally just behaviors by police are significant. Police officer demeanor and consideration for the citizen’s voice were related to higher citizen respect and compliance, respectively (Dai et al., 2013). An angry tone, a hostile attitude, or unnecessary remarks made by the acting police officer were viewed by the citizen as a lack of police

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

professionalism and legitimacy (Dai et al., 2013), but were not related to citizen compliance. The results revealed that effects of procedural justice on citizen behavior and compliance are not as straightforward as suggested by previous research. Therefore, further research is needed to disentangle the nuances of these relationships.

Additionally, systematic reviews and meta-analyses have examined the relationship between procedural justice and compliance. Mazerolle et al. (2013) conducted a meta-analysis on procedural justice and police legitimacy research as related to the dialogue used in police-led interventions. More specifically, the study found that when the police use a dialogue that fosters the principles of procedural justice (e.g., citizen voice, neutrality, respect, and trustworthiness), it can promote opportunities that enhance citizen's perceptions of procedural justice and police legitimacy and increase citizen's likelihood of compliance. Similar to these findings, Jackson and Jackson (2013), in an empirical study, found a link between police legitimacy and citizen compliance; citizens were more likely to comply with police requests when they viewed law enforcement as legitimate.

While the connection between citizen's perceptions of procedural justice and their willingness to comply with police is marked in prior research, the existing dynamics of this relationship have yet to be explored. An officer's demeanor, attitude, and tone during an interaction can impact a citizen's perceptions of the officer's behavior. Barkworth and Murphy (2015) examined the importance of negative emotion in relation to procedural justice and citizen compliance in public encounters with the police. In Study 1, data were collected from Australian citizens who have had a recent encounter with police. In Study 2, a vignette study assessed the mechanisms involved in public interactions with the police, specifically in regards to emotion. Results from both studies found that there is a connection between procedural justice and a

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

citizen's likelihood to comply with police requests (Barkworth & Murphy, 2015). If individuals believed that police treated them in a procedurally just manner, they were less likely to experience negative emotions (e.g., aggression, anger) towards police and were more likely to comply with police requests.

There are also observational studies that have examined the relationship between procedural justice and citizen compliance and investigated its tie to crime severity. Mastroski et al. (1996) conducted an observational cross-sectional study that assessed citizen compliance with specific police requests in 364 observed field encounters in Virginia. Results indicated that when police take actions that undermine their legitimacy and do not exhibit any aspects of procedural justice (e.g. showing disrespect or not taking the citizen's voice into account when reaching a decision), achieving compliance becomes difficult. However, when police act from a place of high legitimacy, achieving citizen compliance becomes less problematic. It was also found that as a crime became more serious (e.g., traffic stop v. drug-related crime), the likelihood of citizen compliance with police decreased. However, there may be predisposing factors that confounded crime severity and citizen compliance; therefore, this relationship should be examined further within an experimental framework.

Similarly, McCluskey et al. (1999) investigated predictors of citizen compliance with police requests. Data were collected from 989 observed police-citizen encounters in Indiana and Florida, in which trained observers accompanied police officers on beats. The results revealed that police legitimacy was most important in predicting compliance, as six of the nine legitimizing factors (e.g., respect/disrespect, victim/non-suspects, illegality of citizen's behavior, repeat compliance, citizen in conflict with partner present, and strength of evidence), showed significant results. While this study closely replicated Mastroski et al.'s (1996) observational

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

study, these findings did show some differences in results. A large numbers of variables, such as crime seriousness, citizen predispositions (e.g., demographics as well as demographic contrast between police officer and citizen), officer predispositions (e.g., disrespect, years on police force), were not significantly associated with citizen compliance.

Since only two studies, Mastrofski et al., 1996 and McCluskey et al., 1999, have investigated crime severity and its relationship to procedural justice and citizen compliance, it is unclear whether the seriousness of a crime has the potential of influencing this relationship. Mastrofski et al. (1996) proposed two hypotheses about the relationship between crime severity and citizen compliance that reflect the citizen's investment in the situation; (1) the more serious the crime, the greater the cost to the citizen for noncompliance, thus making the citizen more likely to comply (2) the less serious the crime, the less willing the citizen is to increase the costs by not complying, thus making the citizen more likely to comply. Given that there are mixed findings about the influence of crime severity on citizen compliance (Mastrofski et al., 1996; McCluskey et al., 1999), the aim of the present study is to explore this dynamic relationship and add to the limited research in this area.

Police Legitimacy and Citizen Willingness to Assist Police

The relationship between perceptions of police legitimacy and its link to citizen's willingness to cooperate with and assist the police has been examined. Murphy, Hinds, and Fleming (2008) aimed to investigate this relationship by conducting two studies; Study 1 used a cross-sectional design and data from a jurisdiction-wide postal survey. The survey included questions about procedural justice, legitimacy, police performance, and cooperation with police. Study 2 used a panel design of citizens living in a specific suburb of the jurisdiction used in Study 1, who had been subjected to a community policing initiative. Results from both studies

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

indicated that when citizens viewed the police as legitimate, they were more likely to assist the police, specifically with the reporting of crimes and calling the police when witnessing something that needed police attention (Murphy et al., 2008). Similarly, Sunshine and Tyler (2003) conducted a study to examine the effects of police legitimacy on public cooperation with police, specifically in regards to compliance. Results indicated that when the police were viewed as legitimate, residents were more likely to cooperate with police by assisting them with crime control (e.g., reporting crimes, and suspicious activity/persons).

Prior Dispositions and Citizen Compliance

Social contextual factors and citizen's prior dispositions about the police can also influence perceptions and evaluations of police. Braga, Winship, Tyler, Fagan, and Meares (2014) examined evaluations of police using a randomized factorial experimental design, where they manipulated social contextual factors (e.g., officer history, citizen history, context of stop, and climate of police-citizen relationships). Participants were shown three videos of police-citizen encounters that suggested either a negative, positive, or neutral climate for police-community relationships. Results of this study indicated that some prior dispositions of respondents, including political ideology, identification with police, and prior contact with police, had a profound impact on their evaluations of police actions. However, concerns about neighborhood disorder, fear of crime, and trust in government were not statistically significant in respondent's evaluations of police actions (Braga et al., 2014). It was also found that social contextual factors (e.g., officer history, citizen history, context of stop, and climate of police-citizen relationships) shape citizen's perceptions of police wrongdoing, even when individuals observe the same police-citizen encounter video. This study suggests that some prior dispositions

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

play a role in the public evaluation of the police. It is still unclear, however, whether or not such prior dispositions influence citizen compliance with police.

The Present Study

There is a large body of research indicating that procedural justice and police legitimacy play important roles in police-community relations; perceptions of procedural justice and police legitimacy are influenced by how fairly and/or respectfully citizens believe the police have treated them. Police legitimacy results in greater citizen compliance, as citizens who view the police as more legitimate are more likely to comply with police requests. While substantial research has been conducted on procedural justice and citizen compliance with police, little is known about the how these factors vary under different circumstances. To date, no study has manipulated police officer demeanor and crime severity to examine citizen compliance within an experimental framework. The current study seeks to examine whether varying levels of procedural justice (i.e., manipulated by police officer treatment of an individual) impact citizen compliance, including providing identification, consenting to a search, and informing the officer of suspicious activity. We will further investigate whether this relationship varies by severity of the crime (e.g., petty theft versus armed robbery). Further, we will conduct some correlational analyses to examine the relationships between neighborhood disorder, fear of crime, belief in the criminal justice system, compliance with authority, and attitudes towards police.

It is hypothesized that:

- (1) Participants will be more likely to comply with the officer by providing identification, consenting to a search, and reporting suspicious behavior, regardless of officer demeanor, when the crime severity is high (e.g., armed robbery).

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

- (2) Participants will be more likely to comply with the officer by providing identification, consenting to a search, and reporting suspicious behavior, regardless of crime severity, when the police officer behaves in a procedurally just manner.
- (3) Participants will be most likely to comply officer by providing identification, consenting to a search, and reporting suspicious behavior officer when the crime severity level is high and the police officer behaves in a procedurally just manner.
- (4) The relationship between neighborhood disorder, fear of being a crime victim, belief in the criminal justice system, compliance with authority, and attitudes towards police will all be associated with one another.

Method

Research Design

The study used a 2 x 2 experimental design, in which participants were assigned to one of the four vignettes (See Appendix A). We manipulated the demeanor of the police officer in the survey vignette (e.g., procedurally just or not procedurally just) and the severity of the crime the individual in the vignette was suspected of committing (e.g., minor crime [petty theft] or major crime [armed robbery]). The dependent variable, citizen compliance/willingness to assist the police officer, was operationalized through self-report questions in the survey and included three outcomes (e.g., providing identification, consenting to a search, and reporting suspicious behavior).

Participants

Participants ($n = 141$) were psychology students from a larger Northeastern University. A total of nineteen participants failed the manipulation check and were excluded from the study. There were 111 females and 30 males between the ages of 17 and 33 ($M = 19.62$, $SD = 2.70$).

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

The sample included 51.8% Hispanic, 15.6% Non-Hispanic Black, 13.5% Non-Hispanic Asian, 11.3% Non-Hispanic White, and 7.8% Non-Hispanic Other. They were recruited via SONA Systems (research experience program). Participants were asked to come to a psychology research lab at a designated time to complete the survey in-person. After completing the study, participants received one credit towards their class course.

Measures

Compliance with Police Officer and Reporting of Suspicious Behavior. Vignette based-compliance and willingness to assist police were measured using a set of three questions (e.g., “If you were Chris, would you give Officer Lewis your ID?”, “If you were Chris, would you let Office Lewis search you?”, and “If you were Chris and saw someone suspicious in the area, would you have told Officer Lewis?”). The response choices were “Yes”, “No”, and “Don’t Know”.

Manipulation Check and Identification with Politeness. As the manipulation check, participants were asked “What crime was Chris stopped for?”. Nineteen participants failed this manipulation check and were excluded from the study. Participants were also asked “How polite do you think Officer Lewis was?” using a 10-point Likert scale (1 = *very impolite* to 10 = *very polite*).

Neighborhood Disorder. Neighborhood disorder (Skogan, 1986) was assessed using twelve items inquiring about the extent of various problems within the participant’s current neighborhood using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *never* to 5 = *very often*; See Appendix B). Examples include gang fights, vandalism or destroyed property, and robbery or muggings. This scale had high internal consistency ($\alpha = .92$).

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Fear of Crime. Fear of crime was measured using three items inquiring about how worried the participant was about various crimes being committed against them using a 4-point Likert scale (1 = *not much at all* to 4 = *a great deal*). The items were “being a crime victim”, “your home being broken into”, and “being robbed, assaulted, mugged in your neighborhood” (See Appendix B). The consistency of the scale was adequate ($\alpha = .74$).

Belief in the System. Belief in the criminal justice system (Wrightsmann & Schiffhauer, 2002) was measured using fifteen items on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*). Participants were asked how much they agree with statements, such as “High standard of honesty and justice prevail in American courts.” and “Juries base their decisions only on the evidence given in court.” Items including, “Police brutality is more common than people think.”, “All too often, minority group members do not get fair trials.”, and “Police will often keep a suspect in custody even then they don’t have any firm evidence against him.” were reverse scored (See Appendix B). Higher scores indicated beliefs that the legal system “works” or faith in the system, while lower scores indicated a lack of confidence in the legal system. The reliability of this scale was high ($\alpha = .85$).

General Compliance with Authority. Compliance with authority was assessed using five items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Participants were asked how much they agreed with statements, such as “You should accept the decisions made by the police, even if you think they are wrong.” and “Communities work best when people follow the directions of the police.” Two items were removed from the scale to ensure its reliability (See Appendix B). The reliability of this scale was adequate ($\alpha = .75$).

Attitudes towards the New York Police Department (NYPD). Attitudes towards the NYPD were measured using ten items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly*

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

agree). Participants were asked how much they agreed with statements, such as “I am proud of the work of the NYPD.” and “I agree with many of the values that define what the NYPD stands for.” The reliability for this scale was high ($\alpha = .94$) (See Appendix B).

Materials

Participants completed an online survey that included the vignette and a set of questions that assessed the participant’s willingness to comply with the police as well as the likelihood of reporting suspicious behavior. Participants were also asked a series of questions regarding their neighborhood and perceptions of police. The survey was designed and administered online using the Qualtrics Research Suite software. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four vignettes (*major crime-procedurally just interaction, major crime-less procedurally just interaction, minor crime-procedurally just interaction, or minor crime-less procedurally just interaction*) about a specific police-citizen encounter. The vignette described a scenario in which a 20-year old male college student, Chris, was stopped and questioned by a police officer. The officer stated a crime was reported nearby and that police in the area were searching for a 20- to 25-year-old man who matched the suspect’s description provided by storeowners.

Procedure

At the beginning of the study, participants were presented with a consent form (See Appendix C), which described the purpose of the study. The consent form was reviewed individually with the presence of the lead author. Participants had the opportunity to email the Principal Investigator (PI) with further questions if they did not understand the information presented. Participants were able to click the ‘Agree’ button to indicate that they had read and understood the consent form and wished to continue with the study. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four vignettes and were asked to complete the survey, which took

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

approximately 15-30 minutes to finish. In the survey, the vignette was presented first, followed by various compliance and willingness to assist police questions, and then a set of Likert scale procedural justice, police legitimacy, and neighborhood concerns statements. Upon completing the survey, participants were given a debriefing form (See Appendix D) and granted one credit towards their class. They were given one credit regardless of whether they completed the survey.

Results

Manipulation Check

Officer demeanor, based on the vignette, and perceived officer politeness was significant, $t(139) = 14.53, p = .00$). Participants rated the officer as less polite on average in the less procedurally just conditions ($M = 1.74; SD = 1.91$) when compared to those in the more procedurally just conditions ($M = 6.88; SD = 2.24$).

Frequencies

Table 1: Vignette-Based Compliance

	Major Crime Less Procedurally Just (n = 35)	Major Crime Procedurally Just (n = 38)	Minor Crime Less Procedurally Just (n = 30)	Minor Crime Procedurally Just (n = 38)	TOTAL (n = 141)
Provide Identification					
Yes	22 (62.9%)	26 (68.4%)	23 (76.7%)	25 (65.8%)	96 (68.1%)
No	10 (28.6%)	9 (23.7%)	6 (20%)	12 (31.6%)	37 (26.2%)
Don't know	3 (8.6%)	3 (7.9%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (2.6%)	8 (5.7%)
Consent to a Search					
Yes	17 (48.6%)	26 (68.4%)	13 (43.3%)	21 (55.3%)	77 (54.6%)
No	14 (40.0%)	12 (31.6%)	14 (46.7%)	12 (31.6%)	52 (36.9%)
Don't know	4 (11.4%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (10%)	5 (13.2%)	12 (8.5%)
Report Suspicious Person***					
Yes	22 (62.9%)	31 (81.6%)	17 (56.7%)	30 (78.9%)	100(70.9%)
No	7 (20.0%)	4 (10.5%)	8 (26.7%)	5 (13.2%)	24 (17%)
Don't know	6 (17.1%)	3 (7.9%)	5 (16.7%)	3 (7.9%)	17 (12.1%)

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

The frequencies with regard to compliance as a function of the vignette are presented in Table 1, above. As you can see, more than 60% of the participants were willing to provide identification to the police officer, regardless of condition type. More than 50% of the participants were also willing to let the police officer search them with more compliance occurring in the procedurally just conditions. Additionally, the table indicates that 70% of the participants would report suspicious behavior, and they were likely to report a suspicious person to the officer in the procedurally just conditions than in the less procedurally just conditions.

General Linear Model

We used General Linear Models (GLMs) to determine the effects of police officer demeanor (e.g., procedurally just or not procedurally just) and crime severity (e.g., petty theft or armed robbery) on citizen compliance (See Table 2). We analyzed the data two ways, by removing the “Don’t Know” response and by combining the “No” with “Don’t Know” responses. The patterns of results were the same. We report the combined analyses of the “No” and “Don’t Know” responses below. To test all hypotheses, we conducted planned comparisons.

Results indicated no significant differences between officer demeanor ($F = 0.11, p = 0.74; d = 0.06$) and crime severity ($F = 0.49, p = 0.48; d = 0.04$) on providing identification. Results approached significance for officer demeanor ($F = 3.58, p = 0.06; d = 0.32$) on consenting to a search, with a large effect size, showing that those in the procedurally just conditions were more likely to consent to search than those in the less procedurally just conditions. However, crime severity ($F = 1.20, p = 0.28; d = 0.18$) and consenting to a search was not significant. Similarly, there was no significant difference for crime severity ($F = 0.34, p = 0.56; d = 0.10$) on reporting a suspicious person. However, results revealed a significant effect for officer demeanor ($F = 7.30, p = 0.008; d = 0.46$) on reporting a suspicious person, with a

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

large effect size, indicating that those in the procedurally just conditions were more likely to report a suspicious person than those in the less procedurally just conditions.

To test the third hypothesis, planned comparisons were conducted contrasting two vignette conditions (e.g., procedurally just officer demeanor with major crime v. less procedurally just officer demeanor with minor crime). The results did not reveal a significant difference between officer demeanor and crime severity ($F = 0.52, p = 0.46, d = 0.18$) on providing identification. However, results showed a significant effect between officer demeanor and crime severity ($F = 4.29, p = 0.040, d = 0.51$) on consenting to a search, as participants in the procedurally just with a major crime condition were more likely to consent to a search than those in the less procedurally just with a minor crime condition. Results also revealed a significant difference between officer demeanor and crime severity ($F = 5.17, p = 0.025, d = 0.56$) on reporting a suspicious person to police, as participants in the procedurally just with a major crime condition were more likely to report a suspicious person than those in the less procedurally just with a minor crime condition.

Table 2: Overall Models and Planned Comparisons by Group for All Variables

	Overall Model	Procedurally Just v. Not Procedurally Just	Minor Crime v. Major Crime	Procedurally Just Major Crime v. Less Procedurally Just Minor Crime
Provide Identification	(3, 137) $F = 0.51$	(1, 137) $F = 0.11$ $d = 0.06$	(1, 137) $F = 0.49$ $d = 0.04$	(1, 137) $F = 0.52$ $d = 0.18$
Consent to Search	(3, 137) $F = 1.67$	(1, 137) $F = 3.58$ $d = 0.32$	(1, 137) $F = 1.20$ $d = 0.18$	(1, 137) $F = 4.29^*$ $d = 0.51$
Report Suspicious Person	(3, 137) $F = 2.51$	(1, 137) $F = 7.30^{**}$ $d = 0.46$	(1, 137) $F = 0.34$ $d = 0.10$	(1, 137) $F = 5.17^*$ $d = 0.56$

Note. $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Secondary Analysis

Table 3 displays the means, standard deviations, and ranges of the secondary correlational analyses. Neighborhood disorder was rated an average of 1.80 ($SD = 0.73$), indicating that participants reported various problems (e.g., vandalism, burglaries) in their current neighborhood on average a “few times.” Participants rated fear of crime on average of 2.96 ($SD = 1.03$), indicating they were “somewhat” worried about various crimes being committed against them (e.g., robbery). Participants rated an average of 3.61 ($SD = .88$) on the belief scale, indicating that they had “moderate to little” confidence in the criminal justice system. Compliance with authority was rated an average of 2.90 ($SD = .65$) and attitudes towards the police was rated an average of 3.28 ($SD = .75$), both falling between “Disagree” and “Neither Agree or Disagree”.

Table 3: Secondary Correlational Analyses (Means and Standard Deviations)

	Neighborhood Disorder (n = 141)	Fear of Crime (n = 141)	Belief in System (n = 141)	Compliance with Authority (n = 141)	Attitudes towards NYPD (n = 141)
Mean	1.80	2.96	3.61	2.90	3.28
Standard Deviation	0.73	1.03	0.88	0.65	0.75
Range	3.17	3.00	4.00	3.60	4.00

Secondary correlational analyses revealed that neighborhood disorder, fear of crime, belief in the criminal justice system, compliance with authority, and attitudes towards the NYPD were significantly correlated (See Table 4). More specifically, it was found that neighborhood disorder was positively correlated to fear of crime ($r = .25, p = .003$) and negatively correlated to belief in the criminal justice system ($r = -.21, p = .013$). Fear of crime was also negatively correlated to compliance with authority ($r = -.18, p = .033$) and attitudes towards the NYPD ($r =$

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

-.18, $p = .038$). Moreover, belief in the criminal justice system was positively correlated with compliance with authority and attitudes towards the NYPD, $r = .65$, $p = .000$ and $r = .63$, $p = .000$, respectively. Lastly, it was found that compliance with authority and attitudes towards the NYPD positively correlated with each other, $r = .736$, $p = .000$.

Table 4: Secondary Correctional Analyses

	Neighborhood Disorder (n = 141)	Fear of Crime (n = 141)	Belief in System (n = 141)	Compliance with Authority (n = 141)	Attitudes towards the NYPD (n = 141)
Neighborhood Disorder					
Fear of Crime	0.25**				
Belief in System	-0.21*	-0.15			
Compliance with Authority	-0.15	-0.18*	0.65***		
Attitudes towards NYPD	-0.12	-0.18*	0.63***	0.73***	

*Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$*

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate and better understand the relationship between procedural justice and citizen compliance, as it relates to different contexts of a police-citizen interaction. Using an experimental framework, we found that officer demeanor and crime severity was not significantly associated with willingness to provide identification to the officer. In accordance with our hypothesis, however, we did find that procedurally just factors influence one's willingness to assist police with an investigation. Further, we found that a combination of procedurally just behaviors and high crime severity results in participants being more likely to consent to search and report a suspicious person, with large effect sizes. Taken together, our results suggest that when police officers behave in a procedurally just manner, they are more likely to gain compliance and assistance from citizens.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

First, it was hypothesized that participants will be more likely to comply with police requests and report a suspicious person, regardless of officer demeanor, when the crime severity is high (e.g., robbery). The results indicated that there was no significant relationship between crime severity on providing identification, consenting to a search, and reporting a suspicious person to police. In contrast to Mastrofski et al. (1996), who found that as crime seriousness increased the likelihood of citizen compliance decreased, we found different results. Given that our study was conducted through an experimental framework rather than an observational framework, it is possible that crime severity was not as pivotal for participants (i.e., since participants were reading the vignette and not physically present at the scene of a crime). Alternatively, there may have been other confounds that were unaccounted with the Mastrofski et al. observational study.

Second, it was hypothesized that participants will be more likely to comply with police requests and report a suspicious person, regardless of crime severity, when the police officer behaves in a procedurally just manner. Results indicated a trend of more procedurally just officer demeanor resulting in a higher likelihood of consenting to a search, with a large effect size—indicating that if there were more participants in this study, the results would have been significant.

Additionally, results found that participants were more likely to report a suspicious person if the officer behaved in a procedurally just manner. These findings support results by Murphy et al. (2008), as citizens who viewed the police as more legitimate were more likely to assist the police (e.g., reporting of crimes and calling the police when witnessing something that needed police attention) than citizens who viewed the police as less legitimate. Similarly, our results also support findings by Sunshine and Tyler (2003), as participants were more likely to

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

report suspicious activity/persons when the police were viewed as legitimate. Prior studies were based on survey data and given that our results used an experimental framework, they add to the growing body of literature on policing.

Lastly, it was hypothesized that participants will be more likely to comply with police requests and report a suspicious person when the crime severity was high and the police officer behaves in a procedurally just manner. As with all the analyses, there was no relationship to providing identification. However, in accordance with our hypothesis, participants who read the procedurally just officer demeanor-major crime condition vignette were more likely to consent to a search and report a suspicious person to police than those who read the less procedurally just officer demeanor-minor crime condition vignette. These results support findings by Mazerolle et al. (2013), showing that procedurally just tactics during an encounter are important mechanisms that influence citizen's likelihood to comply with and assist police.

Notably, according to New York State law, citizens are not legally required to carry and provide identification to police officers or consent to a search (Dugger, 2007). Participants may not have known the law or may have not have been informed of their legal rights. Therefore, participants may have felt that they had no option but to comply with police requests with regard to providing identification or that the strength of the manipulation was not strong enough to influence the outcome.

In addition, prior dispositions of fear of crime, belief in the criminal justice system, and attitudes towards the NYPD were associated with compliance towards authority. While Braga et al. (2014) found that neighborhood disorder and fear of crime do not influence public evaluations of the police, our results suggest that an individual's prior dispositions can affect how likely one is to comply with authority, using a survey. More specifically, participants that believe in the

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

criminal justice system were more likely to comply with authority than participants that did not believe that the criminal justice system. Individuals who held more positive attitudes towards the NYPD were also more likely to comply with authority than those who hold more negative attitudes towards the NYPD.

Our results indicate that officer demeanor and attitude during an interaction have the potential of influencing a citizen's willingness to assist with a police investigation (e.g., answering questions asked by police, identifying a possible suspect) and comply with behaviors—an implication that should be examined by future researchers. Furthermore, the results of this study have the potential of informing law enforcement how to improve relationships with the community and show the significance of implementing policing strategies that foster aspects of procedural justice. Providing police officers training in procedural justice (as is being done in some police departments, such as Chicago) (Gilbert, Wakeling, & Crandall, 2015) may be beneficial in receiving assistance from the public, which can in turn help solve crimes. By utilizing aspects of procedural justice in encounters with citizens, police will be able to fulfill their duties and achieve compliance from citizens.

Notably, participants could have acted differently if they were physically present at the scene of an actual police-citizen encounter; reading a vignette about a fictitious police-citizen encounter could evoke a different reaction from participants than being present during a real-life scenario. Additionally, the sample included college students—a majority being Hispanic females. This is a specific group of individuals that may hold different views towards police than the public based on their interactions with law enforcement, thus making the results less applicable to the general population.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Future researchers should focus on investigating whether or not other social or contextual factors influence perceptions of procedural justice and citizen compliance. It may be helpful to examine this relationship through stronger experimental manipulations. Researchers should also examine individual and situational factors that influence a citizen's willingness to assist the police with an investigation, such as prior victimizations—as it is an important aspect of crime control and public cooperation.

This study further adds to the research on procedural justice and citizen compliance, as it suggests that aspects of procedural justice are invariant across all contexts of a police-citizen encounter; which demonstrates the importance of potentially implementing procedural justice tactics into policing strategies. It is important for police departments to integrate aspects of procedural justice to ensure that all citizens are treated in a fair and respectful manner. By doing such, the ultimate goal of attaining citizen compliance and assistance with police investigations can be achieved across all contexts of an encounter—creating a positive climate of police-community relationships.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

References

- Antrobus, E., Bradford, B., Murphy, K., & Sargeant, E. (2015). Community norms, procedural justice, and the public's perceptions of police legitimacy. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *31*(2), 151-170. doi:10.1177/1043986214568840
- Barkworth, J. M., & Murphy, K. (2015). Procedural justice policing and citizen compliance behaviour: The importance of emotion. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *21*(3), 254-273. doi:10.1080/1068316X.2014.951649
- Braga, A.A., Winship, C., Tyler, T.R., Fagan, J., & Meares, T.L. (2014). The salience of social contextual factors in appraisals of police interactions with citizens: A randomized factorial experiment. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *30*(4), 599-627. doi:10.1007/s10940-014-9216
- Dai, M., Frank, J., & Sun, I. (2011). Procedural justice during police-citizen encounters: The effects of process-based policing on citizen compliance and demeanor. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *39*(2), 159-168. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.01004
- Dugger, C. (2007). Column: Showing I.D to the NYPD (our times). *New York Civil Liberties Union*. Retrieved from <https://www.nyclu.org/en/publications/column-showing-id-nypd-our-times>.
- Gilbert, D., Wakeling, S., & Crandall, V. (2015). Procedural justice and police legitimacy: Using training as a foundation for strengthening community-police relationships. *California Partnership for Safe Communities*.
- Hawdon, J.E., Ryan, J., & Griffin, S.P. (2003). Policing tactics and perceptions of police legitimacy. *Police Quarterly*, *6*(4), 469.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

- Hinds, L., & Murphy, K. (2007). Public satisfaction with police: Using procedural justice to improve police legitimacy. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *40*(1), 27-42, doi:10.1375/acri.40.1.27
- Jackson, T.R. & Jackson, J. (2013). Popular Legitimacy and the exercise of legal authority.
- Mastrofski, S. D., Snipes, J. B., & Supina, A. E. (1996). Compliance on demand: The public's response to specific police requests. *Journal of Research In Crime And Delinquency*, *33*(3), 269-305. doi:10.1177/0022427896033003001
- Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E., & Manning, M. (2013). Procedural justice and police legitimacy: A systematic review of the research evidence. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *9*(3), 245-274. doi:10.1007/s11292-013-9175-2
- McCluskey, J. D., Mastrofski, S. D., & Parks, R. B. (1999). To acquiesce or rebel: Predicting citizen compliance with police requests. *Police Quarterly*, *2*(4), 389-416.
- Murphy, K., & Cherney, A. (2012). Understanding cooperation with police in a diverse society. *British Journal Of Criminology*, *52*(1), 181-201. doi:10.1093/bjc/azr065
- Murphy, K., Hinds, L., & Fleming, J. (2008). Encouraging public cooperation and support for police. *Policing & Society*, *18*(2), 136-155. doi:10.1080/10439460802008660
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, *37*(3), 513-548. doi:10.1111/1540-5893.3703002
- Wells, W. (2007). Type of contact and evaluations of police officers: The effects of procedural justice across three types of police-citizen contacts. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *35*(6), 612-621. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2007.09.006

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Wolfe, S. E., Nix, J., Kaminski, R., & Rojek, J. (2016). Is the effect of procedural justice on police legitimacy invariant? Testing the generality of procedural justice and competing antecedents of legitimacy. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 32(2), 253-282.
doi:10.1007/s10940-015-9263-8

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Appendix A**Minor Crime in a Procedurally Just Manner Vignette**

“Chris is a 20-year-old college student. He is walking towards the 59th Street subway station near Columbus Circle around 6:00pm on a Wednesday night after class finished. While walking towards the subway station, he is approached by a police officer. The police officer says, “Excuse me, sir. I am Officer Lewis. Can I see some ID?” Chris takes out his ID and shows it to Officer Lewis. Officer Lewis explains to Chris why he stopped him; “Beer cans were reported stolen from the nearby bodega and you match the description given by store owners. Were you involved in the incident?” Chris replies, “No, I just got out of class and don’t have anything like that on me.” Officer Lewis nods his head and asks Chris, “Do you have any weapons on you?” Chris replies “No.” Officer Lewis then asks Chris “Do you mind stepping aside for me so I could search you?” Officer Lewis searches Chris and his bag and does not find anything suspicious. He asks Chris, “Have you seen anything or anyone suspicious in the area?” Chris replies, “No, I was just headed home from class.” Officer Lewis tells Chris, “Okay. Sorry to trouble you.” and lets Chris go.”

Minor Crime in a Less Procedurally Just Manner Vignette

Chris is a 20-year-old college student. He is walking towards the 59th Street subway station near Columbus Circle around 6:00pm on a Wednesday night after class finished. While walking towards the subway station, he is approached by a police officer. The police officer says, “Hey you! Let me see some ID.” Chris takes out his ID and shows it to Officer Lewis. Officer Lewis explains to Chris why he stopped him; “Beer cans were reported stolen from the nearby bodega and you look like the suspect. Were you involved in the incident?” Chris replies, “No, I just got out of class and don’t have anything like that on me.” Officer Lewis nods his head and asks

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Chris, "Do you have any weapons on you?" Chris replies, "No." Officer Lewis then demands, "Give me your bag! Turn around and put your hands on the wall, now!" Officer Lewis searches Chris and his bag and does not find anything suspicious. He asks Chris, "Have you seen anything or anyone suspicious in the area?" Chris replies, "No, I was just headed home from class." Officer Lewis tells Chris, "Okay. Get out of here." and lets Chris go.

Major Crime in a Procedurally Just Manner Vignette

Chris is a 20-year-old college student. He is walking towards the 59th Street subway station near Columbus Circle around 6:00pm on a Wednesday night after class finished. While walking towards the subway station, he is approached by a police officer. The police officer says, "Excuse me, sir. I am Officer Lewis. Can I see some ID?" Chris takes out his ID and shows it to Officer Lewis. Officer Lewis explains to Chris why he stopped him; "There was an armed robbery reported in the nearby bodega and you match the description given by store owners. Were you involved in the incident?" Chris replies, "No, I just got out of class and don't have anything like that on me." Officer Lewis nods his head and asks Chris, "Do you have any weapons on you?" Chris replies, "No." Officer Lewis then asks Chris, "Do you mind stepping aside for me so I could search you?" Officer Lewis searches Chris and his bag and does not find anything suspicious. He asks Chris, "Have you seen anything or anyone suspicious in the area?" Chris replies, "No, I was just headed home from class." Officer Lewis tells Chris, "Okay. Sorry to trouble you." and lets Chris go.

Major Crime in a Less Procedurally Just Manner Vignette

Chris is a 20-year-old college student. He is walking towards the 59th Street subway station near Columbus Circle around 6:00pm on a Wednesday night after class finished. While walking towards the subway station, he is approached by a police officer. The police officer says, "Hey

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

you! Let me see some ID.” Chris takes out his ID and shows it to Officer Lewis. Officer Lewis explains to Chris why he stopped him; “There was an armed robbery reported in the nearby bodega and you look like the suspect. Were you involved in the incident?” Chris replies, “No, I just got out of class and don’t have anything like that on me.” Officer Lewis nods his head and asks Chris, “Do you have any weapons on you?” Chris replies, “No.” Officer Lewis then demands, “Give me your bag! Turn around and put your hands on the wall, now!” Officer Lewis searches Chris and his bag and does not find anything suspicious. He asks Chris, “Have you seen anything or anyone suspicious in the area?” Chris replies, “No, I was just headed home from class.” Officer Lewis tells Chris, “Okay. Get out of here.” and lets Chris go.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Appendix B**Concerns about Neighborhood Disorder**

How often do you see the following conditions in your neighborhood?

	Never	A Few Times	Many Times	Often	Very Often
Vandalism or Destroyed Property	<input type="radio"/>				
Drunks or Drug Addicts	<input type="radio"/>				
Abandoned Housing	<input type="radio"/>				
Burglary or Thefts	<input type="radio"/>				
Fights in Which Weapon was Used	<input type="radio"/>				
Violent Arguments Between Neighbors	<input type="radio"/>				
Gang Fights	<input type="radio"/>				
Sexual Assaults or Rapes	<input type="radio"/>				
Robbery or Muggings	<input type="radio"/>				
Selling/Distributing Illegal Drugs	<input type="radio"/>				
Gunshots Heard or People Shot At	<input type="radio"/>				
Houses/Apartments Broken Into	<input type="radio"/>				

Fear of Crime

Indicate the extent to which you are worried about the following happening to you.

	A Great Deal	Somewhat	A Little	Not Much At All
Being a Crime Victim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your Home Being Broken Into	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being Robbed, Assaulted, or Mugged in your Neighborhood	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Belief that the System Works (Part I)

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Belief that the System Works (Part II)

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Dis- agree	Slightly Dis- agree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
The police do a good job of investigating crimes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Since witnesses at a trial are under oath, you can assume they are telling the truth.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jurors are capable of accurately determining the innocence or guilt of a defendant.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Supreme Court is, by and large, an effective guardian of the Constitution.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upstanding citizens have nothing to fear from the police.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Police brutality is more common than people think.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Police will often keep a suspect in custody even then they don't have any firm evidence against him.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
All too often, minority group members do not get fair trials.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Compliance (Part I)

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
You should accept the decisions made by the	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
police, even if you think they are wrong.					
Communities work best when people follow the directions of the police.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disobeying the police is seldom justified.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It would be difficult for you to break the law and keep your self-respect.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police can be trusted to make decisions that are right for the people in your neighborhood.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
People's basic rights are well protected by the police.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police in your neighborhood are generally honest.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
NYC has one of the best police forces in the United States.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am proud of the work of the NYPD.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Compliance (Part II)

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I am happy to defend the work of the NYPD to my friends.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I agree with many of the values that define that the NYPD stands for.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I cannot think of another police force that I respect more than the NYPD.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The work of the NYPD encourages me to feel good about our city.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, the police are doing a good job in the neighborhood.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
You have confidence in the police officers that patrol your neighborhood.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, the police are doing a good job in NYC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
You have confidence in the police officers of the NYPD.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Prior Contact with Police

- Have you ever been stopped and questioned by the police? (Yes or No)
- Did it occur within the past year? (Yes or No)
- How many times have you been stopped in the past year? (0, 1, 2-5, 5-10, 10-20, or 20 or more)

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Appendix C**Informed Consent**

You are being asked to participate in this research study because you are a student at John Jay College enrolled in a Psychology class. The purpose of this research study is to understand public interactions that individuals in New York may face in their day-to-day lives. If you agree to participate, we will ask you to complete a survey that will take approximately 30 minutes to finish. The survey consists of Likert scale and short answer responses. You will have the opportunity to express your opinions and thoughts on daily interactions.

You will receive one REP point for your course regardless of whether you complete the survey or not. There are no direct benefits to you as a result of participating in this study. Instead, the results of this study have the potential to inform us how we can improve public interactions in New York.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may choose to end the survey at anytime. Participation in this study will involve minimal risk. If you decide to not participate in the research or terminate the research early, it will not affect your relationship with John Jay College and you will not lose any benefit you are entitled to (i.e., SONA credit). All data collected will be confidential and securely stored using encryption software on a password-protected computer and located in password-protected file stored on Dropbox for five years. We will use your name to provide you with the credit on SONA Systems, but we will remove your name from your survey response and will not be able to link your responses to your name.

By selecting “Yes, I consent to participate in this research study.” below, you are acknowledging that you understand what your participation in this study will entail as well as its potential consequences. You also consent to allowing the information you provide to be retained

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

by the research group for the next five years. If you have any questions about the research now or in the future, please contact the Principal Investigator, Preeti Chauhan, Ph.D., at pchauhan@jjay.cuny.edu. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the John Jay HRPP Office by telephone at (212) 237-8961 or via email at jj-irb@jjay.cuny.edu.

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND CITIZEN COMPLIANCE

Appendix D**Debriefing Form**

Thank you for participating in our study. You have participated in a study that is examining the relationship between procedural justice and citizen compliance in specific police-citizen encounters. We did not initially inform you that the study was related to this because we did not want it to impact your answers on the other questions.

There is a large body of research indicating that procedural justice and legitimacy play an important role in police-community relations. A recent study found that perceptions of procedural justice and police legitimacy are influenced by how fairly and/or respectfully citizens believe the police have treated them (Braga, Winship, Tyler, Fagan, & Meares, 2014). A salient aspect of police legitimacy is compliance, as citizens who view the police as more legitimate are more likely to comply with police requests. While substantial research has been done on procedural justice and citizen compliance with police, little is known about how the two are related under varying circumstances. Therefore, we are interested in determining whether treating citizens in a fair and respectful way leads to greater compliance with the police.

If you have any questions about the research now or in the future, please contact the Principal Investigator, Preeti Chauhan, Ph.D., at pchauhan@jjay.cuny.edu. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the John Jay HRPP Office by telephone at (212)-237-8961 or via email at jj-irb@jjay.cuny.edu.