

PERCEPTIONS OF YOUTH ABOUT PROCEDURAL AND DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE AND THEIR COOPERATION WITH POLICE

Sidra Noreen,

PhD scholar, Department of Sociology University of Agriculture Faisalabad

Sidrasiyan@ymail.com

Dr. Manan Khan Tareen (PhD)

Research Scholar, Department of Communication Studies, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan.

Dr. Muhammad Makkey Bhutta (PhD)

Research Scholar, Department of Communication Studies, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan

Hannan Khan Tareen

PhD Scholar/Associate Lecturer, Department of Media Studies, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan.

Ghullam Murtaza

Masters in Media Studies, Department of Media Studies, Islamia University Bahawalpur, Pakistan.

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to investigate as to how perceptions of the youth about procedural and distributive justice influence their cooperation with police. The study was conducted on students of the University of the Punjab, Lahore. The major objective of the study was to see whether or not perceptions about police legitimacy fostered cooperation of the youth with police for collaborative crime control. A survey of the University students was carried out and a structured questionnaire was used as a tool of data collection. Data were gathered from 111 students of the five randomly selected Departments of the University of the Punjab, Lahore. The findings of the present study showed that the perceptions of the students about procedural justice were significantly related with their intent to cooperate with police. The respondents' judgments about the fairness of the police seemed to be important in promoting cooperation with police. This present research indicated that perceptions of police fairness were linked with social identity,

which in turn was related with cooperation. Legitimacy judgments were the main drivers of cooperation. Overall, the findings of the present study showed that students had low schema about Police performance in procedural justice and they have negative notions about Police workforce for bringing harmony and stability in society.

Keywords : procedural,distributive,justice,cooperation,crime,police legitimacy

Introduction

Every society has a strong impact of social control on its members. Social control is a universal feature of all human societies. However it is difficult to imagine that how lack of control influence the life of people on macro or micro level. Norms, law and values have grip on peoples' lives. Our concern here is with public responses to one institution of social control, the police and to one mechanism of social control, police legitimacy.

Distributive justice is the perceived fairness in outcomes while Procedural Justice is the fairness of the procedures used to decide the distribution of resources (Mcshane & Glinow, 2005). Distributive justice has significant effect on the life of people. Behaviour is highly correlated with social action.

Legitimacy is a property of an authority or institution that leads people to feel that the authority or institution is entitled to be deferred to and obeyed. It represents an "acceptance by needy people to bring their behavior into line with the dictates of an external authority" (Tyler,1990:25). But people are not only rational actors; they are also moral beings "whose interactions with each other depend on mutually recognizable patterns that can be articulated in terms of right versus wrong conduct, or of what one ought to do in a certain setting" (MacCormick, 2007: 20). They are therefore likely to obey the law and to cooperate with legal authorities on the grounds of deterrence and also for reasons of legitimacy. Social control play a significant role in the life of people. Police is a broad form of law enforcement and to maintain social harmony in society but if police does not follow their duties and delay the distributive justice than peoples' trust on their authority will be vanished and people adopt other ways to overcome their anxiety. This feeling of obligation is not simply linked to the authority's possession of instruments of reward or coercion, but also to properties of the authority that lead people to feel it is entitled to be obeyed (Beetham 1991).The police have endured numerous challenges to their legitimacy as an institution of social control. Throughout their history, the relationship between the police and the public has been vague.

The legitimacy of the police in the eyes of the public is important because it is the fulcrum of the relationship between the police and the public. If the police are viewed as effective, citizens are more likely to cooperate with them. As with the deterrence perspective, this view of public support is instrumental. It suggests that people make instrumental evaluations of authority, working with the police when they think that the police is effectively dealing with community issues and problems (Skogan1990; Skogan and Hartnett 1997).

Policing in Pakistani scenario

It is common in Pakistan to blame the police for all ills of the society. Many naively believe that Pakistan will be transformed if the Police were to be free of corruption. The higher judiciary also calls in senior police officers to the Court where the officers face strong criticism by the senior members of the bench. While the police are criticised for their failure, they are not praised when the police excel in achieving the nearly impossible goals set by the public and the politicians. The capacity of the Pakistan Police Service to deliver on all these fronts is severely diminished by political manipulation, the lack of forensic services, inadequate training and equipment, corruption, and weaknesses in the judicial sphere. Disconnect and lack of coordination between numerous kinds of policing and intelligence organizations are major hurdles on the path leading to collective strategizing. The police in Pakistan have a terrible reputation, and ordinary people often avoid approaching police to report crime or communicate grievances. There is a general perception that the institution of the police is corrupt, institutionally incompetent, and brutal. Consequently, justice is elusive, insecurity is rampant, and ordinary citizens are the victims of this system. Even internal police assessments acknowledge the police force's lack of credibility in the public eye. However, in the overall scenario and in comparative terms, police performance is not much different from the functioning of customs officials, bureaucrats running the provincial and federal secretariats, and the intelligence services. The police officers get the most blame because they are visible to everyone and are expected to do everything in Pakistan, from crisis management to resolving political and legal disputes, in addition to facing the wrath of people venting their frustrations over blunders committed by the country's leadership, both political and military. Still, the police force cannot be defended for its routine excesses, violations of human rights, and inefficiency.

Procedural and Distributive Justice

Procedural Justice refers to the idea of fairness in the processes that resolve disputes and allocate resources, while Distributive Justice refers to the perceived fairness of one 'outcomes. It is also defined as perceived fairness of how rewards and costs are shared by group members.

The distinction between different sources of justice information is also corroborated by a core distinction in the social psychological literature. The literature on sources of authority distinguishes between authority that is linked to a person (personal legitimacy), and authority linked to an institution (institutional legitimacy (1959; Rasinski, Tyler, and Fridkin, 1985).

Procedural Justice refers to the idea of fairness in the processes that resolve disputes and allocate resources. Procedural justice itself turns out to embrace two dimensions: "quality of decision-making" and "quality of interpersonal treatment" (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003).

Quality of decision-making encapsulates a number of considerations, including the opportunity for people to present fully their case to the police, the neutrality of the police in the decision-

making process, and the consistency of the police in applying the law (Paternoster, Bachman, Brame, & Sherman, 1997; Tyler, 2003).

The instrumental perspective holds that the police are legitimate to the extent that they are effective in fighting crime and in preventing disorder. This perspective has been much discussed in the analysis of institutional legitimacy in communist societies, where rulers attempted to cultivate legitimacy through performance (Rothschild, 1977; Tankebe, 2008).

Demographic conditions of places have been related to police resource allocations and police responses to crime, most notably the racial and ethnic compositions of communities and population densities. Police resource allocations determine the capacity for crime control and are not only driven by crime rates but also large populations and high population densities (Holmes, Smith, Freng, & Munoz, 2008). Increased police resources may not be distributed according to crime control needs. Rather, resources are likely to be distributed in a way that severely disadvantages particular groups in society (Holmes et al., 2008).

At the most basic level, people who feel strongly affiliated with a group incorporate it in their concept of self in such a way that the ends of the group become their own (Blader and Tyler 2009, p. 446).

No one particular group is imagined - it could be a work organization, a leisuregroup, a pressure group, or a nation – and the usage allows for the fact that people havemultiple group memberships (Moghaddam 2008).

Another argument is that the legitimacy of group authorities is itself partly emergent from social identity judgments. When people feel included in and valued by social groups they are motivated to legitimate group authorities (Tyler and Huo 2002),

Distributive justice is the perceived fairness in outcomes received relative to the contribution and the outcomes, and the contribution of others while Procedural Justice is the fairness of the procedures used to decide the distribution of resources (Mcshane & Glinow, 2005). Distributive justice in simple terms is one's beliefs that everyone should get what they deserve (Luthans, 2005).

Number of procedural justice criteria has been drawn, such as opportunities for control of the process and the outcomes, ability to voice one's viewpoints, consistency, lack of bias, availability of appeal mechanisms, accuracy, use of accurate information, and following ethical and moral norms (Ponnu & Chuah, 2010).

The idea is, then, that (a) people's social identities are shaped by the behaviour of the

police as a group authority, and (b) the strength of individual's identification with the group influences their behaviour in relation to it. Investigating the dynamics of crowd control through

the prism of their elaborated social identity model Non-confrontational, process-based methods of policing football and other crowds activate social identities among crowd members that cross its 'border' to include other relevant social groups – including, perhaps, the police – while at the same marginalising 'troublemakers' within it. The majority in the crowd begins to police itself, isolating any members causing trouble, addressing their behaviour informally, and even helping police identify and interdict them. Aggressive, confrontational policing tactics, by contrast, fuse the crowd together in a group that stands against the police and strengthen the bonds individuals within the crowd have with each other, including with those who may want to cause trouble (Stott and Reicher,1998).

Blader and Tyler (2009) stressed that procedural justice is not the only element of individual's treatment at the hands of group authorities that might promote cooperative behaviour. In employment settings economic outcomes also encourage extra-role activity and other types of cooperation (see for example .This may indicate rational choice calculation, as people choose to work with authorities that can provide them with material rewards. Blader and Tyler argue, however, that evidence that people act purely on the basis of economic self-interest is mixed, at best (Kohn 1999, Tyler 2011). Furthermore, instrumental outcomes themselves carry important symbolic value, conveying information relating to self-worth, group values, and the extent to which the group values the individual (Porter et al. 1996). Both processes may of course occur at the same time. If assessments of instrumental effectiveness are associated with cooperative behaviours this may be because effectiveness indicates group status and values and because people are more willing to engage with authorities that provide them with material returns

Results and Discussion

The Present Research examining the relationship between police legitimacy and crime and its impact produced conflicting among youth's state of mind. While most studies have found that there is no discernable relationship, several studies suggest that police contribute to reduced crime levels through deterrence, although reductions have been found to vary on the basis of crime type. The review draws no clear conclusions about how the deployment of police (i.e., how they spend their time) impacts on crime. Both police activity and criminal activity are mutually interactive, making any connection between police legitimacy and their work force ability to provide Justice for victim.Data shows that most of the respondents were from age bracket of 22-25 with the percentage of 70.3%. Respondents from age bracket of 26-29 have the least percentage of 5.4% because of the rule of Punjab University that students can't get admission if they cross age 25. The 5.4% (26-29) respondents were from replica program. Most of the students (62.2%) were from master program. 60.3% respondents considered the police as unfair in interrogation Procedural justice is a strong correlate of police legitimacy. 48.6% respondents considered the legal authorities as unfair in implementing laws and according to respondents; the legal authorities are not working properly to bring peace in the society. 61.2% respondents believe that the police are unfair in fighting against crime. By contrast, legitimacy is

connected with people's internal sense of obligation to authority and therefore promotes voluntary, cooperative behaviour. 51.3% respondents said that the legal authorities are not fair for both majority and minority groups and are not working properly to keep equality. 71.1% respondents believe people's willingness to cooperate with legal authorities are directly linked to the evaluations of police performance. 56.7% respondents conclude that acceptance of laws is linked to distributive justice. 69.3% respondents believe that unfairness in police' services lead to non-cooperation between public and legal authorities. 69.3% respondents believe that the police cannot control crime without the cooperation of public. 70.2% respondents believe that unfairness lead to alienation, defiance which later on changes into conflicts. 71.1% respondents believe that people have lost faith in the ability of the police because of their wrong doings to the public. 57.6% respondents believed that Procedural fairness influences public's judgments about legitimacy 54% respondents believe that legitimacy influences the public's reactions to the police. 63.9% respondents believe that police legitimacy influence the life and behaviour of people. Police is a broad form of law enforcement and to maintain social harmony in society but if police does not follow their duties and delay the distributive justice than peoples' trust on their authority will be vanished and people adopt other ways to overcome their anxiety. The legitimacy of the police in the eyes of the public is important because it is the fulcrum of the relationship between the police and the public. If the police are viewed as effective, citizens are more likely to cooperate with them. The given research notions that police and justice are playing with the life of people as toys. Youth is disgust the police workforce and have negative notion about police that delay and sluggish law cause a feelings of alienation among people. This stress on integration, in turn, sits within wider policy and public discourses concerning the importance of enhancing citizenship and 'belonging' among ethnic and other minority groups. Critical voices have noted, often ironically, that many of the methods of current counter terrorism policing such as stop and search activity may serve to undermine trust and turn communities inwards and away from the majority society and the state; because, indeed, they are found to be unfair. As currently implemented, and despite the apparent intention behind Prevent, counter-terrorism policing that is not extremely well targeted may have entirely counter-productive implications, as aggressive police tactics and political rhetoric *create* radicalisation a withdrawal from social identities associated with the wider society. The importance of generating a sense of 'belonging' via Prevent policies (and indeed many other government initiatives) is an idea that continues to garner significant political support while at the same time being heavily critiqued by academics, community activists and others. Yet the everyday activity of police and the lived experience of policing among young people from ethnic and other minority groups, may, in as much as it is experienced as fair or unfair, may be just as important an influence on their sense of identity and social embedded ness.

References

- Beetham ,C (1991).Membership dynamics in groups at work: A theoretical framework. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 17, 373-411.
- Blader and Tyler (2009). The power of trust in manufacturer-retailer relationships. *Harvard Business Review*, Nov Dec.
- Bottoms, A., and Tankebe, J. in press. 'Beyond Procedural Justice: A Dialogic Approach to Legitimacy in Criminal Justice', *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*.
- Bowling, B, and C Philips. (2002). *Racism, crime and justice*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Bradford, B., Jackson, J. and Stanko, E.A. (2009). Contact and confidence: revisiting the impact of public encounters with the police, *Policing and Society* 19(1), 20-46.
- Carson, W.G. (2007). Calamity or Catalyst: Futures for Community in Twenty- First-Centur Crime Prevention, *British Journal of Criminology*47(5), 711–27.
- Folger, Robert , *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
- Gilliland, S.(1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: an organisational justice perspective.
- Greenberg, J. (1986). The distributive justice of organisational performance evaluations.
- Holmes, Smith, Freng, & Munoz, (2008).Hydropolitics in Pakistan's Indus Basin by Daanish Mustafa (Special Report, November 2010)
- Lassman, P. (2000). The rule of man over man: Politics, power, and legitimation. In S. Turner (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Weber* (pp. 83-98). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lupfer M, Weeks K, Doan K and D Houston.(2000). Folk conceptions of fairness and unfairness. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. Vol. 30: 405-428.
- Luthans F. (2005). *Cognitive Process of Organizational Behaviour: Organizational Behaviour*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- MacCormick, (2007). 'Understanding cooperation with police in a diverse society' *British Journal of Criminology* Advance access.
- Mcshane & Glinow, (2005).*Organizational Behaviour*, 6/E.
- Paternoster, Bachman, Brame, & Sherman, (1997).Cohen and J Greenberg (Eds), *Justice in Social Relations*, New York: Plenum.
- Porter, C. H., & Chuah, C. C. (1996). Organizational Commitment, Organizational Justice and Employee Turnover in Malaysia. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage*, 4(13), 2676-2692.
- Rasinski, and Fridkin,(1985). Less pain, same gain: The effects of priming fairness in price negotiations. 545-562.
- Robert M. Perito (2009)*The Interior Ministry's Role in Security Sector Reform* by Robert M. Perito.

Rothschild, (1977); Tankebe, (2008). Organisational justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*. Vol. 16: 399-432.

Shaping Public Support for Policing, *Law and Society Review*, 37,513—548

Sunshine, J., and Tyler, T.R. (2003). The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in

Tyler, T., and Folger, R. (1980) "Distributional and procedural aspects of satisfaction with citizen-police encounters," *Basic Kim*,

W. C., and Mauborgne, R. A. (1995) "A procedural justice model of strategic decision making.