Instruction: Briefly address each item below. Provide enough information to allow the CCJG the ability to evaluate the scope of the review, appropriateness for the Campbell Collaboration, and any possible overlap with existing registered reviews.

1. **Title of the review**

   Legitimacy in Policing

2. **Background and objective of this review (briefly describe the problem and the intervention).**

   Much empirical research exists examining the effectiveness of different policing models in reducing and controlling crime (e.g., Braga & Weisburd, 2006; Braga, Weisburd, Waring, Mazerolle, Spelman & Gajewski, 1999). Perceived increases in crime have resulted in a growth of public dissatisfaction with traditional policing models and more negative attitudes toward the legitimacy of policing overall (Maher & Dixon, 1999; Weisburd & Braga, 2006). Moreover, contemporary ethnic, religious, cultural and ideological issues, create new challenges for the police and raise public concern about the growing social isolation and marginalisation of particular groups (Kane, 2005).

   Research demonstrates that police response to complex problems can result in serious unintended consequences (e.g. Maher & Dixon, 1999). For example, aggressive police presence has been associated with decreases in procedural fairness. Further, research suggests that procedural justice is an antecedent of legitimacy (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Sushine & Tyler, 2003; Wells, 2007) and that the relationship between procedural justice and police legitimacy is circular and reciprocal. That is, positive perceptions of procedural justice lead to an augmentation in public confidence of police legitimacy, which in turn leads to further shaping of procedural justice that may, as a result, influence police legitimacy (Hawdon, 2008).

   When there exists negative perceptions of police legitimacy, the police struggle to elicit public cooperation and compliance (Murphy, Hinds & Fleming, 2008; Sunshine and Tyler, 2003). Non-compliance with police can escalate to violence towards police officers, which may increase the risk of harm to both the police and citizens at the encounter (see Reiss, 1971). Further, police face more critics with respect to the modes, efficacy and efficiency of their actions when their legitimacy is questioned. This in turn, compromises their functionality as a policing body and may reduce the participation by the public to assist police in their role as guardians of law; for example: reduced incident reporting. Moreover, a rift between policing authorities and citizens may occur; this is particularly the case when demographic factors, structural factors and historical experiences significantly differ between citizens and the various policing bodies – this in
turn increases the risk of negative perceptions of quality of treatment and procedural fairness (see Hawdon, 2008; Kane, 2005; Mastrofski, Snipes & Supina, 1996; McCluskey, 2003; Reiss, 1971).

Currently, we lack a summary of empirical evidence of methods that encourage legitimacy in policing. Therefore, this systematic review will investigate what is known about programs that facilitate legitimacy in policing at a micro (the individual) and macro (the institution) level. Results from our meta-analytic review will provide evidence for policy-makers and policing agencies to be able to firstly implement modes of delivery that advance citizen perceptions of legitimacy. Second, provide police with evidence-based models to assist them in performing their duties; and more importantly, advance citizen compliance and enhance the public’s perceptions with respect to their responsibilities.

3. Define the population

The population will be surveys, observations, interviews, case studies, experimental studies, initiatives and programs (hereafter referred to as interventions) that encourage legitimacy in policing.

4. Define the intervention

The analysis will be limited to interventions that promote legitimacy in policing.

5. Outcome(s) (what is aimed to accomplish – Primary and secondary outcomes should all be mentioned)

Primary outcomes include:

- An inventory of interventions that promote legitimacy in policing as they currently exist and their salient outcome domains and their respective indicators.
- A summary of mean effect sizes (i.e. Cohen’s d,) for the interventions and measures of legitimacy (e.g. compliance).
- Investigate moderating variables with respect to police legitimacy (e.g. race, gender, age).

Secondary outcome includes a review that will provide evidence for:

- Policy-makers and policing agencies to be able to implement modes of delivery that advance citizen perceptions of legitimacy,
- Police with models to assist them in advancing citizen compliance and enhance the public’s perceptions with respect to their responsibilities.

6. Methodology (What types of studies are to be included or excluded and what will be your method of synthesis? Will you use meta-analysis?)

The specific aim of this review will be to conduct a quantitative review (meta-analytic technique e.g. Lipsey & Wilson, 2000) of interventions that encourage legitimacy in
policing. Additionally, a systematic narrative of non-experimental data will be included for interventions where an effect size cannot be calculated.

Our team has recently completed an exhaustive systematic literature search of procedural justice and legitimacy policing culminating in identification of nearly 20,000 articles of which nearly 2,000 are likely to be of direct relevance to the current proposal. This systematic search was conducted for the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) under the direction of Professor Lorraine Mazerolle (due for submission on Monday 22nd June). A copy of this very detailed search report is available upon request.

In our database of documents, we have identified books, book sections, journal articles, reports, dissertations and electronic sources that have explored legitimacy in policing. Our proposed Campbell analysis will draw evidence from our database of searches using the following criteria:

1. The study must have been completed after 1980 – April 2009.
2. The study must refer to interventions that promote legitimacy in policing.
3. Interventions that have adopted either a universal (all people in the population) or selected approach will be included.
4. A prospective design with control and comparison groups would be preferred, however, less rigorous methods of evaluation will be included.
5. Studies must have been reported in such a manner that effect sizes can be identified and calculated.
6. Studies must have been reported in either English, German, Spanish and French.

7. Do you need support in any of these areas (methodology, statistics, systematic searches, field expertise, review manager etc?)

Support for this study will be provided by the Institute for Social Sciences Research, University of Queensland; the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance, and the Centre of Excellence in Policing and Security at Griffith University. It is not envisioned that further support will be required to complete the research objectives.
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