

Four Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives

David P. Weiss¹

Abstract

This article discusses four challenges for the future of policing as self-identified by twelve police executive leaders throughout the U.S. Twelve police executives from throughout the U.S. were interviewed by this author with regard to future challenges of policing, with a content analysis conducted of their interviews using Tyler's argument of the necessity of procedural justice, legitimacy, and trust for social cohesion as the explanatory theoretical basis. Four common themes were identified by many of the police executive leaders who were interviewed, including protecting constitutional rights of all, keeping up with ever-changing technologies, navigating multigenerational divides in the workplace, and meeting community expectations. This article makes a contribution to the literature and to policing by discussing those issues most salient to police executives across the U.S. with regard to the future of policing and the policy implications therein. Both current and up-and-coming police leaders throughout the nation can take note of these self-identified challenges and govern or plan accordingly.

Keywords: Procedural justice, Legitimacy, Constitutional rights, Technologies, Multigenerational workplace, Community expectations

1. Introduction

The perils and challenges of policing in the twenty-first century are ever-increasing, as demonstrated by the Occupy Movement of a few years back, the community upheaval in Ferguson, Missouri, and, more recently, the intentional ambushing of Pennsylvania State Police troopers during shift change, resulting in the death of one trooper and serious injury to another.

¹PhD, Fitchburg State University, Fitchburg, MA

Yet today's policing challenges are not just limited to the rank and file. Police executives, too, such as chiefs, commissioners, directors, and superintendents, have their own set of issues to address and overcome. Stemming from structured discussions held at Fitchburg State University's annual leadership summit for public safety professionals, as well as from ongoing research at Syracuse and Villanova universities on envisioning the community of the future including police and public safety, the question as to what specific types of challenges should police executive leaders be prepared to address in the next few decades was asked over and over again. To begin to adequately answer this broad question, 12 police executive leaders from across the U.S. were asked a set of 15 questions each. Conducting a content analysis of their responses, four broad areas of concern were readily identified.

First, many of the police executives highlighted the importance of guaranteeing constitutional rights for all individuals in their community—law-abiders and lawbreakers alike. As shown by the demonstrations of the Occupy Movement's protestors throughout the summer and fall of 2011, as well as, possibly, by the shooting of an unarmed black man in Ferguson, Missouri, this past summer, ensuring constitutional rights can be a difficult matter, just as it is problematic to decipher between authentic protestors and chaos-inducing anarchists, or between those lawbreakers who will cooperate with officers' instructions and those who will do whatever it takes to remain outside of police apprehension.

Second, police leaders observed the successes and frustrations of keeping up with the ever-changing technologies in the field of policing. Such technologies include those used within departments, such as the development of newer less-than-lethal weapons, mobile laptops, tablets, and smart phones, and those used outside of the departments that impact their broader communities, such as society's greater access to social media and the use of police departments' neighborhood listservs by community residents. These advanced technological tools, the police leaders reported, had the ability to either enhance community cohesion and facilitate institutional trust and legitimacy, or to create conditions within the community leading to societal upheaval.

Third, the executives discussed the trials and tribulations of leading a department with today's multigenerational workforce.

Now with Baby Boomers, Gen. X-ers, and Millennials serving alongside each other in the workplace, such a compilation of workers up and down the chain-of-command creates problems both with intra-departmental communications and also with workload expectations. Communication styles, skill and educational levels, and expectations of coworkers all differ between the three generations of workers within policing, resulting in low-level tension and conflict for many police departments.

Finally, several of the chiefs, commissioners, and superintendents interviewed deliberated about identifying, responding to, and meeting community expectations. As often noted in the media, these expectations are not readily identified until a significant or even tragic event takes place within the greater community, exposing the community's latent expectations of police—oftentimes too late for a proper response.

Yet these broad themes – protecting constitutional rights, keeping up with ever-changing technologies, navigating multigenerational workforces, and meeting community expectations – lead to even greater tangible public policy implications for the communities in which the police departments are located. For example, the broader national issue of immigration reform and dealing with undocumented individuals in the local community is a hot-button policy issue for many police departments today. How are such undocumented individuals apprehended for an alleged crime to be dealt with, and what expectations does the broader community hold in the processing of such folks? Additionally, with mounting evidence of the continuing loss of the middle class, income inequality, and the growing divide between the “haves” and the “have-nots” (or between the 1-percenters and the 99-percenters), where are the constitutional lines for police between lawful protestors, those residents desiring a civil and orderly society, and outright anarchists whose goal is to bring bedlam to a community? Privatization of policing and the securing of one's own personal safety is yet another policy issue befuddling police executives, with the focus, once again, on the “haves” who can afford such private policing and the “have-nots” who must rely on their local police department. A final example – though by no means the last – of another public policy implication emanating from the leaders' interviews is that of the use of technology in keeping communities safe. Street-corner cameras, police dashboard and body cameras, drones used by federal law enforcement officials on the national border, and other such technologies used by authorities raise questions of potential constitutionality and the infringement upon one's civil liberties.

This paper adds to the literature of the challenges of policing in the twenty-first century by laying out several broad matters for the future of policing as identified by police executive leaders from across the U.S., and links them to relevant, national public policy issues and their implications impacting police and communities alike, all under the explanatory framework of procedural justice, building institutional trust, and establishing governmental legitimacy between the police and their respective communities.

2. Theoretical Framework

Undergirding and helping to elucidate this discussion put forward by the police executive leaders is the Tylerian theory of procedural justice, legitimacy, and trust as set forth by Tom R. Tyler of Yale Law School (Meares *et al.*, 2014; Papachristos *et al.*, 2009; Tyler and Huo, 2002; Tyler 2006; Tyler, 2011). Tyler and Huo (2002) argue, in part, that procedural justice – the perceived fairness of the process wherein authorities make decisions and whether or not individuals believe they were treated with dignity and respect by the authorities – is pertinent to instilling institutional trust and establishing legitimacy of the authorities. Meares *et al.* (2014) recommend, for the purpose of maintaining social cohesion in the community, that police establish relationships with their residents toward that end. Such arguments help to explain community reactions to law enforcement authorities and shape the various expectations of the community.

However, a CNN poll released on August 8, 2014, found that the public's trust in government is at an all-time low (Steinhauser, 2014). A mere 13 percent of U.S. residents agreed that government can be trusted to do what's right most of the time or almost always. A whopping 76 percent of those interviewed said that government can be trusted to do what's right only some of the time, while 10 percent stated that the government can never be trusted. Surely if one profession represents and symbolizes "the government" more than any other profession, it's law enforcement—whether local, state, or federal. This, then, is a public relations and communications headache for police leaders and agencies across the country. Yet the Tylerian model of procedural justice can help frame and explicate these challenges faced by police executives and their agencies.

While principals in both the criminal and civil legal systems look at police policies and procedures through a constitutional lens, citizens and residents judge police behavior on whether or not the policetreat them fairly, recognize their rights as citizens, treat them with dignity and respect, and sincerely care about their concerns (Meares *et al.*, 2006; Tyler and Huo, 2002). According to Tyler (2006), people tend to focus on fair *process*(i.e., procedural justice) rather than fair *outcomes* (i.e., distributive justice), and that the normative issues of procedural fairness matter greatly, influencing residents' behaviors with regard to the law. In fact, for both whites and minority groups alike, the fair use of procedures by police helps to bring about police legitimacy, thereby influencing the public's reaction to them (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003; Tyler and Wakslak, 2004). Additionally, Tyler (2011) and Tyler and Huo (2002) prefer to treat the issue of trust as a distinct aspect of police authorities and not something that is part and parcel to procedural justice, althoughcertainly intertwined with it. Yet the authors found that when they treat trust and procedural justice as independent from each other, "both contribute strongly" to the public's acceptance of police decisions, thereby allowing the issue of what promotes trust to be address directly (Tyler, 2011). Such concepts are modeled in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Interpretive Model of the Tylerian Theory of Procedural Justice

<u>Antecedent</u>	<u>Objective</u>	<u>Outcomes/Goals</u>
<i>Procedural Fairness</i>	<i>Legitimacy</i>	<i>Desirable Behaviors/Attitudes/Effects</i>
Defined as:	Stemming from:	Examples of:
Quality of decision making, neutrality Quality of treatment (e.g., dignity, respect) Trustworthiness Having a voice in decision-making process Lack of bias; all arguments have been considered Honesty Efforts to be fair Politeness Respect for citizens' rights Demonstrated interest in well-being of all parties	Sense of obligation Social norms and values Trust and confidence in authorities Willingness to defer to authorities	Lawful public behavior; crime control Decision acceptance Compliance with/consent to law Cooperation with police Voluntary acceptance of police authority Less resistance to regulation Lasting deference to police decisions Lasting deference to compliance with laws Lasting deference to cooperate with police Less likelihood of conflict/confrontations Reduces problematic people over time Reduces problematic situations over time Less need to control by force/threat of force Less need to control by punishment Greater personal safety for police Greater development of legitimacy Enhances effectiveness of legal authorities

This theoretical framework helps us to better understand and address many of the challenges faced by today's police executives as identified in their interviews.

Additionally, these challenges, such as protecting the constitutional rights of all or meeting community expectations, have even greater implications when it comes to interpreting current public policies or implementing new ones. These challenges, and their policy implications, are addressed below with Tyler's theory of procedural justice in mind.

3. Data Collection

Qualitative data on the future challenges of policing were collected from police executive leaders throughout the U.S. with the use of a questionnaire. Twelve executives, including chiefs, commissioners, superintendents, and one director, from various-sized departments (small, moderately-sized, and large departments) representing four different regions of the nation – Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Southeast, and West – were contacted for an interview between 2012 and 2014. Due to geographical logistics, among other reasons, two completed written surveys were submitted electronically and one interview was conducted by telephone, while the remaining nine executives were interviewed in person.

Table 2: Police Executive Leaders Interviewed by Date, 2012-2014

<u>Interviewee</u>	<u>Date Interviewed</u>	<u>Interview Method</u>
Robert A. DeMoura, Chief Fitchburg Police Dept. Fitchburg, MA	04/30/12	In person
Charles Ramsey, Commissioner Philadelphia Police Dept. Philadelphia, PA	05/04/12	In person
Michael McGrath, Superintendent Lower Merion Township Police Dept. Ardmore, PA	05/04/12	In person
Kenneth Lavalle, Superintendent Lowell Police Dept. Lowell, MA	05/14/12	In person
Ed Davis, Commissioner Boston Police Dept. Boston, MA	05/22/12	Telephone
Thomas Manger, Chief Montgomery County Police Dept. Montgomery County, MD	06/12/12	In person
Bernard Melekian, Director Community Oriented Policing Services U.S. Department of Justice Washington, D.C.	06/12/12	In person
Dean Esserman, Chief New Haven Police Dept. New Haven, CT	06/26/12	In person
John Welter, Chief Anaheim Police Dept. Anaheim, CA	07/20/12	Electronic
Cathy Lanier, Chief Metropolitan Police Dept. Washington, D.C.	08/21/12	In person
Joseph Price, Chief Leesburg Police Dept. Leesburg, VA	09/03/14	In person
Edward Denmark, Chief Harvard Police Dept. Harvard, MA	10/20/14	Electronic

The survey consisted of 15 open-ended questions asked of each interviewee. Answers were recorded by the interviewers with pen and paper (no recording device was used), while still others who were interviewed in person also preferred to submit written responses, too. The two electronic surveys, sent via email attachment, were, obviously, written responses to the 15 questions.

Table 3: Interview Questions, 1-15

1. Please tell us a little bit about your background and how you came to be a leader in police work.
2. What are the biggest changes you have seen over your career in police work?
3. What are some of the challenges of police work that you feel civic leaders, politicians, and citizens should be more aware of?
4. When you project into the future, what changes would you hope to see for police departments and the training of officers?
5. What impediments do you anticipate in making these changes?
6. What skills and training do officers need the most now and how will that change in the future?
7. What attributes should a police professional bring to the position and how has that changed in more recent times?
8. If you could design a training program for officers without concern about funding, what would it look like?
9. What kind of relationships do you hope police officers will have with the public and what would have to happen to make that come about?
10. If you could educate the public about police departments, what would you want them to know?
11. What changes do you think are needed in the management structure of police departments to accommodate the new roles and tasks officers need to perform?
12. What positive roles could unions play in constructing the police department of the future?
13. If things were changing and moving toward the kind of police department you would like to see, what would be the first thing you would notice?
14. In what ways are police departments in larger cities different from other kinds of police departments?
15. When you think about the police department of the future, what troubles you the most and what are you most encouraged by?

A content analysis was conducted on all 12 of the responses, resulting in the observed four emergent categories of protecting constitutional rights of all, keeping up with ever-changing technologies, navigating multigenerational divides in the workplace, and meeting community expectations. Secondary and tertiary issues were also identified by the police executives, and will be amplified in the final section of this paper.

4. Findings and Discussion

Much, but not all, of what is revealed in the executives' interviews has been on the minds of many police leaders for the past few years.

Bayley and Nixon (2010) noted that the salient issues of policing in 2008 were those of budgets and costs, dealing with immigrants, working with police unions, matters of terrorism, and racial discrimination, while current or coming changes included that of private policing and the devolution of policing to the communities. Batts, Smoot and Scrivner (2012) found that leadership challenges in policing included, among others, technological innovations and changes, and incorporating a new generation of police officers into departmental ranks. In 2014, Ramsey continued his focus on all matters constitutional, noting that law enforcement's "first priority is the protection of constitutional rights" of all people.

These matters, and others, are the focus of today's police executives across the nation with regard to the future challenges in policing. Yet these pivotal issues – constitutional rights, technological advances, a multigenerational workplace, and community expectations – can be further linked to relevant, national public policy issues and their implications impacting police and communities alike.

4.1. Protecting constitutional rights of all

Several of the leaders interviewed identified the protection of constitutional rights of all individuals as primary, both for today as well as into the future. The constitutional balance between the rights of the accused, police officers' safety, authentic individuals or groups of individuals exercising their various rights, and service to and protection of a civil society is delicate.

Commissioners Ramsey and Davis and chiefs Esserman and Price all expressed genuine concern with regard to protecting individuals' freedoms. Commissioner Ramsey (2012) stated that police must "protect the constitutional rights" of all people, and recommended that the First and Fourth Amendments of the Bill of Rights to the U.S. Constitution be read at every police roll call, reminding officers of their primary task. Ramsey cited examples throughout the past several years wherein such guarantees were a challenge, including the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, the treatment of Muslims or perceived Muslims shortly after 9/11, and, more recently, the management of protestors across the country during the Occupy Movement demonstrations in 2011.

Commissioner Davis (2012) further echoed Ramsey's concerns, similarly noting that officer training for both now and into the future must include that of how to abide by the U.S. Constitution.

Additionally, Chief Esserman (2012) also specified that upholding the Constitution is primary, and that officers must have a "genuine civic understanding" of it. Chief Price (2014) pondered if civil disobedience is to become a major issue once again, and the many constitutional issues associated with it. Citing the various Occupy movements, and, more recently, the civil unrest in Ferguson, Missouri, associated with the shooting and death of unarmed teenager Michael Brown, Price noted the fine line between legitimate demonstrators and chaos-inducing anarchists.

So, while seemingly ambiguous, theoretical, and possibly even somewhat elusive in concept, protecting the constitutional rights of all individuals in society – the accused, officers, demonstrators, and bystanders alike – must be, according to these four police executives, operationalized and inculcated into the street-level officers and their respective supervisors and departments across the nation.

4.2. Keeping up with ever-changing technologies

Today's technological advancements are a multifaceted challenge for police across the country. Such progress can benefit departments with better forms of internal communication, such as mobile laptops and advanced emergency communications centers; with better tracking of crime statistics and apprehension of criminals (e.g., CompStat, Shot Spotter, DNA testing); and, with greater ease of passing along pertinent information to specific neighborhoods and communities through the use of email listservs, texts, and reverse 911 calls. Yet, such technological advancements can also benefit today's criminals, too; for example, the use of eBay or Craigslist to sell stolen goods, or use of the Internet to distribute or receive child pornography.

Such advancements in technology are viewed by police leaders as a double-edged sword—a tool which can cut both ways, either for good or for ill. With one lone exception, all other police executives viewed technology as being one of the biggest changes they have seen in policing over the course of their careers (Davis, 2012; DeMoura, 2012; Denmark, 2014; Lanier, 2012; Lavalley, 2012; McGrath, 2012; Manger, 2012; Melekian, 2012; Price, 2014; Ramsey, 2012; Welter, 2012).

The advantages to police of ever-changing technologies are numerous. Tools such as automatic vehicle locators, dash cameras, and body cameras may provide for greater officer accountability and safety. Laptops, iPads, and now even department-issued hand-held smart phones give street-level officers greater autonomy and independence, freeing up their time to intensify patrol and visibility within local neighborhoods and communities and increase resident contact. Likewise, community members may also significantly benefit from these tools, having greater and quicker access to pertinent public safety information through community and neighborhood listservs, as well as reporting public safety concerns via the use of “text tips” by texting their concerns to “50411” (Metropolitan Police Department; Lanier, 2012). As observed by one police leader, this is the century of a new breed of young officers who whole-heartedly embrace and effortlessly use these innovative cutting-edge technologies (Price, 2014).

Yet concerns abound as to the proper uses, professional limits, and court-imposed constitutional constraints on various technologies, as well as those concerns expressed over the gains made, or potential harm caused, by intended malefactors. The enforcers must have a handle on today’s technology (Lanier, 2012), while departments must be savvy with such forms of social media as Facebook and Twitter (Price, 2014).

Additional concerns surrounding advanced technologies centered around two main areas. First, leaders voiced worries over the delicate balance between civil liberties and advanced new technologies (Manger, 2012); over the blurred lines of police authority and the use of said technologies (Davis, 2012); and, over too many cameras and tracking devices limiting private freedoms (Welter, 2012). The second broad area of concern unveiled was with regard to the nefarious use of advanced technologies by sophisticated criminal groups to commit significant economic offenses—albeit with far less violence but with greater societal impact (Price, 2014). Such economic crimes threaten our aging society (Welter, 2012). As Chief Price also noted, the crime of the twenty-first century is electronic- and technology-based (2014).

Officers and departments large and small alike will need access to continually-updated, top-notch training on these ever-changing technologies far into the future, as well as training on the professional and constitutional limits of these advanced technological tools.

4.3. Navigating multigenerational divides in the workplace

The presence of multi-generations in today's workplace is not unique to law enforcement, although the specific challenges they present in policing can be. With Baby Boomers, GenX-ers, and Millennials now in the workforce, expectations of workload and working conditions, job satisfaction, and methods of communicating vary widely between these three generations.

While Ramsey (2012) noted that the quality of people coming into today's workforce is better than in prior years, McGrath and Denmark had somewhat different perspectives. Denmark (2014) opined that "the new generation of police officers [has] a hard time finding information that they cannot locate somewhere on a computer screen," whereas McGrath (2012) observed that the job expectations of the newer generations of officers have been one of the biggest changes he has seen throughout his policing career, with Baby Boomers far more willing to make greater work sacrifices than the other generations. However, by far the biggest challenge listed by a majority of the police executives when dealing with a multigenerational workforce is that of "good communication skills" and knowing how to properly communicate with coworkers, supervisors, other departments and agencies, and the general public (Davis, 2012; Denmark, 2014; Lanier, 2012; Lavalley, 2012; Manger, 2012; Melekian, 2012; Price, 2014; Ramsey, 2012).

With today's emphasis for professionals in policing on communication and problem-solving skills (Price, 2014), it is essential to remember that communication can take on various forms (Ramsey, 2012); however, Ramsey is concerned that the more recent generations of workers have diminished person-to-person communication skills which are essential in policing. Additionally, cultivating relationships with the general public in an effort to establish trust also depends upon developing the proper lines of communication (Manger, 2012).

According to Davis (2012), such a goal can be achieved through the use of foot patrols that are focused on communication and prevention rather than arrest and prosecution, as well as through the greater use of social media, such as Facebook and Twitter, to communicate with the public.

Yet, unless and until officers of every generation are trained in the proper forms of communication with the public – people skills for the younger generations, technology and social media skills for the older generation – merely putting 20-somethings on the street and 50-somethings in front of a laptop without such training will only perpetuate the communication challenges experienced by many of today's police departments. In short, proper training for all the various forms of communication used in the workplace environment involving coworkers, supervisors, other departments or agencies, and, especially, the general public, is essential (Lavalle, 2012; Manger, 2012; Melekian, 2012; Price, 2014).

4.4. Meeting community expectations

When it comes to the crossroads of police and community, it is clear that police leaders readily accept law enforcement's role in preventing crime and maintaining safe communities, while acknowledging that communities, too, must also accept their share of the responsibility in preventing and responding to crime. Issues of communication, trust, procedural justice, and legitimacy were referred to more than a few times by the twelve executives interviewed. This section will look at meeting community expectations through a variety of lenses, including those of changes over time (Q2), challenges of police work (Q3), types of relationships hoped to be established (Q9), educating the public (Q10), noticeable changes toward the future (Q13), and future hopes and challenges (Q15).

As McGrath clearly stated (2012), community expectations of police and policing have changed over time, with the philosophical change moving from the professional 911 model to the community model (Davis, 2012), and from the community model to a problem-solving model (Melekian, 2012). Further, Welter (2012) believes that there is a willingness on behalf of law enforcement leaders to improve community relations and engage in a partnership with community members in implementing and maintaining effective crime prevention strategies.

Manger (2012) observed that today's community- and intelligence-led policing have brought about "smarter policing," but that such was not always the case. Back in the 1950s and '60s, per Manger, police told the community what to do, often through fear and intimidation. No longer is that the case in policing today, with police obligated to establish good relations with the community and not be viewed as an occupying force. Taking Manger's observations a step further, Esserman (2012) remarked that communities today want greater respect and the use of procedural justice by police, in an effort to establish trust and legitimacy between the two entities. Lanier (2012) took a more practical approach to police/community relations, observing that trust in law enforcement from the community through the use of uniformed foot patrols is key in identifying and meeting community expectations. Additionally, Lanier stressed that patrol-level officers must use their interpersonal communication skills to develop relations within their respective communities, citing that 85 percent of sources developed in the field come from community members who are connected to a uniformed officer. As such, Lanier places a heavy emphasis on uniformed foot patrols in Washington, D.C.

When it comes to educating civic leaders, politicians, and citizens on the challenges of police work, the executives indicated that there is much work to be done and that these three principals must continuously be educated as to the ongoing changes taking place within law enforcement (McGrath, 2012). Yet two executives linked this educational process and the creation of safer communities to greater fiscal resources. DeMoura (2012) opined that safe communities cost money, since no one wants to live or work in an unsafe community, and, as such, economic development of the community is the linchpin of public safety. Similarly, Welter (2012) recommended that more resources be allotted to police/community crime prevention activities, as led by police. With further regard to resources, Esserman (2012) noted that the average community has 10 percent fewer officers working in their respective communities, yet community members expect that police departments will engage in procedural justice, and also expect that any violence previously eradicated from their respective neighborhoods will not resurface. With police departments and police officers under constant scrutiny by members of the community (Ramsey, 2012), Welter (2012), in an effort to educate civic leaders, politician, and citizens alike, recommends that the police and three principals commit to more dialogue and evaluation of police practices and effectiveness.

In establishing relationships with the public, and how that might look, Sir Robert Peel, a British statesman in the early 1800s, was referenced by two of the police leaders interviewed. Paraphrasing a quote attributed to Peel that the police are the public and the public are the police, Lavalley (2012) and Denmark (2014) emphasized Peel's philosophy that the police and the public are one. As such, active partnerships, positive relationships, trust, mutual cooperation, support, and respect between police and public must be established (Lavalley, 2012; Welter, 2012; Denmark, 2014). Yet, how are such lofty ideals to be established? Esserman (2012) would recommend through the use of procedural justice in policing. Furthermore, Welter (2012), like Manger (2012), argued that police cannot be seen merely as an occupying force using only their powers of arrest to combat criminal activity, and that, according to Denmark (2014), responsibility for public safety and the suppression of criminal activity must be on the shoulders of both community members and police alike. Taking a more practical, yet aggressive, stance on establishing relationships between police and public, McGrath (2012) asserted that law enforcement must go into the neighborhoods more often to reach out and meet the various community groups, while DeMoura (2012) placed an emphasis on training the officers on how to build better relationships with the community. According to DeMoura (2012), police leaders cannot expect officers to have an open relationship with the community if said leaders don't demand it of their officers, and, further, if the leaders don't provide the necessary and proper training for their officers.

When educating the public about police and policing matters in general, a plethora of issues surface. Ramsey (2012) noted that the biggest challenge within minority communities is that of police legitimacy. DeMoura (2012), in alluding to matters of legitimacy and trust, commented that the police force must mirror their community and that the community should not be afraid to discuss issues with officers. Welter (2012) would remind the public that both parents and members of the community must wield their influence and responsibility in reducing neighborhood crime and violent behavior; yet, police, too, must exhibit better customer service to the community and improve their respect toward neighborhood residents.

In looking at the future of policing, the executives envisioned a variety of scenarios.

Melekian (2012) predicted greater involvement by members of the community with police departments in the day-to-day environment of policing. Lanier (2012) forecasted a different look to policing altogether; that being, greater engagement of teams entering the communities, with such team members including law enforcers, scientists, analysts, and others. Welter (2012) also took a practical approach to the question at hand, noting that society would see more community members coming to police departments to provide support in crime prevention activities; community members asking their local government for more resources and community training to expand proactive crime prevention strategies; and, more community members implementing neighborhood-specific crime prevention strategies with little police guidance or presence. Approaching the matter philosophically, Esserman (2012) focused, once again, on procedural justice and police legitimacy, asking rhetorically, "Do we have the respect of the community?" Lastly, relying upon social control theory, Denmark (2014) surmised that if communities started normalizing appropriate behaviors and ostracizing non-conformists, informal social controls would take the place of any need for formal police action.

Finally, again looking toward the future of policing but this time with an eye specifically on meeting community expectations, Davis (2012) acknowledged the great progress that has already been made with regard to police connecting with their respective communities and helping to reduce crime, while Welter (2012) is most encouraged by the expansion of "true" police/community partnerships. Price (2014) observed that today's new officers are very dedicated to their jobs and arrive with the personal philosophy that they are hired to serve their community; yet, he warned, social issues such as immigration and income inequality have the potential to put distance between the police and their communities if such issues are not properly handled or if the communities' expectations of such pertinent matters are left unaddressed.

5. Policy Implications and Conclusion

Throughout the course of the dozen interviews, several secondary policy issues were identified by the police executives, having relevance at the local, state, and national levels of policing.

These policies are, obviously, inextricably linked to the future challenges of policing laid out above and include: immigration reform; income inequality; the role and proper use of emerging advanced technologies; and, institutional restructuring of law enforcement agencies to encourage greater community access.

National immigration reform has turned into nothing short of a game of political football. Republicans, who have now taken both chambers of Congress, are threatening a government shutdown if President Obama takes policy action with an executive order. Caught in the middle are the myriad of law enforcement agencies who navigate immigration issues in the dark. Further, procedural disparities abound as to how federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies process undocumented individuals, whether they are to be processed through the criminal justice system for criminal acts alone, or whether they are to be detained and processed for merely being undocumented. Additionally, expectations by various communities and immigrant populations vary widely as to how police are to respond to, and proceed with, those caught up in the abyss of erratic immigration policies. The courts, too, add another layer of unpredictable challenges to police agencies across the nation. As such, legislative immigration reform and judicial clarification of immigration policies and procedures throughout all three levels of government is imperative if law enforcement is to function efficiently, with legitimacy, and with the trust of the people.

Income inequality – the haves versus the have-nots, or the 1-percenters versus the 99-percenters – is another nation-wide policy challenge facing police agencies, executives, and officers across the country. Readers may remember the WTO riots of 1999 in Seattle, focused on globalization and perceived corporate greed, where the police response to such riots brought down the city's respected police chief, while other readers may remember the 2011 Occupy Wall Street movement and demonstrations in cities from coast to coast. Should income inequality persist, and should the middle class continue to shrink, police, too, will continue to have their hands full with both legitimate protestors, whose constitutional rights must be upheld by police if trust and legitimacy are to exist, as well as with anarchists and other criminal elements whose aims are nefarious and can only be stopped by means of selective and short-term incapacitation. Moving beyond these street-level demonstrations is the under-the-radar issue of privatized policing—privatization of one's safety and security, accessible, once again, only to those who have the financial means for such.

Examples of this include gated residential communities or large firms and corporations, each with their own private security staffs. Addressing this policy challenge for law enforcement will take more than just local access to resources for community residents; rather, it will also take a concerted effort to address unemployment and jobs-creation for tens of thousands of hurting Americans in an uncertain national and global economy.

A third policy area identified by the police executives as having reverberations for the future of policing is the role and proper use of emerging advanced technologies. Such new-and-improved technologies are seemingly ubiquitous, used by offenders and officers alike. Use of smartphone apps assist criminals in avoiding police, while Craigslist and eBay are the pawn shops of the twenty-first century, used to unload stolen goods. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and other social media are also exploited to make deleterious connections, show off weapons, or brag of delinquent activities. Further, the Internet is effortlessly used to exploit innocents in the distribution and trading of child pornography, as well as to engage in international human trafficking.

Yet law enforcement agencies also use advanced technologies for their own purposes, including such technologies as license plate readers, streetlight-mounted video cameras, unmanned/unarmed drones used for border security and protection, perusing the Internet and social media to solve crimes, communicating to specific individuals or community residents via text, email listservs or reverse 911, shot-spotter software, vehicle tracking devices, dash- and uniform-mounted video cameras, and accessing cellphone/cell tower “pings” to locate those on the run from police. However, overarching all of these matters of civil liberties and constitutionality. Federal and state courts rule on such matters on an increasingly-frequent basis, making it difficult for our approximately 20,000 nation-wide law enforcement agencies to keep abreast of current case law. Finally with regard to the role and use of advanced technologies are the issues of agency resources and personnel training. Many of these technologies are costly and out of financial reach for even midsize police agencies. Yet, even if accessed, additional costs must still be borne by the agencies to properly train their personnel. Such “ratcheting up” of the use of advanced technologies may eventually reach a point of diminishing returns—as well as roadblocks by both civil libertarians and the courts.

Lastly is the matter of restructuring our law enforcement institutions to allow for greater community access. At first blush, this may seem like an odd policy for police executives to identify and pursue. Yet, as the world becomes ever-smaller through various methods of instantaneous communiques and social media, police agencies, too, must adapt to this new reality. Forward-looking policies and procedures helping to achieve this goal might include: the continued flattening of bureaucratic and hierarchical police institutions by requiring lieutenants, captains, and even deputy or assistant chiefs to engage in community contact and occasional patrol; regionalizing or consolidating public safety services (which also helps to reduce costs); accrediting law enforcement agencies through the national organization of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) to help create uniform hiring and promotional standards; deemphasizing and closing traditional police academies, relocating such training and education onto college and university campuses; requiring a college-level education for new patrol officers (which they can obtain through the above-mentioned colleges and universities); and, lastly, engaging in genuine community policing through the continued establishment of relationships with communities, community groups, and community residents alike. Police agencies across the county are working under the new norm of policing smarter with fewer tangible and financial resources. Increasing and intensifying community partnerships will go a long way toward gaining the public's trust and establishing police legitimacy, thereby bringing about desirable prosocial behaviors and attitudes.

The four future challenges in policing laid out in this paper, as well as the four policy implications, bring us full circle to the importance of the Tylerian theory of procedural justice. If we are to succeed in our objective of gaining institutional legitimacy through trust and confidence in authorizes with the outcome of desirable prosocial behaviors and attitudes, procedural fairness in working with the community must come first. Operationalizing procedural fairness comes, in part, though officers' quality of decision-making and treatment of its community members, allowing members to have a voice in the decision-making process, considering all sides of the argument and showing efforts to be fair, demonstrating an interest in the well-being of all parties, and exhibiting a capacity for honesty, politeness, dignity, respect, and transparency of process. One needsto look no further than Ferguson, Missouri, to see community expectations and institutional trust and legitimacy lie in an ash heap of ruins.

Yet, while implementing and sustaining procedural justice is a monumental task, its importance to the future of policing in helping to achieve a cohesive society is paramount.

References

- Batts, A.W., Smoot, S.M. and Scrivner, E. (2012), *Police Leadership Challenges in a Changing World*, National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice, Washington, DC.
- Bayley, D.H. and Nixon, C. (2010), *The Changing Environment for Policing, 1985-2008*, National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice, Washington, DC.
- Davis, E. (2012), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss, May 22.
- DeMoura, R. (2012), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss, April 30.
- Denmark, E. (2014), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss, October 20.
- Esserman, D. (2012), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss and John Chetro-Szivos, June 26.
- Lanier, C. (2012), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss, August 21.
- Lavalle, K. (2012), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss and John Chetro-Szivos, May 14.
- McGrath, M. (2012), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss and John Chetro-Szivos, May 4.
- Manger, T. (2012), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss, June 12.
- Meares, T.L., Tyler, T.R. and Gardener, J. (2014), "Lawful or Fair? How Cops and Laypeople View Good Policing," working paper no. 255, Yale Law School, Yale University, New Haven, CT, August 11.
- Melekian, B. (2012), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss, June 12.
- Papachristos, A.V., Meares, T.L. and Fagan, J. (2009), "Why Do Criminals Obey the Law? The Influence of Legitimacy and Social Networks on Active Gun Offenders," research paper no. 373, Yale University, New Haven, CT, January 12, available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1326631 (accessed September 17, 2014).
- Price, J. (2014), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss, September 3.
- Ramsey, C.H. (2012), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss and John Chetro-Szivos, May 4.
- Ramsey, C.H. (2014), *The Challenge of Policing in a Democratic Society: A Personal Journey Toward Understanding*, National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

- Schulhofer, S.J., Tyler, T.R. and Huq, A.Z. (2011), "American Policing at a Crossroads: Unsustainable Policies and the Procedural Justice Alternative," *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, Vol. 101 No. 2, pp. 335-374.
- Steinhauser, P. (2014), "CNN Poll: Trust in government at all-time low," Washington, DC, August 8.
- Sunshine, J., and Tyler, T.R. (2003), "The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Shaping Public Support for Policing," *Law & Society Review*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 513-547.
- Tyler, T.R. (2005), "Introduction: Legitimizing Ideologies," *Social Justice Research*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 211-215.
- Tyler, T.R. (2006), *Why People Obey the Law*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Tyler, T.R. (2010), "Overview of police legitimacy, procedural justice and values based policing," paper presented at a procedural justice roundtable, August 11.
- Tyler, T.R. (2011), *Why People Cooperate: The Role of Social Motivations*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Tyler, T.R. and Huo, Y.J. (2002), *Trust in the Law: Encouraging Public Cooperation with the Police and Courts*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, NY.
- Tyler, T.R., and Wakslak, C.J. (2004), "Profiling and Police Legitimacy: Procedural Justice, Attributions of Movie, and Acceptance of Police Authority," *Criminology*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 253-281.
- Welter, J. (2012), "Future Challenges in Policing for Chief Executives," Interviewed by David P. Weiss, July 20.