

# INPLASY

## Police Legitimacy and Procedural Justice for Children and Youth: A Scoping Review of Definitions, Determinants, and Consequences

INPLASY202490064

doi: 10.37766/inplasy2024.9.0064

Received: 16 September 2024

Published: 16 September 2024

Li, JCM; Zhang, SY; Sun, IY; Ho, ASK.

### Corresponding author:

Jessica C.M, Li

cmjli@polyu.edu.hk

### Author Affiliation:

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

### ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

**Support** - This work is based on a project supported by the General Research Fund, Research Grants Council of Hong Kong, Special Administrative Region, China. (Project number is PolyU-15608321).

**Review Stage at time of this submission** - Completed but not published.

**Conflicts of interest** - None declared.

**INPLASY registration number:** INPLASY202490064

**Amendments** - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 16 September 2024 and was last updated on 16 September 2024.

### INTRODUCTION

**Review question / Objective** (1) How can we define police legitimacy and procedural justice for children and youth? (2) What are the determinants of police procedural justice and legitimacy for children and youth? (3) What are the consequences of police procedural (in)justice and (il)legitimacy for children and youth? (4) Among children and youth, who are the vulnerable groups receiving less legitimate and unjust treatment from the police?

**Condition being studied** Understanding police legitimacy among children and youth is important for building a just and democratic society. Although the volume of studies on police legitimacy among underaged persons has grown in recent decades, the findings on the relationships between police legitimacy and procedural justice

and their definitions, associated determinants, and consequences remain heterogeneous across studies and across political and legal contexts.

### METHODS

**Search strategy** A scoping review of the literature published between January 1, 1990 and May 31, 2022 was conducted based on four databases: PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus, and ProQuest. Guided by the scoping review screening framework proposed by Arksey and O'Malley (2005), that is, the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis guidelines, and the checklist provided by the Joanna Briggs Institute for quality assessment, 47 publications, consisting of 38 quantitative studies and 9 qualitative studies, were retained in the final sample.

**Participant or population** Police officers and young people.

**Intervention** N.A.

**Comparator** N.A.

**Study designs to be included** This scoping review offers readers a comprehensive and comparative understanding of this topic related to police procedural justice.

**Eligibility criteria** Publications were included if they met each of the following criteria: (1) were scholarly refereed journal articles (book chapters, dissertation/thesis, etc. were excluded), (2) were empirical studies using quantitative, qualitative, or mixed method approaches (reviews, proceedings, letters to the editor, newsletters, etc. were excluded); and (3) were published in English.

**Information sources** Electronic database.

**Main outcome(s)** 47 publications, consisting of 38 quantitative studies and 9 qualitative studies, were retained in the final sample. The results synthesize the operational and subjective interpretations of police legitimacy offered by the respondents in the studies reviewed which is followed by the discussion of conceptual and measurement issues. The key correlates of police legitimacy identified in these studies were police procedural justice and behavior, followed by experience and contact with the police, relationships with other authority figures, and personal competence in moral reasoning and self-control. In addition to compliance and cooperation, cynicism, trust, and health were related to police (il)legitimacy.

**Additional outcome(s)** N.A.

**Data management** The data is stored in the first author's computer and encrypted with passwords.

**Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis** We adopted the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) which is an evidence-based organization formed to develop methodologies and guidelines for conducting systematic or scoping reviews (Munn, Tufanaru and Aromtaris, 2014). It provides a checklist of 8–13 questions for evaluating the quality of studies with different research designs (see Joanna Briggs Institute, 2017, for full descriptions of the items in each checklist).

**Strategy of data synthesis** As this review aimed to clarify the definitions, determinants, and consequences of police procedural justice/

legitimacy, a scoping review was employed to achieve the research objective. The approach was underpinned by Arksey and O'Malley's (2005) five-stage framework: (1) identifying the initial research questions, (2) locating relevant studies, (3) selecting studies, (4) charting the data, and (5) collating, summarizing, and reporting the results. The approach was underpinned by Arksey and O'Malley's (2005) five-stage framework: (1) identifying the initial research questions, (2) locating relevant studies, (3) selecting studies, (4) charting the data, and (5) collating, summarizing, and reporting the results.

**Subgroup analysis** N.A.

**Sensitivity analysis** N.A.

**Language restriction** English only.

**Country(ies) involved** Hong Kong.

**Other relevant information** N.A.

**Keywords** Legitimacy , Procedural justice , Compliance , Youth , Police, and Trust.

**Dissemination plans** to be published in a Journal - Frontier in Sociology.

#### **Contributions of each author**

Author 1 - Jessica C.M. Li - Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing-original draft, Writing - review and editing.

Email: cmjli@polyu.edu.hk

Author 2 - Serena Y. Zhang - Data curation, Formal analysis, Validation, Writing-original draft.

Email: yzhan@socsci.aau.dk

Author 3 - Ivan Y Sun - Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing - original draft.

Email: isun@udel.edu

Author 4 - Albert S.K. Ho - Conceptualization, Writing- original draft.

Email: albertho@cantab.net