What Shapes Security Guards' Trust in Police? The Role of Perceived Obligation to Obey, Procedural Fairness, Distributive Justice, and Legal Cynicism[1]

Mahesh K. Nalla[2], Gorazd Meško[3]

There have been studies about citizens' perceptions of trust in the police in both developed and undeveloped economies relative to security guards, who for the most part are private citizens but whose job responsibilities and duties sometimes resemble some functions of the public police. In this paper, we examine security guards' attitudes regarding their trust and confidence in police officers in Slovenia. The data for the study come from a sample of security officers who were required by law to undergo professional development courses on a periodic basis as delineated by the Private Security Act (Zakon o zasebnem varovanju, 2011) of Slovenia. The findings suggest that distributive fairness, procedural justice, and legal cynicism are strong predictors of security guards' trust in police.

Keywords: private security officers, police, trust, Slovenia

UDC: 351.74/.76

1 Introduction

Two bodies of research on policing have emerged in recent decades. The first focuses on the growth of private policing[4] and the private security industry. While policing is a function of social regulation for the public good, in reality policing by non-state actors is widespread, not only in developed democracies but in emerging and transitional societies as well. Of the non-state actors, the manned security industry has been the most visible element of social regulation and has been the focus of considerable research over the last 30 years, particularly among those scholars interested in examining the phenomenon of "private policing." While public police officers have been labelled and assumed to be the primary source of crime control up until the 1980s, private security has since slowly begun to play a significant role. Many explanations have been offered for such shifts, and include due shifts in property relations (i.e., *mass private property*, a term for the spaces in which much public life takes place, among others,

such as amusement parks and large apartment complexes (Shearing & Stenning, 1983), general consumerism and marketing of private security (Loader, 1999; Shearing, 1992), and shrinking state budgets and consequent redefinition of public law enforcement's role (Garland, 1996).

The second body of research relates to the study of police legitimacy, obedience to authority and law, trust, and confidence in public law enforcement and policing institutions. The major thrust of this work is the assumption that police work is effective only to the extent citizens are willing to cooperate with police and compliant to police directives. This compliance, cooperation, and trust can be achieved only if citizens recognize police work as effective, legitimate, and fair (Tyler, 1990).

What makes the intersection between these two bodies of literature is the nature of police work in contrast to the tasks security guards perform. Both groups function as social regulators as they come in contact and interact with private citizens on a regular basis. This commonality in their services to citizens also brings them in contact with each other as professionals on a regular basis. Considerable research has been done on assessing citizens' attitudes toward public police, more specifically trust in police, and to a lesser extent on private security guards. However, we know very little about private security guards, who are private citizens but interact with the police on a regular basis as part of their work, and the extent to which they have positive views of public police. If citizen perceptions of police are important because it would help improve police services, it is also vital to understand how

security guards view police officers given the opportunities these two groups have to meet and work with each other. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to assess the extent to which private security guards' attitudes toward public police officers are positive. More specifically, we examine whether their perceptions of legitimacy, fairness, effectiveness, and contact influence their trust in public police officers. The context of this research is Slovenia.

2   Police Officers vis-à-vis Private Security Guards

Though there were no clear conceptual differences between what constituted private police from that of public police prior to the 19th century (Horwitz, 1982), the first modern public police, which has its origins in the Metropolitan Police of London in 1829, emerged purely as a function of the welfare state (Reiner, 2007). However, modern private police re--emerged after the formal public police were well established (Joh, 2005). Thus, while private security is not a new phenomena (Johnston, 1992), it has assumed some significance as a provider of safety and security with shifts in governance from the "welfare state approach," that is, the state as the primary provider of goods and services to market-led new-liberal policies where the state began to outsource many of the critical services to the private sector as a consequence of fiscal crises (White, 2012). Consequently, the growth of private security has caused the public sector to no longer hold a monopoly over policing (Bayley & Shearing, 1996; Shearing, 1992).

With the expansion of mass private property, such as shopping malls, amusement parks, and gated communities (Shearing & Stenning, 1983) where much public life takes place on private properties, policing by private security guards has become a routine business. Security guards not only engage in street patrolling and order maintenance functions but also in exercising coercive control (Baker, 2002; Rigakos, 2002; Stenning, 2000) over citizens. For instance, both public police and private security guards do patrol work (though legal frameworks of specific countries govern the powers of public police work) in contrast to security guards, whose status is primarily that of private citizens.

Private security personnel deliver services of private policing to prevent crime and antisocial behaviour but also deliver for their clients, services such as "housekeeping," "customer care," "enforcing rules and administering sanctions," "responding to emergencies and offences in progress," and "gathering and sharing information" (Wakefield, 2003), which contribute toward increased surveillance and crime prevention. In other words, security guards operate most often with

greater powers than private citizens. Though there are some fundamental differences in functionality and powers between the public and private police (Joh, 2004, 2005), and the fact that police officers as a group are collectively distinct from citizens (Herbert, 2006), both groups engage in similar tasks, such as patrol work, public assistance, traffic control, order maintenance, and crime prevention. In many, but not all countries (De Waard, 1999), such organizations and individuals are usually granted "special powers" (Button, 2007: 114) "that are greater than those of ordinary citizens" (Wakefield, 2005: 534), and which are suspiciously reminiscent of the responsibilities and powers of the police.

3   Citizen Attitudes toward Police Officers: Prior Research

There is a large body of research on citizens' attitudes toward public policing in many countries. Generally, these studies examine the relationship between demographic characteristics, such as age, gender, income, and occupation, as explanatory variables for citizen trust in the police and favourable attitudes toward the police. There is considerable literature that found evidence of younger people having less favourable impressions of the police (Jesilow, Meyer, & Namazzi, 1995). However, others have found no such relationship (Thurman & Reisig, 1996), yet others (McCluskey, McCluskey, & Enriquez, 2008) found that older people tend have more positive views of the police. The findings regarding gender and positive views of the police were also mixed. Some have found females to have more positive views of the police (Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Reisig & Giacomazzi, 1998), while others have found just the opposite relationship (Correia, Reisig, & Lovrich, 1996). Yet, still others have found no relationship between gender and positive views of the police (Chermak, McGarrell, & Weiss, 2001). Many scholars have studied the relationship of the nature of citizen-police contact, perceived effectiveness, professionalism, and other such attributes of police work to citizen satisfaction with the ice (Engel, 2005; Frank, Smith, & Novak, 2005; Weitzer & Tuch, 2005).

There is also extensive research on the relationship between contextual characteristics in determining citizens' positive attitudes – specifically, trust and satisfaction with police. These contextual variables include issues of police effectiveness and performance, perceived legitimacy of police officers, fairness and compassion while engaging with the public, and contact. Among these, the notion of police legitimacy is a critical factor. The past few decades have seen much space devoted to research on police legitimacy. The key question, as it relates to police, is "Why should citizens find it

compelling to obey police authority?" More importantly, how are views on police legitimacy related to citizen trust in the police? According to Jackson, Bradford, Hough, and Murray (2012), police legitimacy assumes citizens' obligation to obey the directives and authority of the officers, since it is directly linked to compliance with the law. Sunshine and Tyler (2003) have suggested that perceived police legitimacy is composed of instrumental and normative aspects; the former include the elements of police performance, risk, and judgment about distributive justice, while the latter include an aspect of procedural justice that has been the focus of a large body of research and is found to be an important correlate of citizen satisfaction with police work. To illustrate, studies have argued that an authority's legitimacy is linked to one's satisfaction with the procedural justice aspects of their encounter with that authority (Lind & Tyler, 1992; Murphy, 2005). Findings from the United States (Tyler, 2011), Australia (Hinds & Murphy, 2007), and other countries (Reisig & Lloyd, 2009; Tankebe, 2009), confirm that a citizen's perceived notions of legitimacy, as expressed through views of obligation to obey, are related to their satisfaction and positive attitudes about police officers. More specifically, these positive assertions are linked to citizens' willingness to cooperate with police.

The normative aspect of the concept that is integral to understanding police legitimacy is procedural justice. This idea refers to the perceived fairness of officers' interactions with and decision-making about citizens, that is, the fairness of procedures. There is considerable research the supports the relationship between procedural justice on citizens' perceived legitimacy, as well as their positive attitudes toward police (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Tyler, 1997). Empirical findings in various countries suggest that those who have positive experiences in their contact with police, and whether police have treated them fairly and politely (civility), view the police positively (Engel, 2005; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1990; Tyler & Huo, 2002).

Closely tied to the notion of procedural justice is the idea of distributive fairness. This refers to people's one's assessment of the fairness of the outcomes after their interactions with police (Tyler, 1990). While this concept of distributive fairness is closely related to procedural justice and its influence on shaping police legitimacy, Tyler (1990) argues that distributive fairness of outcomes in police interactions is distinct from procedural fairness. Engel (2005), and Hinds and Murphy (2007), found that distributive justice did not influence satisfaction with the police as much as it did with perceived procedural fairness in the United States and Australia, respectively.

Research also shows that citizens trust police if they believe the officers perform efficiently (Tyler & Huo, 2002). In other words, the primary goal of much of this work has been to determine factors that predict citizen trust in police and satisfaction with police services, and how these findings can help to foster trust and build cooperative relationships between the two groups.

Public compliance with the law and obeying legal authorities can be crucial for maintaining social order. The general argument is that citizens' evaluations of police legitimacy will influence their decisions to be compliant with the law (Tyler, 1990). Research suggests that citizens' mistrust of police is higher in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, which is also characteristic of higher levels of crime and disorder (Reisig & Parks, 2000). These neighbourhoods exhibit a higher degree of legal cynicism and less satisfaction with police services, resulting in reduced cooperation with the police (Carr, Napolitano, & Keating, 2007; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998).

Research suggests that police legitimacy can be enhanced if citizens perceive police effectiveness in reducing crimes and enhancing safety. Researchers in the United States (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1990) and in Australia (Hinds & Murphy, 2007), concluded that citizen evaluation of police legitimacy is directly related to their assessment of their performance. These sentiments translate into citizen satisfaction with the police and their willingness to cooperate with them.

Much has been written about police contact as a critical dimension in citizens' assessment of the police and, consequently, their trust in the police. Contact can occur as part of being a suspect, a victim of a crime, or as someone who witnessed a crime. Skogan (2005) notes that citizens in disadvantaged communities are more likely to come in contact with the police as a suspect, victim, or a witness to crime. In his analysis of data from Chicago (Skogan, 2005) citizen-initiated contacts were more likely to be satisfied with police than police-initiated contacts. These positive attitudes were shaped by the speed with which police responded or how police paid careful attention to what the citizen had to say, and whether the officers were polite and helpful.

Research on public perceptions of the police in Slovenia suggests citizens' positive attitudes are driven by perceptions of police legitimacy (Reisig, Tankebe, & Meško, 2014) and that procedural justice is positively related to youth perceptions of police legitimacy, which results in willingness to cooperate with the police. In summary, we garner that citizens' positive views of the police are shaped by their perceptions of police legitimacy, fairness, and personal experiences.

4   Prior Research on Security Guards' Attitudes toward the Police

While there is considerable research on the assessment of factors that shape citizens' satisfaction and trust in the police as noted above, private security guards, who are for the most part private citizens but engage in activities that resemble those of police officers, were never a subject of similar assessment. Very limited research is available on security guards' impressions about police officers, and for the most part, this research is narrow is scope as it is limited to assessments of security guards' and police officers' impressions of each other and their willingness to cooperate with each other.

In the United States, findings from the Hallcrest Report noted that the police force held negative views toward the private security officers, whereas the security officers regarded their relationship with the police force as good to excellent (Cunningham & Taylor, 1985). In later studies, similar results were found: security officers held a more positive view of their relationship with law enforcement than law enforcement held of security officers (Nalla & Hummer, 1999a). However, they also found (Nalla & Hummer, 1999b) that security personnel perceived that law enforcement officers view the relationship between the two sectors negatively, even though law enforcement officers were found to hold positive perceptions of the relationship.

Research from other countries also reveals similar disjunction in perceptions of each other. Nalla, Hoffman, and Christian (1996) found that Singapore security guards generally had a positive opinion of police officers, a belief that was not reciprocated by the police staff toward the security guards. A survey of US security professionals (Nalla & Hummer, 1999a, 1999b) observed that police perceptions of security officers and the two sectors' cooperative efforts were more positive than estimated by the security professionals. In a comparison of police officers' and security guards' attitudes toward each other, Nalla, Johnson, and Meško (2009) found that the relationship between the two sectors in South Korea tends to be more positive relative to similar groups in Slovenia. In the United Kingdom, McManus (1995) found that relations between the two sectors were cordial and that police officers often sought help from security personnel to solve local crime problems (McManus, 1995; Rigakos, 2002; Shapland, 1999).

The private security guard industry has drawn attention to itself because of some of the law enforcement types of activities it performs, but this also creates opportunities to exchange information and intelligence with the police and engage in co-operative activities. As noted above, citizens play a critical role in making police work more efficient and successful. Citizens'

judgments of police behaviour, as well as their assessments of police legitimacy and fairness, shapes their trust in the police, which in turn influences their willingness to comply with the law and cooperate with the police. Police effectiveness and efficiency can be enhanced significantly to the extent private security guards are willing to share information and willing to report matters to the police. This willingness can be influenced by the security guards' perceptions of trust in the police. Given the paucity of research on security guards' impressions of police officers in the context of trust, this paper attempts to fill the void by examining those factors that determine security guards' trust in police officers.

5   Context: The Private Security Industry in Slovenia

With the transformation of the social and political system in the beginning of the 1990s, contemporary private security began to develop in Slovenia. Prior to that, all activities in the private security sector were carried out by security firms that were based on "social ownership" common to the socialist political and economic system of the former Yugoslavia, to whom Slovenia belonged to until 1991 (Meško, Nalla, & Sotlar, 2004). In 1994, the National Assembly (parliament) of Slovenia enacted the Law on Private Security and on Mandatory Organisation of Security Services (Zakon o zasebnem varovanju in o obveznem organiziranju službe varovanja [ZZVO], 1994). The law was important because it defined physical and technical security as forms of private security, and also that the Chamber of the Republic of Slovenia for Private Security (CRSPS) with mandatory membership was founded, and the licensing system was introduced. By the late 1990s, there were more than 200 private security firms established, employing 3,500–4,000 security officers (Sotlar, 2010).

After a decade of rapid development in the private security industry, the National Assembly of Slovenia passed a new Private Security Act in 2003 (Zakon o zasebnem varovanju [ZZasV], 2003). Under this new law, the two categories of physical and technical security have been reclassified into six classifications of private security activities. In addition, mandatory training of private security personnel prior to their employment in security firms was included, and some new job categories were introduced. While the Ministry of the Interior became responsible for granting, revising, and revoking licences for the industry, the CRSPS kept some public powers, mainly connected to the organization of training, administering programs of professional qualifications, and overseeing skills examinations of candidates for various jobs in the private security industry. Such oversight has resulted in a decrease in the registration of new private security firms. Additionally,

the private security market was transformed with two or three large private security firms monopolizing the sector (Sotlar, 2007). After three major incidents between 2005 and 2007 in which private security officers on duty did not react according to security plans and procedures, resulting in a bank safe deposit robbery and four dead youngsters in two night clubs, the government of Slovenia instructed the parliament to pass changes in private security legislation (Sotlar & Čas, 2011).

5.1 The Present Characteristics of Private Security

In Slovenia in 2008, there were 113 private security guard agencies employing over 6,300 guards with 5% female guards earning an average of €750 (about US$825) per month. In contrast to the number of police officers, security guards represented 1 guard per 326 people relative to 1 police officer for 256 Slovenians (CoESS, 2011). However, by 2015, there were 149 registered private security firms (Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve, 2015). In 2014, 6,473 security personnel[5] worked in the private security industry, while the highest number (7,270) was recorded in 2010 (Slak, 2014). However, 8,300[6] people worked in the Slovenian police in 2014 (Policija, 2014) representing a ratio of 0.78 security guards per 1 police officer.[7]

Under the new government formed in 2008, a new Private Security Act (Zakon o zasebnem varovanju [ZZasV-1], 2011) was passed by parliament in 2011. According to this act, eight forms of private security exist in Slovenia all of which require licenses, which are granted by the Ministry of the Interior. Private security firms may apply for one or all eight licenses for the following forms of private security: protection of persons; protection of people and property; transportation and protection of currency and other valuables; security of public gatherings; security at events in catering establishments; operation of security control centres; design of technical security systems; and implementation of technical security systems (Meško, Lobnikar, Modic, & Sotlar, 2013).

Private security guards in Slovenia are granted "special" powers that go beyond the powers of regular citizens, un-

like security guards in most other countries. In special circumstances as defined by the Private Security Act (ZZasV-1, 2011), private security guards may use the following measures (in the area they protect): warn a person; give verbal orders; determine the identity of the person; examine the vehicle, and baggage of the person entering or leaving the protected area; prevent a person entering or leaving the protected area; detain a person who has been found committing an offense; use physical force; use "coercive means" (firearms, handcuffs, gas sprayers, service dogs); and, use other measures if this is prescribed by law in the field of security of airports, casinos, and nuclear facilities; and use technical security systems (e.g., video surveillance systems).

The jobs in which private security personnel are entitled to use the above-mentioned powers and measures are security watchman, security guard, security supervisor, security control centre operator, security bodyguard, and security manager. For all these, (as well as others, such as security technician or authorized security system engineer, etc.), a training program is prescribed by the state in terms of both the content and duration. Security personnel must undergo professional and advanced training under programs specified by the minister of the interior, which consists of (basic) training in professional training programs, advanced training in professional training programs, and advanced training in periodical advanced training programs. Before performing particular types of work, security personnel must complete professional and advanced training, and successfully pass the professional qualification examination. Every five years after having completed basic professional training or education or on the basis of an inspection measure, the person must undergo periodical advanced training and successfully pass the refresher professional qualification examination (ZZasV-1, 2011).

A minimum of 62 hours of professional training is prescribed for security watchman (this is the least demanding job), 102 hours for security guard, and 130 hours for bodyguards. It is also important to note that according to the Ministry of Interior mandate, police officers are strictly prohibited from working for private security firms in their spare time. At this time, there are more police officers than private security guards in Slovenia, however, growth of private security personnel is expected due to the introduction of public-private partnership in the field of social control (Tičar & Meško, 2014). Therefore it is reasonable to assume that such a scenario creates ample opportunities for interactions between the two groups of social regulators. Thus, in this study, we examine the factors that determine private security guards' trust in public police officers.

---

[5] *Security personnel* is a common term for personnel (security watchman, security guard, security supervisor, security control centre operator, security bodyguard, security manager, security technician, and authorized security system engineer) who directly perform private security tasks for the licensee or internal security provider.

[6] This number includes 7,212 police officers (uniformed and criminal investigators) and 1,088 other police personnel (without police powers).

[7] If one takes into consideration only 7,212 police officers, the ratio is 0.9:1.

6   The present Study

6.1 Method and Data

Data for this study are drawn from a larger study conducted in Slovenia in spring 2012. A paper and pencil survey adapted from Reisig, Tankebe, and Meško (2012) was administered to a convenience sample of private security guards at their regular annual refresher courses in Ljubljana, Slovenia.[8] Prior to completing the questionnaire, participants received instructions on how to complete the survey, they were informed that their participation was voluntary, and were also guaranteed that their responses were completely anonymous. Most participants completed the questionnaire within 20 and 25 minutes. A total of 114 participated in the study, and given the non-random nature of the sampling strategy, the findings generated from this sample do not easily generalize to the private security population.

6.2 Empirical Specifications

6.2.1 Dependent Variable

As noted earlier, the goal of this research is to assess security guards' trust in public police officers. Drawing on the work of Reisig, Tankebe, and Meško (2012) and consistent with previous literature in policing, the dependent variables for the analyses are those dealing respondents' trust in police officers. Trust is measured by six questions: (1) *The police in my community are trustworthy;* (2) *I am proud of the police in this community;* (3) *I have confidence in the police;* (4) *The police are usually honest;* (5) *People's basic rights are well protected by the police;* and, (6) *The police can be trusted to make decisions that are right for the community.* Respondents are asked to respond on a Likert scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). To test the internal consistency of the sets of questions that measure various dimensions, factor analyses were conducted for each issue to analyse the structure of the items set and determine the loadings of each item in order to verify its suitability for measuring the specific dimension. The reliability of each of these dimensions suggests that each of these scales have acceptable levels of Cronbach's alphas (α). Factors analysis of the six items for the trust scale had loadings exceeding .90 with a Cronbach's alpha of .91, and the factor loadings and the Cronbach's alphas for all the variables are presented in Table 2.

6.2.2 Independent Variables

We included in this study two sets of independent variables: demographic and contextual. Of these variables, age and gender represented demographic variables and a set of contextual variables that constituted Obligation to Obey, Distributive Fairness, Procedural Fairness, Legal Cynicism, Police Performance, and Contact was included in the analyses. The possible answers for each question ranged from 1, "strongly disagree or least likely," to 4, "strongly agree or most likely."

Drawing from prior literature (Reisig & Lloyd, 2009; Tankebe, 2009), we measured Obligation to Obey, a construct to operationalize legitimacy, with two questions. These are: You should do what the police tell you to do only if you understand the reasons for the directives; and You should obey the directives of the police only if you consider their actions lawful. Factor analysis of the two items for this scale had loadings of .83 with a Cronbach's alpha of .56.

The concept of Distributive Fairness was operationalized with eight questions that tapped into the concept. These questions were drawn from the work of Tyler (1990) and included items such as: The police treat citizens with respect; The police are courteous to citizens; The police treat everyone with dignity; and, The police provide the same quality of service to all citizens. Factors analysis of the eight items for this scale had loadings above .74 with a Cronbach's alpha of .91. Similarly, the concept of Procedural Fairness was also drawn from Tyler (1990) and included five items that included: The police make decisions based on facts; The police handle problems fairly; The police follow through on their decisions and promises they make; and, The police make sure citizens receive the outcomes they deserve under the law. Factors analysis of the five items for this scale had loadings above .63 with a Cronbach's alpha of .86.

The concept of Legal Cynicism was operationalized using a five-item scale drawn from the literature of Tyler and Fagan (2008). These included questions such as: How likely are you to be caught and punished if you broke traffic laws?; How likely are you to be caught and punished if you bought something you thought might be stolen; and, How likely are you to be caught and punished if you were to steal a car. Factors analysis of the five items for this scale had loadings above .80 with a Cronbach's alpha of .88.

Police performance was measured with a four-item scale drawn from the work of Reisig, Tankebe, and Meško (2012). These individual items included statements such as: The police are always ready to provide satisfactory assistance to victims of crime; The police provide assistance the public needs from them; The police are doing well in controlling violent

crime; and, The police respond promptly to calls about crime. Factors analysis of the four-items for this scale had loadings above .76 with a Cronbach's alpha of .74. In addition, we included the contact variable, which measure contacted as security guards' willingness to report a hearsay about crime to the police; if security guards called in a police officer to report the crime. This variable was measured as 0 = No and 1 = Yes.

7 Analysis and Findings

7.1 Demographic Characteristics

Details of demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1. Of the 114 respondents, 92 provided their ages: of these, 27% were less than 35 years of age, 46% were 36–50, and the rest were 51 years of age and older. A majority of the respondents were male (87%). Among the 95 respondents who answered the question relating to contact with police, 54% noted that they interacted with the officers when they witnessed matters relating to crime and disorder.

or strongly agreed with the six statements that constituted the variable *trust*. Nearly 74% of the security guards felt that police officers in their community were trustworthy; 67% were proud of the officers; 73% had confidence in police; 72% felt officers were honest; 76% believed police officers protected the basic rights of the citizens; and 74% felt that officers can be trusted to make decisions that are right for the community.

Over two-thirds of the respondents noted agreement with statements that suggest their obligation to obey the laws. More specifically, 68% said that one should do what the police tell them to only if they understand the directives and only if they consider their actions lawful. On the matter of distributive justice, more than three-fourths of the respondents agree with the statements that the police treat citizens with respect

(76%), respect citizens' rights (82%), and are courteous to citizens they come in contact with (83%). There was also a similar congruence in agreement among the respondents on matters relating to fair treatment of people by the police (73%), police taking time to listen to people (64%), and police treating peo-

Table 1: Distributions and Descriptive Statistics of Respondents in Slovenia Private Security Guards Study (N = 114)

Variable	Description	N	%	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age (n = 92)[a]	0 = ≤ 35 years	25	27.2	44.1	9.9	25	61
	1 = 36–50 years	42	45.7				
	1 = 51 and above	25	27.2				
Gender (n = 97)[a]	0 = Female	13	13.4				
	1 = Male	84	86.6				
Contact with police (0 = No; 1 = Yes)	Hearsay Witness (n = 95)	51	53.7				

a. Missing cases were excluded from the analysis.

7.2 Findings on Security Guards' Perceptions on Matters relating to Police Officers

The descriptive statistics table (Table 2) outlines respondents' views on various dimensions of police legitimacy, fairness, effectiveness, and trust. The four response categories on the Likert scale were collapsed into two groups: "strongly disagree" and "disagree" (SD/D), and "agree" and "strongly agree" (A/SA). In addition, the mean scores, standard deviations, factor loadings, as well as KMO scores and Cronbach's alphas of the specific concepts, were listed. These include the dependent variables representing trust. The remaining attributes include police legitimacy, distributive fairness, procedural justice, police performance, and legal cynicism. On the question regarding private security guards' views on trust in police officers, nearly three-fourths of all the respondents replied that they agreed

ple with dignity (62%). A little over half of all the respondents agreed with the statements that police provide the same quality of service to all citizens (59%) and that police enforce the law consistently when dealing with all people (59%).

Findings on security guards views on the issue of procedural justice, police performance (effectiveness), and legal cynicism are also presented in Table 2. Nearly three-fourths of the respondents believe officers act in a fair manner in matters relating to the procedural aspects of police work. Security guards felt that police officers make sure that citizens receive the outcomes they deserve under the law (75%), explain their decisions to the people they deal with (74%), make decisions to handle problems fairly (73%), and make decisions based on facts (72%). A slightly lower number of guards (62%) felt that the police follow through on their decisions and promises they make.

Table 2: Private Security Guards in Slovenia (N = 114)

Factors/Variables[1]	Strongly Disagree / Disagree	Strongly Agree / Agree		
	N/%	N/%	Mean/SD	Factor loadings
Trust in Police				
(KMO = 0.84; Cronbach's alpha = 0.91)				
The police in my community are trustworthy.	27/26.2	76/73.8	2.74/0.713	0.90
I am proud of the police in this community.	33/32.7	67/67.3	2.65/0.741	0.89
I have confidence in the police.	28/27.5	74/72.5	2.78/0.669	0.84
The police are usually honest.	28/27.7	73/72.3	2.75/0.639	0.73
People's basic rights are well protected by the police.	24/23.8	77/76.2	2.77/0.598	0.81
The police can be trusted to make decisions that are right for your community.	27/26.5	75/73.5	2.79/0.665	0.86
Obligations to Obey				
(KMO = 0.50; Cronbach's alpha = 0.56)				
You should do what the police tell you to do only if you understand the reasons for the directives.	34/32.1	72/67.9	2.72/0.765	0.83
You should obey the directives of the police only if you consider their actions lawful.	31/30.1	72/69.9	2.78/0.779	0.83
Distributive Fairness				
(KMO = 0.86; Cronbach's alpha = 0.91)				
The police treat citizens with respect.	24/23.8	77/76.2	2.80/0.566	0.85
The police take time to listen to people.	36/36.0	64/64.0	2.66/0.623	0.72
The police treat people fairly.	27/27.3	72/72.7	2.75/0.560	0.87
The police respect citizens' rights.	18/18.2	81/81.8	2.87/0.508	0.87
The police are courteous to citizens they come into contact with.	17/17.2	82/82.8	2.88/0.540	0.74
The police treat everyone with dignity.	37/38.1	60/61.9	2.65/0.613	0.76
The police provide the same quality of service to all citizens.	41/41.4	58/58.6	2.59/0.729	0.91
The police enforce the law consistently when dealing with ALL people.	41/41.4	58/58.6	2.60/0.741	0.88
Procedural Justice				
(KMO = 0.81; Cronbach's alpha = 0.86)				
The police make decisions based on the facts.	27/27.6	71/72.4	2.78/0.601	0.75
The police explain their decisions to the people they deal with.	25/26.0	71/74.0	2.77/0.571	0.63
The police make decisions to handle problems fairly.	26/26.8	71/73.2	2.74/0.582	0.84
The police follow through on their decisions and promises they make.	37/37.8	61/62.2	2.59/0.655	0.73
The police make sure citizens receive the outcomes they deserve under the law.	25/25.3	74/74.7	2.77/0.620	0.70
Police performance				
(KMO = 0.64; Cronbach's alpha = 0.74)				
The police are always ready to provide satisfactory assistance to victims of crime.	21/21.2	78/78.8	2.88/0.611	0.65
The police are always able to provide the assistance the public needs from them.	30/30.9	67/69.1	2.74/0.545	0.85
The police are doing well in controlling violent crime.	47/49.5	48/50.5	2.46/0.769	0.77
The police respond promptly to calls about crime.	35/37.2	57/62.8	2.66/0.681	0.76
Legal Cynicism[2]				
(KMO = 0.84; Cronbach's alpha = 0.88)				
How likely are you to be caught and punished if you made a lot of noise at night?	47/50.0	47/50.0	2.37/0.892	0.80
How likely are you to be caught and punished if you broke traffic laws?	32/34.1	62/65.9	2.78/0.884	0.80
How likely are you to be caught and punished if you bought something you thought might be stolen?	35/59.7	37/50.3	2.31/0.960	0.86
How likely are you to be caught and punished if were you to steal a car?	35/37.6	58/62.4	2.61/1.123	0.85
How likely are you to be caught and punished if you used marijuana or some other drug?	52/56.0	41/44.1	2.26/1.141	0.81

[1] Responses range from: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly agree.
[2] 1 = Very unlikely; 2 = Unlikely; 3 = Likely; 4 = Very Unlikely.

Over all, private security guards believe that the police do a fairly good job with their work. A vast majority of the respondents felt that the police are always ready to provide satisfactory assistance to victims of crime (79%), provide assistance to the public (69%), and respond promptly to calls about crime (63%). Only 51% of the guards felt that police did a good job controlling violent crime. Finally, on the matter of legal cynicism, the findings were mixed. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents expressed less cynicism on the effectiveness of legal matters such as the likelihood of those who are caught and punished if they broke traffic laws (66%), and for stealing a car (62%). However, half or less of the respondents were less sure about the effectiveness of the legal system. For example, they were unsure if they would be punished if they were caught for making a lot of noise (disturbance) at night (50%), bought something that they thought might have been stolen (50%), or would be caught and punished if they used marijuana or some other drug (44%). In other words, security guards were more certain of getting caught and punished for traffic violations or stealing a car as compared to minor offenses such as causing a disturbance, buying a stolen product, or using illegal substances.

7.3 Additional Analyses

7.3.1 A Partial and a Full Model for Trust

Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression has been employed to examine the correlation between the dependent and independent variables. For each dependent variable, a partial model with demographic variables and a full model with both demographic and explanatory variables were analysed. This approach enabled the authors to examine the mediating effects of the contextual variables in the association between the demographic variables and the dependent variables.

Table 3 shows the results of an analysis with *trust* regressed on the demographic variables. The first column represents a partial model based on demographic characteristics regressed on the *trust* variable, which explains the 8% variance. Results indicate that security guards in the group of 36 to 50 years of age, relative to those 35 years and younger, are likely to trust in police officers compared to other age groups (b = .65, P < .05). A similar finding was apparent for guards' trust in police officers in the older age category of 51 years and over. However, the finding is only marginally statistically significant (b = .56, p < .1). Thus, compared to younger security guards in the age group of 35 and under, the older security guards appeared to be more trusting of police officers. Gender did not have any significant relationship with trust.

Table 3: OLS Regression (Private Security Officer – *Trust in Police* regressed on demographic and contextual variables) (N = 114)

Variables	Model 1			Model 1		
Demographic Characteristics	B/SE	β	t	B/SE	β	t
Constant	-.62/.34		-1.84[†]	-.12/27		-.43
Age (Under 35)						
36-50 Years	.65/.26	.33	2.48*	.35/.16	.19	2.20*
51 and Above	.56/.29	.26	1.95[†]	.21/.18	.10	1.12
Gender – Male	.18/.31	.06	.58	.43/,17	.17	2.54*
Contextual Characteristics						
Obligation to Obey				-.00/.08	-.00	-.01
Distributive Fairness				.58/.11	.60	5.0***
Legal Compliance				.08/.07	.08	1.12
Procedural Justice				.28/.12	.27	2.4*
Legal Cynicism				-.03/.12	-.14	-2.0*
Police Performance				-.03/.12	-.03	-.26
Contact (Hearsay Witness)				.01/.08	.00	.05
R²	7.9			79.1		
Adjusted R²	4.4			75.2		
F	2.23[†]			20.06***		

[†] p< .1. * p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001

Results for the full model are presented in the column in which the variance increased to 75%. Among the demographic variables, age (35–50 years) remained unchanged (b = .35, p < .05). However, compared to females, male guards have more trust in police officers, a finding that is statistically significant (b = .43, p < .05). In addition to the demographic characteristics, three other contextual variables were positively related to trust in police officers. Security guards who perceived police officers to be fair in distributive justice were more trusting of police officers (b = .58, p < .001), and a similar positive finding was also observed for the variable *procedural fairness* (b = .28, p < .05). The finding relating to legal cynicism and trust in the police was also found to be statistically significant and in the expected direction. That is, security guards who were cynical of the legal system (getting away without being punished) were less likely to be trusting of police officers (b = -.03, p < .05). The nature and the direction of the results from the security guards study are consistent with findings in the literature that show a positive relationship between citizens' perceived fairness and trust in police officers (e.g., Murphy, 2005; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003).

8   Discussion and Conclusion

The focus of this study was to examine factors that explain perceived security guards' trust in the police in Slovenia. We suggest that this is an important yet under-examined topic in policing because while private security guards to a large extent have more authority and constitutionally legal rights relative to private citizens, they engage in many of the same chores police officers perform. Since security guards work in maintaining order and crime prevention, if they detect a person committing crime, they can pursue a suspect and interact with the public police who respond to the crime scene. A related significance of this topic is that police performance is only effective to the extent citizens trust law enforcement officers and are willing to cooperate with them.

Understanding the factors which shape security guards' trust in police, is significant given the implications it would have in their interactions with their public counterparts[9]

---

[9]   The results of the study by Meško, Sotlar and Nalla (2005) showed that the police did not respect private security officers, that although police officers required information from private security officers, they were not willing to share it, that private security officers were more optimistic about the development of good relations with the police than police officers were, police officers did not have a positive attitude towards private security in general and private security officers appreciated initiatives for the improvement and development of professional police-private security relations more than police officers did.

(Meško, Sotlar, & Nalla, 2005). Drawing from previous research on factors that determine citizens' trust in public police, we developed a model that examined the extent to which guards' perceived legitimacy, fairness, and legal cynicism, professionalism, and contact predict the outcome.

The results from this study are fairly consistent with the findings observed in studies of private citizens presented in this paper. That is, guards who perceive that police officers engage in behaviour that is fair, those who believe in obligation to obey the law, and those who do not perceive legal cynicism, have greater trust in public police.

The concepts of distributive justice and procedural justice should be not considered as distinct but should be measured comprehensively (Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005) though research on the police often makes a distinction between procedural justice as experienced by the individual versus the vicarious interpretations of distributive fairness.

This study could not be considered as representative for the professional population of private security guards due to a small convenience sample of private security guards, but it serves as a good starting point for conducting a large-scale study on private security guards/police officers' professional relationships. Nevertheless, the results indicate the importance of distributive fairness, procedural justice and legal cynicism in building trust in the public police by private security guards.

References

1.   Ambrose, M. L., & Arnaud, A. (2005). Are procedural justice and distributive justice conceptually distinct? In J. Greenberg, & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 59–84). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
2.   Baker, B. (2002). Living with non-state policing in South Africa: The issues and dilemmas. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, *40*(1), 29–53.
3.   Bayley, D. H., & Shearing, C. D. (1996). The future of policing. *Law and society review*, *30*(3), 585–606.
4.   Button, M. (2007). Assessing the regulation of private security across Europe. *European Journal of Criminology, 4*(1), 109–128.
5.   Cao, L., Frank, J., & Cullen, F. T. (1996). Race, community context and confidence in the police. *American Journal of Police, 15*(1), 3–22.
6.   Carr, P. J., Napolitano, L., & Keating, J. (2007). We never call the cops and here is why: A qualitative examination of legal cynicism in three Philadelphia neighborhoods. *Criminology, 45*(2), 445–480.
7.   Chermak, S., McGarrell, E. F., & Weiss, A. (2001). Citizens' perceptions of aggressive traffic enforcement strategies. *Justice Quarterly, 18*(2), 365–391.

8.   CoESS. (2011). *Private security services in Europe: CoESS facts & figures 2011.* Retrieved from http://www.coess.org/?CategoryID= 200&ArticleID=1558

9.   Correia, M. E., Reisig, M. D., & Lovrich, N. P. (1996). Public perceptions of state police: An analysis of individual-level and contextual variables. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 24*(1), 17–28.

10. Cunningham, W. C., & Taylor, T. H. (1985). *Private security and police in America: The Hallcrest Report I.* Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.

11. De Waard, J. (1999). The private security industry in international perspective. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 7*(2), 143–174.

12. Engel, R. S. (2005). Citizen's perceptions of distributive and procedural injustice during traffic stops with police. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 42*(4), 445–481.

13. Frank, J., Smith, B. V., & Novak, K. J. (2005). Exploring the basis of citizen's attitudes toward the police. *Police Quarterly, 8*(2), 206–228.

14. Garland, D. (1996). The limits of the Sovereign state strategies of crime control in contemporary society. *British Journal of Criminology, 36*(4), 445–471.

15. Herbert, S. (2006). Tangled up in blue: Conflicting paths to police legitimacy. *Theoretical Criminology, 10*(4), 481–504.

16. Hinds, L., & Murphy, K. (2007). Public satisfaction with police: Using procedural justice to improve police legitimacy. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 40*(1), 27–42.

17. Horwitz, M. J. (1982). The history of the public/private distinction. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 130*(6), 1423–1428.

18. Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., & Murray, K. H. (2012). Compliance with the law and policing by consent. In A. Crawford, & A. Hucklesby (Eds.), *Legitimacy and compliance in criminal justice* (pp. 29–49). New York: Routledge.

19. Jesilow, P., Meyer, J. O., & Namazzi, N. (1995). Public attitudes toward the police. *American Journal of Police, 14*(2), 67–88.

20. Joh, E. E. (2004). The paradox of private policing. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 95*(1), 49–132.

21. Joh, E. E. (2005). Conceptualizing the private police. *Utah Law Review, 2*, 573–617.

22. Johnston, L. (1992). *The rebirth of private policing.* London: Routledge.

23. Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances in experimental social psychology, 25*, 115–192.

24. Loader, I. (1999). Consumer culture and the commodification of policing and security. *Sociology, 33*(2), 373–392.

25. McCluskey, J. D., McCluskey, C. P., & Enriquez, R. (2008). A comparison of Latino and white citizen satisfaction with police. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 36*(6), 471–477.

26. McManus, M. (1995). *From fate to choice: Private bobbies, public beats.* Aldershot: Avebury.

27. Meško, G., Lobnikar, B., Modic, M., & Sotlar, A. (2013). Recent developments of policing in Slovenia. In G. Meško, C. B. Fields, B. Lobnikar, & A. Sotlar (Eds.), *Handbook on policing in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 263–286). New York: Springer.

28. Meško, G., Nalla, M., & Sotlar, A. (2004). Youth perceptions of private security in Slovenia: Preliminary findings. In G. Meško, M. Pagon, & B. Dobovšek (Eds.), *Policing in Central and Eastern Europe: Dilemmas of contemporary criminal justice* (pp. 745–752). Ljubljana: Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security.

29. Meško, G., Sotlar, A. & Nalla, M. (2005). Policisti in varnostniki – veliki in mali bratje [Police officers and private security officers – big and little brothers]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo, 56*(2), 147–162.

30. Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve [Ministry of the Interior]. (2015). *Seznam imetnikov licenc* [List of license holders]. Retrieved from http://www.mnz.gov.si/si/mnz_za_vas/zasebno_varovanje_detektivi/zasebno_varovanje/evidence_vloge_in_obrazci

31. Murphy, K. (2005). Regulating More Effectively: The relationship between procedural justice, legitimacy, and tax non-compliance. *Journal of law and Society, 32*(4), 562–589.

32. Nalla, M. K., & Hummer, D. (1999a). Relations between police officers and security professionals: A study of perceptions. *Security Journal, 12*(3), 31–40.

33. Nalla, M. K., & Hummer, D. (1999b). Assessing strategies for improving law enforcement/ security relationships: Implications for community policing. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 23*(2), 227–239.

34. Nalla, M. K., Hoffman, V. J., & Christian, K. E. (1996). Security guards' perceptions of their relationship with police officers and the public in Singapore. *Security Journal, 4*(7), 281–286.

35. Nalla, M. K., Johnson, J. D., & Meško, G. (2009). Are police and security personnel warming up to each other? A comparison of officers' attitudes in developed, emerging, and transitional economies. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 32*(3), 508–525.

36. Policija [Police]. (2014). *O slovenski policiji* [About Slovene Police]. Retrieved from http://www.policija.si/index.php/o-policiji.

37. Reiner, R. (2007). Political economy, crime and criminal justice. In M. Maguire, R. Morgan, & R. Reiner (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of criminology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

38. Reisig, M. D., & Giacomazzi, A. L. (1998). Citizen perceptions of community policing: are attitudes toward police important? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 21*(3), 547–561.

39. Reisig, M. D., & Lloyd, C. (2009). Procedural justice, police legitimacy, and helping the police fight crime: Results from a survey of Jamaican adolescents. *Police Quarterly, 12*(1), 42–62.

40. Reisig, M. D., & Parks, R. B. (2000). Experience, quality of life, and neighborhood context: A hierarchical analysis of satisfaction with police. *Justice Quarterly, 17*(3), 607–630. doi:10.1080/07418820000094681

41. Reisig, M. D., Tankebe, J., & Meško, G. (2012). Procedural justice, police legitimacy, and public cooperation with the police among young Slovene adults. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Security, 14*(2), 147–164.

42. Reisig, M. D., Tankebe, J., & Meško, G. (2014). Compliance with the law in Slovenia: The role of procedural justice and police legitimacy. *European Journal of Criminal Policy Research, 20*(2), 259–276.

43. Rigakos, G. (2002). *The new parapolice.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

44. Sampson, R. J., & Bartusch, D. J. (1998). Legal cynicism and (subcultural?) tolerance of deviance: The neighborhood context of racial differences. *Law and Society Review, 32*(4), 777–804.

45. Shapland, J. (1999). Private worlds: Social control and security in Britain. In J. Shapland, & L. van Outrive (Eds.) *Police et Sécurité: Contrôle Social et l'Interaction Publique-Privé* [Policing and Security: Social Control and the Public-Private Divide]. Paris: L'Harmattan.

46. Shearing, C. D. (1992). Relation between public and private policing. *Crime & Justice, 15*(1), 399–434.

47. Shearing, C. D., & Stenning, P. (1983). Private security: implications for social control. *Social problems, 30*(5), 493–506.

48. Skogan, W. G. (2005). Citizen satisfaction with police encounters. *Police Quarterly, 8*(3), 298–321.

49. Slak, B. (2014). *Deregulacija področja zasebnega varovanja – med potrebo in možnostjo* [Deregulation of the private security sector - between the need and the possibility]. Paper presented at the conference Private Security 2014, Zagreb. Retrieved from http://www.hcz.hr/UserDocsImages/KONFERENCIJA%20PRIVATNA%20ZASTITA%202014/BSLAK-ZRSZV-HCZ-2014.pdf

50. Sotlar, A., & Čas, T. (2011). Analiza dosedanjega razvoja zasebnega varovanja v Sloveniji – med prakso, teorijo in empirijo [Analysis of the current development of private security in Slovenia – between practice, theory and empirical experience]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, *62*(3), 227–241.

51. Sotlar, A. (2007). The (non)existent control over private security companies in Slovenia: The opinions of private security managers and members of parliament. In G. Meško, & B. Dobovšek (Eds.), *Policing in emerging democracies: Critical reflections* (pp. 183–208). Ljubljana: University of Maribor, Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security.

52. Sotlar, A. (2010). Private security in a plural policing environment in Slovenia. *Journal of Police Studies, 3*(16), 335–353.

53. Stenning, P. C. (2000). Powers and accountability of private police. *European journal on criminal policy and research*, *8*(3), 325–352.

54. Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law and Society Review, 37*(3), 513–547.

55. Tankebe, J. (2009). Public cooperation with the police in Ghana: Does procedural fairness matter? *Criminology, 47*(4), 1265–1293.

56. Thurman, Q. C., & Reisig, M. D. (1996). Community-oriented research in an era of community-oriented policing. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *39*(5), 570–586.

57. Tičar, B., & Meško, G. (2014). Kriminološki in pravni vidiki možnosti za javno-zasebno partnerstvo na področju izvrševanja kazni zapora v Sloveniji [Criminological and Legal Aspects of Possibilities for Public Private Partnerships for Enforcement of Prison Sanctions in the Republic of Slovenia]. *Varstvoslovje*, *16*(3), 264–277.

58. Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

59. Tyler, T. R. (1997). The psychology of legitimacy: A relational perspective on voluntary deference to authorities. *Personality and social psychology review*, *1*(4), 323–345.

60. Tyler, T. R. (2011). Trust and legitimacy: Policing in the USA and Europe. *European Journal of Criminology*, *8*(4), 254–266.

61. Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities. *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, *6*, 231–275.

62. Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

63. Wakefield, A. (2003). *Selling security: The private policing of public space*. Cullompton, Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

64. Wakefield, A. (2005). The public surveillance functions of private security. *Surveillance and Society, 2*(4), 529–554.

65. Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2005). Determinants of public satisfaction with the police. *Police Quarterly, 8*(3), 279–297.

66. White, A. (2012). The new political economy of private security. *Theoretical Criminology, 16*(1), 85–101.

67. Zakon o zasebnem varovanju [Private Security Act] (ZZasV). (2003). *Uradni list RS,* (126/03, 102/07).

68. Zakon o zasebnem varovanju [Private Security Act] (ZZasV-1). (2011). *Uradni list RS,* (17/11).

69. Zakon o zasebnem varovanju in o obveznem organiziranju službe varovanja [Law on Private Security and on Mandatory Organisation of Security Services] (ZZVO). (1994). *Uradni list RS,* (32/94).

Kaj oblikuje zaupanje varnostnikov v policijo? Vloga zaznave dolžnosti ubogati, postopkovne pravičnosti, distributivne pravičnosti in pravnega cinizma

Dr. Mahesh K. Nalla, redni profesor za kazensko pravosodje, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University, ZDA.
E-pošta: nalla@msu.edu

Dr. Gorazd Meško, redni profesor za kriminologijo, Fakulteta za varnostne vede Univerze v Mariboru, Slovenija.
E-pošta: gorazd.mesko@fvv.uni-mb.si

Opravljene študije o zaznavah državljanov o zaupanju v policijo v razvitih in nerazvitih ekonomijah so primerljive s študijami o varnostnikih, ki so večino časa zasebni državljani, vendar njihove naloge in službene pristojnosti spominjajo na nekatere funkcije javne policije. V prispevku smo preučevali odnos varnostnikov do policistov, glede njihovega zaupanja policistom v Sloveniji. Podatke smo pridobili iz vzorca varnostnikov, ki so opravljali strokovni tečaj, ki ga določa slovenski Zakon o zasebnem varovanju (2011). Ugotovitve kažejo, da distributivna pravičnost, postopkovna pravičnost in pravni cinizem močno vplivajo na zaupanje varnostnikov v policijo.

Ključne besede: zasebni varnostniki, policija, zaupanje, Slovenija

UDK: 351.74/.76