The Discipline Between The Police Department And The Public

Posted on October 9, 2018

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/the-discipline-between-the-police-department-and-the-public/

Introduction: Discipline, Legitimacy, and Public Service

Discipline in policing has two connected meanings. Internally, it refers to professional standards, supervision, training, accountability, and an officer's ability to exercise lawful restraint. Externally, the public often encounters discipline through police enforcement of laws and maintenance of order. Problems arise when police organizations emphasize obedience by citizens but tolerate misconduct, inconsistency, or secrecy within their own ranks. A legitimate department must show that authority is limited by law, policy, evidence, and ethical duty. Public trust does not require universal agreement with every decision. It requires a reasonable belief that officers and leaders use power fairly, explain actions, correct mistakes, and apply rules to themselves as well as to others (Hassan, 2025).

Negative and Positive Discipline

Negative discipline relies on fear of punishment after rules are broken. It includes reprimands, suspension, demotion, dismissal, and criminal referral where conduct is unlawful. These measures are necessary for serious misconduct but cannot create professionalism alone. Positive discipline develops habits that prevent violations through selection, training, coaching, clear expectations, realistic supervision, and recognition of ethical performance. Officers should understand not only what a rule prohibits but why it protects safety, rights, and evidence integrity. A department depending entirely on punishment may encourage concealment and minimum compliance. A department without credible consequences may communicate that policy is optional. Effective systems combine prevention, correction, proportional sanctions, and learning.

Why Police Discipline Is Distinctive

Police work differs from many occupations because officers can detain, search, use force, carry weapons, and initiate processes that affect liberty and reputation. They often make decisions quickly with incomplete information and limited direct supervision. The organization must therefore grant

discretion while controlling its misuse. Discipline cannot be copied mechanically from a factory or retail workplace because errors may violate constitutional rights, endanger lives, contaminate evidence, or undermine criminal cases. At the same time, the uniqueness of policing should not become an excuse for secrecy. Higher authority creates a stronger need for documentation, review, competence, and independent scrutiny, especially where colleagues or supervisors may have conflicts of interest (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015).

Procedural Justice in Police–Public Encounters

Procedural justice concerns how authorities make and communicate decisions. The U.S. Department of Justice's COPS Office summarizes four central principles: fair processes, transparency, voice, and impartial decision-making. In a police encounter, people are more likely to view authority as legitimate when they can explain their perspective, receive respectful treatment, understand the reason for action, and believe decisions are not based on prejudice or personal hostility. Procedural fairness does not guarantee that a person will like an arrest, ticket, or search. It changes whether the process appears arbitrary. Consistent respectful practice can strengthen cooperation, reporting, and willingness to comply with lawful instructions (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, n.d.; Tyler, 2006).

Internal Procedural Justice

Departments cannot reliably deliver fairness to the public while managing employees through favoritism, humiliation, or unpredictable punishment. Internal procedural justice means officers receive clear rules, notice of allegations, a meaningful opportunity to respond, impartial investigation, consistent sanctions, and protection against retaliation for good-faith reporting. Fair employment procedure does not require shielding misconduct. It improves the credibility of discipline and reduces the belief that outcomes depend on rank, friendship, union politics, race, gender, or public pressure. Leaders should also distinguish honest error, poor judgment, negligence, recklessness, and intentional abuse because each calls for a different response. Consistency should mean comparable reasoning, not automatic identical penalties.

Complaint Intake and Accessibility

A discipline system begins with the ability to report misconduct. Complaints should be accepted in person, online, by telephone, through community organizations, and in languages used locally. Departments should not require a complainant to identify the exact policy violation or discourage reports because evidence is incomplete. Anonymous complaints can be harder to investigate but may reveal patterns. Each complaint should receive a tracking number, acknowledgement, explanation of process, and notice of outcome within lawful privacy limits. Data should be reviewed for repeated

allegations involving the same officer, unit, location, or type of encounter. A complaint process that exists only on paper cannot support accountability.

Investigation Standards

Misconduct investigations should be timely, independent enough to avoid bias, and based on all available evidence. Relevant material may include body-worn-camera footage, dispatch records, reports, medical records, photographs, witness interviews, digital messages, use-of-force data, and prior related incidents. Investigators should test officer and civilian accounts by the same evidentiary standards rather than treating one as automatically credible. Delays can harm everyone by allowing memories to fade and uncertainty to continue. Findings should distinguish sustained, not sustained, exonerated, and unfounded allegations with clear definitions. Where evidence suggests criminal conduct, administrative inquiry should be coordinated with an independent prosecutor or investigative body.

Supervision and Early Intervention

Most accountability occurs before a formal disciplinary case. Frontline supervisors review reports, monitor encounters, respond to scenes, identify training needs, and set informal norms. A supervisor who ignores disrespect or weak documentation teaches that those behaviours are acceptable. Early-intervention systems can flag patterns such as repeated complaints, force incidents, pursuits, injuries, missed court appearances, or problematic searches. A flag is not proof of wrongdoing and should not become an automated punishment. It prompts review, conversation, training, wellness support, reassignment, or closer supervision. The purpose is to identify risk before a serious event rather than waiting until harm becomes undeniable. Review should examine both isolated conduct and cumulative patterns that may be invisible when incidents are considered separately.

Body-Worn Cameras and Quality Measurement

Body-worn cameras can support evidence and review, but activation compliance alone does not show whether policing was procedurally fair. Recent research using Philadelphia traffic-stop footage demonstrates the value of observing tone, explanation, listening, neutrality, and respect. Departments should audit both policy compliance and service quality. Cameras also raise privacy, retention, disclosure, and selective-release concerns. Footage should not replace witness testimony or broader context, and missing video should be investigated rather than automatically interpreted in one direction. Effective camera programs require clear activation rules, secure storage, access controls, public disclosure standards, and consequences for intentional failure to record. Policies should also address when officers may review footage before writing reports, because that choice can affect memory, accuracy, and public confidence (National Institute of Justice, 2024).

Civilian Oversight

Civilian review boards, inspectors general, ombuds offices, and independent monitors can add expertise and public visibility to discipline. Their authority varies from advisory review to independent investigation and subpoena power. Oversight is not automatically trusted merely because it is civilian. A 2025 survey experiment found that civilian-board involvement did not consistently increase perceived legitimacy and could reduce trust when institutional decisions openly conflicted. The lesson is not to abandon oversight but to design it carefully. Members need independence, resources, training, transparent procedures, access to evidence, and clear relationships with chiefs, unions, prosecutors, and elected officials. Public expectations should match actual authority (National Institute of Justice, 2025).

Police Unions, Due Process, and Accountability

Collective-bargaining agreements and civil-service laws protect employees from arbitrary discipline and can support professional independence. They can also complicate accountability when deadlines are unrealistically short, records are erased quickly, interviews are delayed, or prior findings cannot be considered. Reform should preserve legitimate due process while removing provisions that prevent investigation of serious misconduct. Officers accused of wrongdoing deserve representation and fair procedure, just as civilians deserve impartial review. The goal is not discipline driven by public anger or political convenience. It is a system in which evidence can be gathered, decisions explained, and proportionate consequences sustained under legal scrutiny. Any negotiated protection should be evaluated against whether it permits complete fact-finding and enforceable decisions in cases involving serious public harm.

Use of Force and the Duty to Intervene

Force policy should require necessity, proportionality, de-escalation where feasible, medical assistance, reporting, and supervisory review. Officers should have an affirmative duty to intervene when a colleague uses unlawful or clearly excessive force and a duty to report the event accurately. Training must include realistic scenarios involving stress, communication, disability, mental-health crises, and crowd conditions. Discipline is weakened when officers believe loyalty requires silence. Professional loyalty should mean protecting colleagues from avoidable misconduct and protecting the institution from corruption. Anti-retaliation rules, confidential reporting, and leadership behaviour determine whether intervention is practical rather than merely written in policy. Supervisors must review intervention failures as carefully as the original force, since silence can convert individual misconduct into an organizational norm.

Copyright © 2026 Academic Master.

Transparency and Public Reporting

Departments should publish aggregate information about complaints, findings, force, stops, discipline, lawsuits, and corrective action while protecting lawful privacy and active investigations. Transparency allows communities to evaluate patterns and helps officers understand that the organization values accurate reporting. Data must be defined consistently so that apparent improvement is not produced by reclassification or underreporting. Public dashboards should include context, limitations, and demographic analysis. Departments should explain major incidents promptly but avoid releasing selective evidence that prejudges an investigation. Trust grows when leaders acknowledge uncertainty, correct inaccurate statements, and report institutional failures with the same seriousness used to announce enforcement success. Publication schedules and responsible officials should be fixed in policy so transparency does not depend on whether a particular incident attracts media attention.

Community Partnership and Restorative Possibilities

Formal discipline addresses rule violations, but some harms also require dialogue, repair, and organizational change. Community advisory groups, facilitated meetings, problem-solving partnerships, and restorative processes may help where participants consent and safety permits. These approaches should never replace investigation of serious force, discrimination, corruption, or criminal conduct. They can complement accountability by explaining impact and identifying reforms beyond one officer’s sanction. Community engagement should occur before crises, include people who criticize police, and provide evidence that input changes policy. Consultation that asks for views after decisions are final may deepen cynicism rather than build legitimacy. Evaluation should document whether promised reforms are completed, funded, and reflected in measurable changes rather than remaining general statements of intent.

Conclusion

Discipline between police and the public is not simply punishment imposed by authority. It is a reciprocal structure of lawful restraint, professional standards, fair procedure, and accountability. Citizens are more likely to accept police authority when encounters provide voice, respect, neutrality, and explanation. Officers are more likely to follow policy when internal systems use the same principles and impose credible consequences for intentional or repeated misconduct. Complaint access, independent investigation, strong supervision, quality review of camera footage, transparent data, and carefully designed civilian oversight all contribute. The central principle is consistency: a department cannot demand public compliance while treating its own rules as negotiable.

References

1. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. “Procedural Justice.”
2. National Institute of Justice. “Measuring ‘What Matters’ in 21st-Century Policing.” 2024.
3. National Institute of Justice. “Does Civilian Oversight Impact Police Legitimacy?” 2025.
4. President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing. *Final Report*. 2015.
5. Tyler, Tom R. *Why People Obey the Law*. Princeton UP, 2006.
6. Hassan, Bilal. “Procedural and Functional Sources of Trust in Police in Pakistan.” *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, vol. 40, 2025, pp. 239–250.