

# An Assessment of Police Legitimacy and Public Cooperation on Counterterrorism in Turkey

Bülent ULUTÜRK \*

## ABSTRACT

Winning the hearts and minds of the people is the key element for successful law enforcement agencies. This is particularly true of terrorism and counterterrorism. Despite the fact that terrorism has been an important problem around the World since the September 11 terrorist attacks, it has been one of the most important problems Turkey faces because the Turkish State has been combating against terrorist organizations for the last four decades. Therefore, the Turkish government has developed and implemented different counterterrorism measures including military operations, criminal proceedings, and even negotiation with terrorists. Terrorist organizations attempt to gain public support in order to maintain their existence and operate their activities; on the other hand, gaining the public support is also crucial for governments to combat against terrorism. The aim of this study is to explore determinants of public support for cooperation on counterterrorism with law enforcement agencies. By understanding public attitudes toward the police and government policies, authorities can make efforts to improve public attitudes since public trust and cooperation are essential to policing policies and practices.

A great deal of research has been conducted on police legitimacy and public cooperation with the police. However, research on public cooperation with the police in terms of terrorism has been very limited. Using the instrumental and normative perspectives, this study aimed to uncover the influence of the deterrence and legitimacy models on people's views of cooperation. The present study analyzes survey data from 113 public school teachers in one of the districts of Diyarbakir province of Turkey to understand the public views about police legitimacy and cooperation with the police acting against terrorism. The study finds that the vast majority of respondents regard the police legitimate and are willing to cooperate with the police. The results also suggest that community voice, social discrimination, public policing measures, police effectiveness, religiosity, and seriousness of terror risk have a significant influence on participants' attitudes toward cooperation with the police.

**Keywords:** Legitimacy, Cooperation, Counterterrorism, Public Support, Policing

## Türkiye'de Polisin Meşruyeti ve Terörle Mücadelede Halkla İşbirliğinin Değerlendirilmesi

### ÖZ

Başarılı kolluk kuvvetleri için temel unsur insanların kalplerini ve zihinlerini kazanmaktır. Bu, terör ve terörle mücadele için özellikle geçerlidir. Her ne kadar terörizm, 11 Eylül terör saldırılarından bu yana dünya çapında önemli bir sorun haline geldiyse de, Türkiye'nin yüzleştiği en önemli sorunlardan birisidir çünkü Türk devleti terör örgütleriyle kırk yıldır mücadele etmektedir. Bu nedenle Türk hükümeti; askeri operasyonları, cezai kovuşturmaları ve hatta teröristlerle müzakereyi içeren çeşitli terörle mücadele önlemleri geliştirmiş ve uygulamıştır. Terör örgütleri varlıklarını sürdürebilmek ve faaliyetlerini yürütebilmek amacıyla halkın desteğini kazanmaya çalışır; bunun yanı sıra hükümetler için de terörle mücadelede halkın desteğini almak elzemdir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, kolluk kuvvetlerinin, terörle mücadelede halkın işbirliğine olan desteğini kazanmasındaki belirleyici etkenlerini ortaya koymaktır. Polise ve hükümet politikasına karşı halkın tutumunu anlayarak, yetkili merciler halkın tutumunu geliştirmek adına çaba sarf edebilir çünkü halkın güveni ve işbirliği polislik ilke ve uygulamaları için esastır.

Polisin meşruyeti ve halkla işbirliği ile ilgili birçok araştırma yapılmıştır. Ancak, terörizm açısından polis ve halkın işbirliği konusundaki araştırmalar çok kısıtlıdır. Bu çalışma, enstrümental ve normatif açılardan, caydırıcılığın ve meşruyet modellerinin insanların polisle işbirliğine karşı bakış açılarına olan etkisini gün yüzüne çıkarmayı amaçlamıştır. Bu çalışma, halkın, polisin meşruyeti ve terörle mücadelede polisle işbirliği ile ilgili görüşlerini anlamak için Türkiye'nin Diyarbakir ilinin bir ilçesindeki devlet okullarında görevli 113 öğretmenden elde edilen anket verilerini analiz etmektedir. Bu çalışma, ankete katılanların büyük çoğunluğunun polisi meşru bir güç olarak gördüğünü ve polisle işbirliğine sıcak baktığını göstermiştir. Elde edilen sonuçlar ayrıca halkın sesinin, sosyal ayrımcılığın, genel polislik önlemlerinin, polisin etkinliğinin, dindarlığın ve terör riskinin katılımcıların polisle işbirliği konusundaki tutumlarına kayda değer bir etki sağladığını ortaya koymaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Meşruyet, İşbirliği, Terörle Mücadele, Halk Desteği, Polislik

\* Dr., Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü, bulentuluturk@yahoo.com

Makalenin Gönderim Tarihi: 17.03.2016; Makalenin Kabul Tarihi: 13.12.2016

## 1. Introduction

Research on public attitudes and perceptions of terrorism has increased since the attacks of September 11, 2001 (Sun, Wu, and Poteyeva, 2011). The bombings in Istanbul, Madrid, and London 2004, 2004, and 2005, respectively, also contributed to the public awareness of the threat posed by terrorism (Lemyre, Turner, Lee, and Krewski, 2006). Additionally, counterterrorism has become a top priority for law enforcement agencies and has attracted great interest among scholars for the last decade (Sun, Wu, and Poteyeva, 2011). However, Turkey has been subjected to terrorist activities and has experienced thousands of terrorist incidents; therefore, counterterrorism has been one of the top priorities of Turkey since the mid-1980s. Although, left wing terrorist organizations were the major contributors to terrorism during the 1970s and 1980s, terror incidents also included activities of Kurdish and Armenian nationalist groups in Turkey. Finally, for the last decade, Al-Qaida and ISIS have also been a terrorist threat for Turkey.

Nevertheless, the Kurdistan Workers' Party/Partiya Karkaren Kurdistan (PKK), designated as a terrorist organization by the U.S. and the EU, has been the most serious domestic terrorism threat in Turkey since the mid-1980s (Unal, 2012; Gure and Elveren, 2013; Ekici and Erdem, 2009). According to the report, released by the Human Rights Investigation Commission in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (2013), the conflict between the PKK and the Turkish state caused 35,576 fatalities, around 7,918 were security personnel and 5,557 were civilian; on the other hand, 22,101 terrorist were killed from 1984 to 2012. Besides, 386,360 people migrated to the western cities due to the conflicts and threats. Yayman (2011) underlines the economic dimension of conflict saying that about \$300 billion have been spent on counterterrorism for 30 years.

The Turkish government has carried out various counterterrorism policies to end PKK-initiated violence (Unal, 2012). Turkish authorities severely over-reacted to the PKK attacks, declared a State of Emergency for the region, and focused intensely on military operations during 1980s and 1990s. In the meantime, Turkish authorities have disregarded the demands of ordinary Kurds, and failed to improve the socio-economic conditions of the region (Unal, 2012). However, since coming to power in 2003, the Erdogan administration has changed Turkey's policies in its battle against the PKK. Erdogan emphasized that differentiating the PKK and Kurdish problem is essential to solve this problem, because the PKK has abused Kurds' problems in order to gain legitimacy and support from Kurds (Sozen, 2006).

Thus, Turkish authorities have designed and implemented an economic development plan in the region, broadened the range of freedoms; at the same time, successfully prevented and responded to the PKK attacks. More significantly, the Erdogan administration initiated a peace and solution process in early 2013 (Sozen, 2006). On March 21, 2013, Newroz day, a festival celebrated by Kurdish people, the leader of PKK Abdullah Ocalan announced a ceasefire and peace plan.

Scholars emphasize the importance of popular support for terrorist organizations (Crenshaw, 2000; Tessler and Robbins, 2007; Paul, 2009). According to Paul (2009), maintaining popular support is essential for terrorists and authorities should make every effort to reduce the level of popular support for terrorist organizations and improve the level of public support for cooperation in order to effectively fight against terrorism. Therefore, it is essential to understand determinants of public support for cooperation on counterterrorism with law enforcement agencies.

Research on Turkish citizens' attitudes toward police legitimacy and public cooperation on counterterrorism has practical and theoretical significance, so authorities can utilize these findings to improve the legitimacy of the police and to improve public attitudes toward cooperation. Although this study is a partial replication of a research conducted in New York City by Tyler, Schulhofer, and Huq (2010), different historical backgrounds and cultural motivations might generate different results. Given the gap in literature, this study attempts to explore (1) the general picture of attitudes toward legitimacy of the police and cooperation on counterterrorism and (2) determinants of public attitudes toward the legitimacy of the police and cooperation with the police. The current study uses both instrumental and normative theories of policing to understand public cooperation with the police. The study was based on

the results of a survey conducted in one of the districts of Diyarbakir province in January 2014 in which 113 public school teachers participated.

## 2. Literature Review

Since the first attack of the PKK in 1984, the Kurdish problem has been brought to the public attention in Turkey. The Kurdish nationalism rose with the collapse of the multiethnic Ottoman Empire. The disintegration of the empire made Kurds (the largest ethnic groups) to live in four separate states: Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Syria (Laber and Whitman, 1988; McKiernan, 1999). The foundation of the Republic of Turkey fostered ethnic separatist movements in Turkey, because Kemalism, Turkey's official ideology developed based on the Turkish state nationalism and secular identity, perceived Kurdish nationalism and political Islam as a threat to Turkey's national security (Taspinar, 2005; Gunes, 2013).

In response to the Kemalist ideology, Kurdish and Islamic resistance was developed. Hence, in the first two decades following the founding of the Republic of Turkey, Turkey witnessed numerous Islamic and Kurdish rebellions which were harshly suppressed (Taspinar, 2005; Aras, 2014). Aras (2014) states that the suppression of rebellions in southeastern Turkey, along with the execution of rebels and their supporters, raised fear among the Kurdish people. Additionally, in order to ensure national unity and integrity, the government had put some other measures into effect, for example, the use of Kurdish language was banned. Furthermore, the state ignored not only political and cultural rights of Kurds but also economic and social development of the region (Laber and Whitman, 1988; Taspinar, 2005).

However, during the Cold War, political division between the left and the right overshadowed the Kurdish problem. In the meantime, dissatisfaction with the Turkish state caused Kurds to take part in the radical left groups (Taspinar, 2005). Meanwhile, the PKK was founded in 1978 in the village of Fis in the southeastern province of Diyarbakir by Abdullah Ocalan and a group of his friends based on Marxist-Leninist ideology in order to establish a Greater Kurdistan (Criss, 1995; Roth and Sever, 2007; Tucker, 2013). When the 1980 military coup occurred, aimed to end the political chaos and unify the nation, thousands of people were imprisoned; of course, Kurdish protestors were put in Diyarbakir prison, which was famous for torture and violations of human rights (Laber and Whitman, 1988; Calislar, 2013). Interestingly, Calislar (2013) points out that the military intentionally provoked the clashes between the different groups to justify a coup.

Prior to the military coup, top members of the PKK left Turkey for Syria and held their second congress in Damascus in 1982. Abdullah Ocalan, the leader of the PKK, and the group decided to use terrorist activities to establish an independent socialist Kurdish state (Criss, 1995; Roth and Sever, 2007; Unal, 2012). The PKK initiated its first armed attacks against the state in 1984. In the following years, the PKK attacks continued to occur and reached a peak in the early 1990s (Roth and Sever, 2007; Bacik and Coskun, 2011). In addition to armed attacks, the tactics of the PKK included arson, suicide bombings, car bombings, and kidnapping (Roth and Sever, 2007). The PKK also got involved in drug trafficking to finance its activities (Criss, 1995; Roth and Sever, 2007).

The PKK targeted not only the Turkish military and police forces but also civilians, most of whom were Kurds (Criss (1995). According to Criss (1995), the PKK purposefully targeted Kurdish people to (1) convince Kurds to be on board with the PKK against the state through showing them their strength, (2) send threat messages to Kurds that the PKK will penalize them provided that they continue to be on the state's side. (3) The anger of the PKK was toward village guards, who were employed by the state to protect their villages against PKK attacks. The militants of the PKK even killed whole families of village guards (Criss, 1995). Criss (1995) also states that the PKK recruited manpower by kidnapping of children from their families; however, the hatred of families whom children were kidnapped turned into kindness when their children were killed during clashes with security forces.

According to Durna and Hancerli (2007), from 1984 to 1990, majority of Kurds did not support the PKK and only a small proportion of Kurds supported the PKK because it was a strong force in the rural areas and Turkish security forces could not reach rural and remote areas when they are needed. However, increasing PKK attacks forced the state to take more drastic measures which increased public

support for the PKK (Durna and Hancerli, 2007). The military and law enforcement officers behaved towards citizens as potential terrorists owing to the high threat of terrorist attack in some part of the region (Ekici and Erdem, 2009). Especially, those who were believed to have collaborated with PKK militants harshly treated by the Turkish Gendarmerie forces, one of the law enforcement agencies responsible for rural areas. The abuse of gendarmerie authority increased the emotion of fear among Kurds and triggered sympathy for the PKK (Criss, 1995). The PKK used the attitudes of the security forces as a propaganda to claim that the state was discriminating against Kurds and behaving them as second class citizens (Durna and Hancerli, 2007). The PKK even used deceptive tactics to gain public support for its activities and to generate distrust in the Turkish state. For example, PKK militants, dressed with Turkish military uniforms, threatened and attacked Kurdish people, and forced them to evacuate their villages (Ekici and Erdem, 2009).

In 1998, Syria, which had been a safe haven for PKK militants for years, had to expell PKK leader Ocalan due to heavy diplomatic pressure from the Turkish state (Larrabee and Lesser, 2003). Ocalan, after leaving Syria, went to several countries including Russia, Italy, and Greece; and finally captured in Kenya with the assistance of the United States (Durna and Hancerli, 2007). Ocalan was convicted of being the leader of the PKK and sentenced to capital punishment; however, the punishment was later changed to life imprisonment. Following his capture, Ocalan called for a one-sided ceasefire which was accepted by PKK militants, most of whom gave up armed struggle and withdrew from Turkey to Northern Iraq. However, Ocalan called PKK militants back to Turkey to carry out terrorist activities, thus the ceasefire ended in 2004 and the PKK restarted its attacks (Derin-Gure 2011; Bacik and Coskun 2011). To date, the PKK declared ceasefires in 2006, 2009, (Bacik and Coskun 2011) and 2013.

Since the end of the military rule in 1983, political tension over the Kurdish question has been one of the main challenges facing the Turkish state (Keyman, 2012). The state perceived the activities of PKK as a security problem rather than acknowledging the social roots of the problem since the state elites did not want to recognize the existence of an ethnic minority group (Aydinli and Ozcan, 2011). Therefore, the Turkish military was seen as the mainpower in dealing with the Kurdish problem (Bacik and Coskun, 2011). In spite of concerns held by the state's elites, Turgut Ozal, prime minister from 1983 to 1989, gradually made efforts to change the attitudes of public and state towards Kurdish problem. Ozal built good relationships with the leaders of Iraqi Kurds, suggested lifting the ban on broadcasting and publishing. Following a ceasefire in 1993, Ozal was about to declare a broad amnesty for PKK militants to convince them to end the armed struggle; however, killing of 33 unarmed soldiers by PKK militants ended the ceasefire (Barkey, 2007).

The Turkish government has to solve the Kurdish question and enable all citizens of Turkey live in liberty and harmony in order to be a democratic country with strong economies, a high quality of life, and a proactive foreign policy (Keyman 2012). Therefore, the AKP (the Justice and Development Party) government has progressively tried to change the state approach since 2002, and initiated a 'democratic opening project' in order to resolve the problem by political means in 2009 (Bacik and Coskun, 2011; Satana, 2012). Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan, in office between 2003 and 2014, championed the extension of social, cultural, and political rights of Kurdish people in Turkey. Aydinli and Ozcan (2011) state that the democratic opening project was an important sign of shift from countering terrorism toward identifying the root causes of the problem. However, during the 2011 parliamentary elections, the public discourse between the leaders of AKP and the BDP (the Peace and Democracy Party, a pro-PKK political party) increased the political tension across the country (Calislar, 2013). Shortly after election day, unfortunately 13 soldiers were killed by a PKK attack in Silvan, Diyarbakir, leading to the end of the democratic opening project, and consequently, armed clashes erupted between the security forces and the PKK (Calislar, 2013).

Finally, the current peace and solution process was started by the AKP government at the beginning of 2013 (Sozen, 2006). This initiative is backed by the army, although Turkish ultra-nationalist and main opponents party have not supported the conflict resolution. According to Keyman (2012), the Kurdish question was exploited by those of Turkish ultra-nationalist and Kurdish nationalist. They both

have not wanted to be part of the solution and found common ground. Moreover, the Turkish government has passed numerous democratic reform packages in order to become a member of the EU and to normalize civilian-military relations since 2003 (Satana, 2012; Unal, 2012).

As noted earlier, since the outbreak of PKK attacks, counterterrorism has been Turkey's main security and defense policy, essentially, counterterrorism policing has become one of the significant role police departments play. Therefore, law enforcement agencies created counterterrorism units which played a tough role in combating terrorism, but ignored or disregarded the voice of communities. However, for the last decade, tough counterterrorism approach has been changed and community-based approaches have been developed. Besir Atalay, Minister of Interior, declared a transformation process to create community based approach in the Turkish National Police Department (TNP). Thus, the TNP began to implement community policing in 2006 (Boke, 2013). Especially in the southeastern region, community policing strategies and practices have been developed to enhance trust in the police within the community they serve and increase the level of support toward terrorism.

### 3. Theoretical Framework

The importance of the police-community relations has been recognized since the emergence of the community policing approach in 1980s (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003). The police have understood that they need public support and cooperation to be effectively carry out their role (Tyler, 2004). There are two models of policing that impact public cooperation and support for police: Instrumental and normative approach (Tyler, Schulhofer, and Huq, 2010). Instrumental approach highlights the impact of anticipated rewards and penalties, alternatively, a normative approach highlights that legitimacy encourages public cooperation with the police. The current study aimed to test instrumental and normative approaches for public cooperation with the police in the context of terrorism.

The instrumental model asserts that the rational evaluations of expected costs and rewards shapes public behavior toward the police (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003). Sunshine and Tyler (2003) suggest that public cooperation with the police is associated with assessment of three elements: police performance, risk, and judgements about distributive justice. This instrumental approach suggests that police can gain legitimacy in the eyes of the public through effective delivery of police services (Sunshine and Tyler 2003). Tyler and colleagues (2010) argue that if the police can more effectively address crime and disorder, the public will be more willing to cooperate with the police. In terms of terrorism, instrumental model suggests that the public will cooperate with the police if their actions are prompted by a motive of their self-interest. The public may expect to be protected against terrorist threat. Another reason is that their actions may reduce the number of police intrusions in their community and may lead to refrain from confrontation with the police (Tyler et al., 2010).

The normative model, in contrast, asserts that when a government is seen as legitimate, the public obey the law and cooperate with the authorities. Consequently, if the police are regarded as legitimate, the public are more likely to cooperate with the police (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003; Tyler et al., 2010). Legitimacy is defined as “a property that a rule or an authority has when others feel obligated to voluntarily defer to that rule or authority. In other words, a legitimate authority is one that is regarded by people as entitled to have its decisions and rules accepted and followed by others” (Skogan and Frydl, 2004; 297; Tyler et al., 2010; 370). Sunshine and Tyler (2003, 514) further state that “the legitimacy of the police is linked to public judgments about the fairness of the processes through which the police make decisions and exercise authority.”

Researchers consistently report a strong and consistent relationship between people's perceptions of procedural justice and their perceptions about police legitimacy (Tyler and Huo, 2002; Sunshine and Tyler, 2003; Murphy et al., 2008; Tyler et al., 2010; Gau and Brunson, 2010). According to Sunshine and Tyler (2003), if the police use fair procedures when they exercise their power, the public will regard the police as legitimate and will more likely be willing to cooperate with the police. The normative perspective suggest that legitimacy and procedural justice may also help us to understand the cooperative attitudes with regard to terrorism threat. Furthermore, Tyler and colleagues (2010) argue that ideological

perspective, religiosity, culture, and solidarity may play an important role in shaping legitimacy and public opinion toward terrorism.

This argument suggests that an instrumental model views cooperation as a result of external factors, while a normative model regards cooperation as a result of internalization of justice and obligation (Tyler and Huo, 2002; Tyler, 2006). These two rival explanations of policing models have been tested in the context of ordinary crime; however, the literature is limited with regard to terrorism context. Thus, this study aims to contribute to the existing literature by examining the influence of instrumental and normative models on cooperation in the context of terrorism.

## 4. Methodology

### 4.1. Data

The data for this study were collected through a self-administered questionnaire distributed to public school teachers in one of the 14 districts of Diyarbakir province, which is located in the southeastern part of Turkey. Since Diyarbakir is one of top cities most affected by terrorist threats and incidents, one of its districts is selected for this study. This district, which has about 10,000 population, is also one of the most vulnerable districts to terrorist threats. The people of this district has been through numerous terrorist incidents including explosions, clashes, and attacks by the Kurdistan Worker's Party (PKK) since 1990s. Also, there is a significant fear of terror threat among residents. Therefore, this district is a suitable locus for the current study. The public school teachers were selected because teachers have a significant impact on people and they are the ones who have the ability to shape the coming generations.

This is a partial replication of a research conducted in New York City by Tyler et al. (2010). The researcher translated survey questions into Turkish and then an English language teacher and two social scientists checked the translated survey questions. A pilot study of the Turkish questionnaire was tested on 10 teachers to assess the comprehensibility of the final version. After the approval of research goals and the questionnaire by the director of education department, a survey questionnaire was distributed to teachers of public schools in the district by the administrator officers in January 2014. The director of education department was assured that the name of the district and schools would be kept confidential during the approval process. Also, respondents were assured that participation was completely voluntary and that their responses would be anonymous and confidential. The study population is all of the teachers currently working at public schools in the district. From 260 questionnaires, 113 were completed and returned appropriately, giving us a response rate of 43 percent. Principal components analyses and reliability tests were conducted for all scales used in this study.

### 4.2. Dependent Variables

In this study, two dependent variables were measured: legitimacy and cooperation with the police.

*Legitimacy* is defined as “the degree to which respondents felt an obligation to obey the law and felt trust and confidence in legal authorities” (Tyler et al., 2010; 389). An eight-item Likert-type scale was used in this study to assess respondents' perceptions of police legitimacy. Four point Likert-type statements ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) were used as response options. Three items were reverse coded before performing principal components analysis. Principal components analysis of these eight items suggested that a single factor represented the legitimacy scale. Then, these eight items were summed and coded so that a higher score indicated a greater perception of legitimacy. The items in the factor formed a scale with a reliability of 0.92. The mean for legitimacy was 22.49 with a range between 9 and 32, indicating higher perception of legitimacy among participants (see Table 1).

*Cooperation with the police*, also called general willingness to cooperate with the police, is a linear composite of five Likert-type statements, measures “the likelihood that respondents would engage in cooperative actions if asked to do so by the police” (Tyler et al., 2010; 390). Cooperation with the police was measured by Likert-type statements with response options ranging from 1 (very unlikely) to 4 (very likely). Through performing principal components analysis and Cronbach's alpha test of reliability, it was found that a single factor solution best represented these data (Cronbach's alpha=0.93). The cooperation

scale was created by summing these five items and was coded so that high values indicate a strong willingness to cooperate with the police. The mean of this scale was 14.91, (with a range of 7-20), indicating that the majority of participants were willing to cooperate with the police.

### 4.3. Independent Variables

#### 4.3.1. Justice

In this study, we measured justice using three sub-components in the questionnaire:

- 1) *Social discrimination against minorities.* A three-item scale measures the extent to which participants think that minorities are fairly treated: “at work or in schools,” “when dealing with authorities,” and “in the media.” Four point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very unfair) to 4 (very fair) were used as response options. (Tyler et al., 2010). (alpha =0.91). A higher score indicates that majority of participants address the feelings of discrimination.
- 2) *Community voice in government policy formation* scale was created by summing three items. It is used to determine the extent to which participants get involved in decision making process regarding counterterrorism policies. Some of these questions are: “How much the government considers community views when making decisions about how to address terrorism,” and “how much the government considers community views when trying to deal with problems in their community.” Four point Likert-type statements ranging from 1 (not much at all) to 4 (frequently) were used as response options (Tyler et al., 2010) (alpha=0.87). Higher scores indicate that the majority of participants think that the government considers their thoughts and they can offer opinions during policy formation.
- 3) *The fairness of police decision making in policy implementation.* A four-item Likert scale, assesses the extent to which participants feel that the police make fair decisions (Tyler et al., 2010). In order to measure this variable, the following items were used: “The police give people a chance to express their views before making decisions,”; “the police accurately understand and apply the law,”; “the police make their decisions based upon facts, not their personal opinions”; and “the police apply the law consistently to everyone, regardless of who they are.” Response options were rated on a four point scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 4 (often) (alpha =0.87). A high score indicates a greater sense of fairness.

#### 4.3.2. Policing practices

Policing practices were measured by two components.

- 1) *Public measures* is a four-item scale used to measure the public policing behaviors such as targeting people for stopping, questioning, or searching based on their ethnicity (Tyler et al., 2010). This scale was measured by Likert-type statements with response options ranging from 1 (almost never) to 4 (often) (alpha =0.90). Higher scores on the measure indicate higher level and frequency of police activities.
- 2) *Evaluations of the police.*
  - a) *The feeling of safety* was measured by a single survey item: “How would you rate the Diyarbakir Police Department in terms of whether it is making you feel safe from the threat of terrorism?” Response options range from 1 (very bad) to 4 (very good). This scale measures the extent to which the activities of the police make participants feel safe from the threat of terrorism (Tyler et al., 2010). A higher score suggests a strong feeling of safety among participants.
  - b) *The effectiveness of the police* is also a single item used to determine the likelihood of police effectiveness to prevent a terrorist attack. In order to measure the effectiveness of the police, the following question was asked: “If someone were planning a terrorist attack in the city of Diyarbakir today, how likely do you think it is that they would be caught in advance?” This single item was measured by a Likert-type statement with response options ranging from 1 (not likely at all) to 4 (very likely) (Tyler et al., 2010). A higher score on the measure indicates participants think that the police can prevent terrorism more effectively.

### 4.3.3. Views on terrorism

*Seriousness of terrorism risk* is a linear combination of three items, which measures the extent to which participants feel that terrorism is a serious threat (Lemyre et al., 2006; Tyler et al., 2010). Five point Likert-type statements ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely) were used as response options. Some of these questions are: “To what extent do you think that terrorism is a threat to the citizens of Turkey in general?”; to “what extent do you think that terrorism is a threat to you and your family.”(alpha=0.91). A higher score indicates a higher perception of terrorism risk.

*Proterror means* is a linear combination of five items, which measures the extent to which participants justify (1 = never justified; 4 = often justified) some kinds of incidents such as: “Suicide bombing and other types of attacks intentionally aimed at civilians are ...”; “any types of attacks, carried out by the PKK, aimed at civilians are ...”; and “any types of attacks, carried out by the PKK, aimed at the police or army forces are ...”(Tyler et al., 2010). In addition to Tyler and colleagues' one item, four items were added and this scale was created (alpha = 0.88). It was coded so that a higher score indicates a greater justification for terror incidents.

*Patriotism* was measured by using revised version of symbolic patriotism questions used in ANES (Parker, 2010). Also, researcher developed two questions and added to the scale. The response categories for these four-point scale ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree): (1) My love for Turkey is extremely strong, (2) When I see the Turkish flag, I feel extremely good, (3) I am proud to be a citizen of Turkey, (4) It bothers me when I see children performing the National Anthem of Turkey (alpha=0.94). Patriotism scale was created by the combined score of these four items. Higher scores indicate greater patriotic feelings.

### 4.3.4. Demographic variables

Measures of participants' socio-demographic characteristics provide us to test whether they are significant factors to predict the attitudes toward legitimacy and cooperation. The following four individual demographic variables were used: participants' age (in years), gender (1 = female, 0 = male), household income (a ten-point ordinal scale ranging from 1 = 0-500TL to 10 = 4500TL and more), ethnicity (1 = Turk, 0=minorities – referring ethnic minorities such as Kurds, Zaza or Arabs), and religiosity (1 = religious, 0 =non religious). These demographic variables are commonly used as additional independent variables. The researcher expects to find that income and ethnicity will be positively associated with attitudes. On the other hand, we contend that age and gender will be negatively associated with attitudes toward legitimacy and cooperation. Especially, ethnicity is expected to be one of the significant predictives of public perceptions on legitimacy. Education was not used since population included only public school teachers and bachelor's degree is required to become a teacher.

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Variables**

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Range
<i>Dependent Variables</i>			
Cooperation	14.91	4.48	7-20
Legitimacy	22.49	6.09	9-32
<i>Independent Variables</i>			
Community voice	7.62	2.80	3-12
Social discrimination	8.43	2.92	3-12
Public measures	9.43	3.84	4-16
Effectiveness	2.42	0.94	1-4
Terrorrisk	10.35	3.48	3-15
Ethnicity (Turk=1)	0.49	0.50	0-1
Religiosity (Religious=1)	0.72	0.45	0-1



*Characteristics of the Sample*

In the sample, 45.1 percent of the participants were female and 54 percent were male. The mean age of teachers who participated in the survey was 27.16 years (SD 3.69), with a minimum age of 22 years and a maximum age of 45 years. Household income was measured by using a ten-point ordinal scale ranging from 1 = 0-500TL to 10 = 4500TL and more. The average household income was 5.7 (2001 – 2500TL), with a standard deviation of 1.8. Regarding ethnic identity, the sample consisted of 47.8 percent Turk, 39.8 percent Kurd, 3.5 percent Zaza, 0.9 percent Arab, and 5.3 percent said other minorities. In addition, the majority of the respondents defined themselves as religious (71.7%), whereas 22.1 percent defined themselves as secular and 1.8 percent as atheist.

**5. Findings**

Table II reports the Pearson correlation coefficients of the variables employed in this study. Looking at the area of legitimacy and cooperation, we can see the similar results. First, in terms of demographic variables, income, religiosity, and ethnicity were found to be significantly associated with participants' perception of legitimacy and cooperation. The results suggest that Turks are more likely than minorities, religious participants are more likely than nonreligious participants, and those participants who have higher household income are more likely to have positive attitudes about legitimacy and cooperation.

**Table II. Correlation Matrix for Independent and Dependent Variables**

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.Legitimacy	-								
2.Cooperation	.814**	-							
3.Social Discrimination	.855**	.879**	-						
4.Community voice	.632**	.687**	.667**	-					
5.Terror risk	.705**	.792**	.718**	.464**	-				
6.Effectiveness	.596**	.477**	.486**	.407**	.480**	-			
7.Public measures	-.769**	-.846**	-.803**	-.730**	-.663**	-.404**	-		
8.Ethnicity	.566**	.509**	.462**	.265**	.548**	.204*	-.422**	-	
9.Religious	.596**	.596**	.547**	.404**	.469**	.454**	-.482**	.402**	-

Notes:\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01 (2-tailed)

Second, the analysis indicates that each of justice, policing practices, evaluations of the police, views on terrorism, and patriotism variables was significantly associated with legitimacy and cooperation variables and these relationships were moderate to strong in strength ( $0.48 \leq |r| \leq 0.88$ ). Those participants who think that they have more ability to have input into policy decisions, who think that the

police are fair in policy implementation, who think that the police do not discriminate against minorities, who feel safer, who find the police more effective, who take terror risk more seriously, and who feel patriotism more deeply are more likely to have higher perception of legitimacy and more likely to cooperate with the police. However, the scales measuring proterror means and public policing measures are negatively associated with both legitimacy and cooperation scales. Thus, participants who think that terrorist activities are justified in some way, and those who think that police show differential behavior toward ethnic minorities are less likely to cooperate with the police.

Table III presents the results of Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression analyses of the independent variables on participants' perception of legitimacy and cooperation with the police. While the results of Pearson correlation coefficients were informative about the relationships between dependent and independent variables, OLS regression allows the researcher to assess the relative influence of each of these variables on participants' perceptions.

The current study found that among all independent variables, social discrimination ( $\beta = 0.50$ ), ethnicity ( $\beta = 0.13$ ), and household income ( $\beta = 0.12$ ) variables significantly predicted participants' perception of legitimacy. Overall, all the factors in this model explained 83 percent of the variation in participants' perception of legitimacy. As anticipated, those who thought that they were treated fairly in the community were more likely to view the police as legitimate. In addition, we found that Turks' perception about the police was significantly different from those who were minorities which also indicated that Turks were more likely to hold positive perception of the police. Finally, the results indicated that participants with higher income were more likely to have positive perception of the police.

Regarding determinants of cooperation with the police, the results show that community voice ( $\beta = 0.15$ ), social discrimination ( $\beta = 0.28$ ), public policing measures ( $\beta = -0.25$ ), police effectiveness ( $\beta = -0.16$ ), and seriousness of terror risk ( $\beta = 0.21$ ) are significant predictors of citizen cooperation with the police. The results suggest that as perceptions of positive attitudes about the community voice increases, perceptions of cooperation also increase. For instance, those participants who think that they have more ability to offer their decisions during policy formation about security are more likely to cooperate with the police. Consistent with the findings in model 1, the results indicated that those who thought that they were treated fairly in the community were more likely to cooperate with the police. In addition, the results show that participants who take terror risk more seriously are more likely to cooperate. As participants' perceptions of terror risk increase, so too do their perceptions of cooperation. Surprisingly, it was found that people who saw the police as effective were less willing to cooperate with the police. The results also showed that as participants expressed dissatisfaction with policing behavior, perceptions of cooperation declined. Among demographic variables, only religiosity ( $\beta = 0.12$ ) was significantly and positively associated with the perception of cooperation. Furthermore, the results indicate that those who defined themselves as religious were more likely to cooperate with the police. About 88 percent of the variance in cooperation was explained by all these variables in the study.

Table III. Multiple Regression Summary

Predictors	Legitimacy			Cooperation		
	B	S.E.	$\beta$	B	S.E.	$\beta$
<i>Justice</i>						
Community voice	.037	.169	.016	.215	.099	.130*
Social discrimination	.943	.205	.454***	.503	.127	.325***
<i>Evaluations of the police</i>						
Public policing measures	-.303	.141	-.191*	-.328	.083	-.282***
Police effectiveness	1.248	.400	.186**	-.303	.235	-.062
<i>Views on terrorism</i>						
Terror risk	.034	.129	.020	.313	.082	.243***
<i>Demographic variables</i>						
Ethnicity (Turk=1)	2.073	.742	.166**	.185	.437	.020
Religiosity (Religious=1)	1.026	.879	.075	1.241	.528	.124*
R <sup>2</sup>	%80			87%		

Notes: \*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001.

## 6. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the attitudes of public toward police legitimacy and cooperation on counterterrorism and to examine the factors concerning the public willingness to cooperate with the police by shedding light on the influence of deterrence and legitimacy on cooperation. In addition, this study aimed to examine how instrumental and normative models of policing explain the public's willingness to cooperate with the police. The present study is significant in two ways: One, it attempts to identify factors that influence public cooperation with the police. Two, this is a partial replication of the Tyler, Schulhofer, and Huq's (2010) study in a non-U.S. jurisdiction.

The data used for this study derived from a survey distributed to public school teachers in a district, located in the southeastern province of Diyarbakir. Overall, results of the present study suggest that a large majority of respondents view the police as legitimate and they are willing to cooperate with the police. The results indicate that social discrimination, income, and ethnicity have significant effects on public views about the legitimacy of the police. Regarding legitimacy, participants who feel that they are not discriminated against are more likely to view the police as a legitimate authority. The results also show that those who consider themselves as Turks, and those who have higher income are more likely to view the police as legitimate.

This study also identifies variables that influence people's willingness to cooperate with the police in the southeastern region of Turkey. People who feel that they are treated fairly and not discriminated against are more likely to cooperate with the police. People who think that they have more ability to offer their decisions during policy formation about security are more likely to cooperate with the police. Additionally, people who think that the police effectively perform their professional functions are more willing to cooperate with them. On the other hand, people who report low level of satisfaction with police are less likely to assist police. The perceived risk of terrorism is also correlated with cooperative behavior, accordingly, people who take terror risk more seriously are more willing to assist the police. Another important finding is that religious people are more willing to assist the police. The findings of the present study are partially consistent with those of Tyler et al. (2010). In addition to the important factors identified by Tyler and colleagues, the present study finds significant relationship between income, ethnicity and legitimacy; and community voice, public searches, police effectiveness, perceived risk of

terrorism and cooperative behavior. Finally, this study confirms that the legitimacy model better explains people's attitudes on cooperation, since community voice and social discrimination have a significant, positive impact on cooperative behavior. On the other hand, the results of this study show that deterrence model partially explains people's view about cooperation with the police, since the perceived risk of terrorism has significant positive impact on cooperative behavior while the effectiveness of police has significant negative impact on cooperative behavior.

For the police to perform their functions, they must cooperate with the community. Since the police cannot deliver effective and efficient security services without public support, it is crucial for the police to be viewed as legitimate by the citizens they serve (Tyler and Fagan, 2008). Police departments should adopt the community policing philosophy to fight against terrorism. According to Pickering (2007), tough counterterrorism measures may provoke the terrorist activities; therefore, police departments can use community policing strategy more effectively to counter terrorism. According to Silk (2012), building police-community relations plays an important role in protecting against terrorism. It is noted, however, that, it is crucial to establish trust between the police and community members at early stages of a relationship. Additionally, the police should have empathy with Kurdish people and should not talk about sensitive issues such as terrorism which makes Kurdish people uncomfortable since police officers would feel the same way if someone talks about police brutality and corruption. Moreover, spending time with community members may also facilitate understanding of values and beliefs of each other and correct misconceptions between the police and local people (Silk 2012).

Moreover, since it is mandatory for police officers to serve in the southeastern region at least two years, police departments should provide training for the newcomers to help them understand the cultures of the people living in the southeastern region of Turkey. Police officers should be taught that the police can serve Kurdish people and function their duties only if they can gain the hearts and minds of the people. Furthermore, the police should follow the process-based policing strategy by applying the policies and procedures fairly while using their authority and proving their trustworthiness to the community they serve (Tyler and Huo, 2002).

This research had some limitations and further research should be done to understand people's views about the legitimacy of the police, public cooperation and the factors affecting their attitudes. First, the present study was conducted in a district of a southeastern province which was selected purposefully due to proximity and accessibility. Thus, the research findings may not be generalized outside of this district. Therefore, researchers should replicate this study in multiple districts of the region. Second, the researcher was not able to obtain the list of teachers from the education department to implement random sampling; therefore, instead of using convenience sampling among the public school teachers of the school district, a survey was administered to a whole population in the school district. Third, to make this study manageable, the researcher focused on some dimensions of procedural justice. More research needs to be conducted by using variables measuring other dimensions of procedural justice, such as the fairness of police and quality of police treatment. Another limitation is that the researcher used a cross-sectional design in the present study. Thus, longitudinal studies on this topic should be done in order to examine attitudinal changes and their impact on public opinion.

## References

- Aras, R. (2014). "State sovereignty and politics of fear: Ethnography of political violence and the Kurdish struggle in Turkey", In the Kurdish Question in Turkey: New Perspectives on Violence, Representation, and Reconciliation, edited by C. Gunes and W. Zeydanlıoğlu, 89-113. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Aydinli, E. and Ozcan, N. A. (2011). "The Conflict Resolution and Counterterrorism Dilemma: Turkey Faces its Kurdish Question", Terrorism and Political Violence, 23: 438-457.
- Bacik, G. and Coskun, B. B. (2011). "The PKK Problem: Explaining Turkey's Failure to Develop a Political Solution", Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 34: 248-265.

- Barkey, H. J. (2007). "Turkey and the PKK: A Pyrrhic Victory." In *Democracy and Counterterrorism: Lessons from the Past*, edited by Robert J. Art and L. Richardson, 343-381. Washington, DC: United State Institute of Peace.
- Boke, K. (2013). "Turkey", In *Community Policing in Indigenous Communities*, edited by M. K. Nalla and G. R. Newman, 349-354. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Calislar, O. (2013). "The Kurdish Issue in Turkey: Its Social, Political, and Cultural Dimensions," In *Understanding Turkey's Kurdish Question*, edited by Fevzi Bilgin and Ali Sarihan, 29-46. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Criss, N.B. (1995). "The Nature of PKK Terrorism in Turkey", *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 18: 17-37.
- Crenshaw, M. (2000). "The Psychology of Terrorism: An Agenda for the 21st Century", *Political Psychology* 21(2): 405-420.
- Derin-Gure, P. (2011). "Separatist Terrorism and Economic Conditions in South-Eastern Turkey", *Defence & Peace Economics*, 22(4): 393-407.
- Durna, T. and Hancerli, S. (2007). "Implementing Democratic Policing in the PKK Terrorism Torn Areas of Turkey", In *Understanding and Responding to the Terrorism Phenomenon: A Multi-Dimensional Perspective*, edited by Ozgur Nikbay and Suleyman Hancerli, 326-338. Netherlands, IOS Press.
- Ekici, A. and Erdem, O. (2009). "The Impact of Law Enforcement Practices on Terrorism", In *Building Terrorism Resistant Communities*, edited by Siddik Ekici, Ahmet Ekici, and David A McEntire, 87-108. Netherlands, IOS Press.
- Gunes, Cengiz. (2012). "Explaining the PKK's Mobilization of the Kurds in Turkey: Hegemony, Myth and Violence", *Ethnopolitics*, 12(3): 247-267.
- Human Rights Investigation Commission Report. (2013). The Grand National Assembly of Turkey.
- Laber, J. and Whitman, L. (1988). *Destroying Ethnic Identity: The Kurds of Turkey*, New York, NY: A Helsinki Watch Report.
- Larrabee, F. S. and Lesser, I. O. (2003). *Turkish Foreign Policy in an Age of Uncertainty*, Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Lemyre, L., M.C. Turner, J.E.C. Lee and Krewski, D. (2006). "Public Perception of Terrorism Threats and Related Information Sources in Canada: Implications for the Management of Terrorism Risks", *Journal of Risk Research*, 9(7): 755-774.
- Moon, B. (2006). "The Influence of Organizational Socialization on Police Officers' Acceptance of Community Policing", *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 9(4): 704-722.
- Murphy, K., Hinds, L. and Fleming, J. (2008). "Encouraging Public Cooperation and Support for the Police", *Policing & Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*, 18(2): 136-155.
- Ooslander, A. M. (2003). "Turkey's Application for Membership of the EU." European Parliament Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defense Policy. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/committees/afet/20030512/495680EN.pdf>, [Access date: 19. 03. 2014].
- Parker, C. S. (2010). "Symbolic versus Blind Patriotism: Distinction without Difference?", *Political Research Quarterly*, 63(1): 97-114.
- Paul, C. (2009). "How Do Terrorists Generate and Maintain Support?", In *Social Sciences for Counterterrorism: Putting the Pieces Together*, edited by Paul K. Davis and Kim Cragin, 113-150. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Pickering, S. (2007). "Community policing the best way to fight terrorism." *ABC News*. <<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2007-10-15/community-policing-the-best-way-to-fight-terrorism/698600>> [Accessed on March 26, 2014].
- Silk, D. (2012). "Community Policing to Prevent Violent Extremism", *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 81(10): 1-6.

- Sozen, A. (2006). “*Terrorism and the Politics of Anti-Terrorism in Turkey*” In National Counter-Terrorism Strategies, edited by R.W. Orttung and A. Makarychew, 131-144. IOS Press.
- Sun, I. Y., Wu, Y. and Poteyeva, M. (2011). “*Arab Americans’ Opinion on Counterterrorism Measures: The Impact of Race, Ethnicity, and Religion*”, Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 34: 540-555.
- Sunshine, J. and Tyler, T. R. (2003). “*The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Shaping Public Support for Policing*”, Law & Society Review, 37(3): 513-548.
- Taşpınar, O. (2005). Kurdish Nationalism and Political Islam in Turkey: Kemalist Identity in Transition. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tessler, M. and Robbins, M. D. H. (2007). “*What Leads Ordinary Arab Men and Women to Approve of Terrorist Acts Against the United States?*”, Journal of Conflict Resolution, 51(2):305-328.
- Tucker, S. C. (2013). “*Kurdistan Worker’s Party*”, In Encyclopedia of Insurgency and Counterinsurgency: A New Era of Modern Warfare, edited by Tucker Spencer C. And Santa Barbara, 305-306. CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). Why People Obey the Law. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. and Huo, Y. J.. (2002). Trust in the Law: Encouraging Public Cooperation with the Police and Courts. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Tyler, T. R. and 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.
- Tyler, T. R., Schulhofer, S. and Huq, A. Z. (2010). “*Legitimacy and Deterrence Effects in Counterterrorism Policing: A Study of Muslim Americans*”, Law & Society Review, 44(2): 365-401.
- Unal, M. C. (2012). “*The Kurdistan Worker’s Party (PKK) and Popular Support: Counterterrorism towards an Insurgency Nature*”, Small Wars & Insurgencies, 23(3): 432-455.
- Yayman, H. (2011). Şark Meselesinden Demokratik Açılıma: Türkiye’nin Kürt Sorunu Hafızası. Ankara, Turkey: SETA Yayınları.