An Exploratory Study of Confidence in Policing in India

John R. Tahiliani
Worcester State University

Jeffrey W. Cohen
University of Washington-Tacoma

ABSTRACT

The November 2008 terrorist attack in Mumbai has brought a great deal of attention upon policing in India. In light of the proposed overhauls in policing in India, community policing initiatives have become increasingly utilized across the sub-continent. There remains, however, the important question as to how successful these initiatives can be in a country with such ethnic, class and religious diversity. The study undertaken here is an exploratory examination as to which variables are most closely associated with police confidence. The data for the study drew upon the India Human Development Study 2004-2005 of 41,554 households across India. The results of this study suggest that the variables most significantly associated with confidence in police (human/social capital, religion/caste) are best examined at the state level due to the degree of variance across states. Possible implications for community policing policies in India are also considered.

Keywords: social capital, human capital, India, law enforcement practices

INTRODUCTION

India is a country long in history and rich in cultural diversity. As a nuclear power, a country with an engaged standing army, a significant contributor in the information technologies sector, a formidable economic consumer base and the largest democracy in the world, attention is offered to India both politically and economically. Despite these distinctions, some argue that the country still has a considerable way to go to become a global power on the level of Western democracies (Khanna, 2007).

Many of the prescriptions that are offered to India regarding its progress place a great deal of importance on investments in infrastructure (Rudolph & Rudolph, 2002; Varshney, 2007; Pye, 2008). However, lost amongst transportation improvements, energy concerns and political ethics reform, scholarly recommendations about the country's internal security are found wanton. At the heart of political/economic questions of any emerging capitalist democracy are issues of internal security. Therefore, confidence in public institutions has been strongly associated with an engaged democracy and robust economy (Fukuyama, 1995; Knack & Keefer, 1997; Halpern, 2005).

There has long been an association between capable policing and stable nations (Dennis, 1976; Decker, 1981; Das, 1997; Cao et al, 1998). Much attention towards Indian policing has been given to police practices themselves, not the deliberation of these practices by citizenry (Verma, 2005; Verma & Gavermeni, 2006; Subramanian, 2007). When deliberation is expressed in the form of citizen confidence in police, for example, we can gain insight into the internal security of a nation (Jackson & Sunshine, 2007). The question then arises as to what civic community factors are most strongly associated with citizen confidence in law enforcement. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to examine which factors are most associated with citizen confidence in police in India.

General Demographics

Despite its size of 3,287,240 Sq km., India has a population density of 325 persons/sq. kilometer, making it one of the more dense countries in the world. Despite India's population of over one billion people, 72.2% live in what would be classified as a rural area. Minority groups, both caste and religious, may be small in comparison to majority groups but still can number in the millions of people. 5.03% of India's total population are homeless or are in homeless shelters. India is a country that is both young (35.1% under the age of fourteen) and growing (21.3% increase in population) (Census of India, 2001). There are 122 police officers per 100,000 people (Ministry of Home Affairs, 2005). These demographic figures illustrate that policing in India involves stark extremes in geography, religious/ethnic diversity, income and age.

Policing in India

Colonization by the British from the 16th century to 1948 has had a significant impact on the way in which India is policed today (Raghavan, 1999). Beginning with the role of the British East India Company and their strict, hierarchical organization of Imperial Police, the mission of law enforcement in India continues to be largely centered on protecting economic interests and riot control (Verma, 2005). Police corruption is not uncommon (Center for Media Studies, 2005).

While much of India continues to police in relatively the same way since colonization, several areas have undertaken community policing experiments. Beginning in the early 1990's,

in response to several Hindu-Muslim riots, police agencies in places such as Mumbai and Pune have become actively involved in supporting community liaison programs. These programs are designed to allow village/community elders to act as mediators in disputes to quell any potential riots. In the state of Assam, community policing strategies have involved efforts not unlike those found in other countries. For instance, neighborhood watches, community meetings and education programs have all been undertaken. Police in the state were even involved in public works projects such as well and road construction. Additionally, the Kolkata police department has also made attempts to improve community-police relationships through education and police sponsored recreational programs (Mukerjee, 2008).

However, attempts to change from a "social control" policing philosophy to a more "community oriented" policing philosophy have been slow. Some researchers suggest that this slow pace is due to lingering distrust by citizenry from years of perceived oppression (Cole, 1981; Ebbe, 1996; Pakes, 2004; Verma, 2005). Abuses of power by police are widespread and bribing of the police is viewed as a way of life (Center for Media Studies, 2005). Variables affecting policing in India are multiple. As law enforcement in India makes a shift to a more "community oriented" approach, it becomes important to explore what variables may have an effect on police-community relationships.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Confidence in police

Confidence in public institutions can be seen as an expression of citizens making an assessment as to how well those institutions conduct the business of governing (Theiss-Morris, 1995). Ideally, citizens want public institutions to make decisions in an efficient, polite, balanced and straightforward manner. Confidence has been seen to decrease the more discordant and complex a public institution becomes (Keller & Wolak, 2007). According to the World Values Survey (2005), in several other Asian countries the police have enjoyed higher levels of citizen confidence than other public institutions such as national, state and local governments, the judiciary and the education system.

Cao and Burton (2006) in their study of Turkish police, profile four reasons as to why the study of police confidence in established and emerging democracies is important. First, police functioning is greatly reliant upon citizens believing that the police can resolve issues. Second, citizens are the consumers of police services. This being the case, feedback on police performance is as vital as other governmental institutions receiving feedback. Third, feedback plays an important role in the policy adoption and retention process. Lastly, police confidence can act as a means of measuring overall effectiveness.

Confidence in the police can have several interpretations. First, confidence can imply general goodwill toward an institution. Additionally, confidence can indicate a respondent's feelings of reliance and trust towards the police (Decker, 1981; Cao & Stack, 2004).

Police confidence measures in India can be particularly beneficial. Many cities such as Mumbai, Chennai and Kolkata are making concerted efforts to adopt community policing measures in their respective cities. Feedback from implementing these programs is vital to the overall function of community-oriented policing (COP) programs (Zhao, Schneider & Thurman, 2002). Additionally, terrorist incidents occur in India with regular frequency (Institute of Conflict Management, 2007). Confidence measures can assess the extent to which terrorists are

undermining public confidence in a more responsible way than the mainstream media has thus far (Nacos, 1994).

Demographic/Environmental factors

Research looking into the relationship between confidence in policing and race variables have found mixed results. Several studies have, for instance, indicated low levels of confidence in the police among minority groups (Baker, et al. 1983; Brown & Coulter 1983; Huang & Vaughn 1996; Thomas & Hyman, 1977; Scaglion & Condon 1980; Webb & Marshall, 1995; T. Ho & J. McKean , 2004). In contrast, a few studies exist that indicate that race is not significantly associated while controlling for other variables (Cao et al, 1996; Jesilow, 1995). Importantly for the current study, minorities in India are more likely to be defined by religion and caste rather than race. According to Cao and Stack (2004), religion is positively correlated with confidence in police.

In this study, environmental factors are operationalized by state/union territory and whether the household is in a rural, urban, or slum setting. Previous studies indicate that there are significant differences across both state/union territory (Wolf, 2008) and rural and urban citizens (Cao & Stack, 2004) as it relates to confidence in police. Similarly, Jackson and Sunshine (2007) found in their study of rural British police that confidence levels were markedly high when compared to urban areas.

Threat or "fear" of crime has, in several studies, been conversely associated with police confidence. Threats of criminal victimization have been seen as breakdowns in the moral fabric of a community. If the justice system is viewed as allowing a criminal to go unpunished, the community may view the police as not taking the threat seriously due to a lack of shared community values. As a result, confidence in the police may diminish (Jackson & Sunshine, 2007). Being consistently responsive to community needs and concerns may be one of the reasons why police in Japan have higher citizen confidence compared to citizen opinions in the United States (Cao & Stack, 2004).

Human capital factors

Human capital is the increase of output (usually defined as wealth) by means of increasing education, training and other means of skill acquisition (Solow, 1956; Becker, 1975). The concept of human capital has its genesis in Adam Smith's opus *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), where Smith expounds the many-fold increases in production to be had from the coupling of division of labor and human capital. The underlying concept is that human capital variables such as education are the tools by which one is given elevated community status in turn granting one greater and/or more efficient access to government institutions (Hall, 1999; Putnam, 2000). For instance, linkages exist between educational attainment and employment within civic community. Most studies of human capital and the criminal justice system involve human capital variables and their relationship to criminogeneity or victimization. However, Weakliem (2002) identified that education is also strongly associated with confidence in public institutions.

Interestingly, Weakliem found significant correlations between a country's wealth and the attitudes of the well educated. According to the study, the well educated in poorer countries had lower levels of confidence in public institutions than the well educated of wealthier nations (Weakliem, 2002). On an individual level, there is also evidence to suggest that personal wealth

impacts confidence in public institutions. For instance, studies of confidence in police have consistently indicated a positive association between one's income and confidence in the police (Thomas & Hyman 1977; Apple & O'Brien, 1983; Webb & Marshall, 1995).

In terms of India, Mayer (2004) found that human capital (particularly education) did more to build civic community and government outputs than social capital across most of the states of India. Mayer's study, however, did not reflect criminal justice system outputs. The few studies that do consider criminal justice system outputs and their relation to human capital, on the other hand, have shown mixed results. Mitra and Singh (2007), in their study of the state of Kerala, found that despite having high human capital (here measured as literacy), suicide and violent crime rates were unusually high. Additionally, Cappelli (2008) states that the benefits of education are relative to the job one holds. A software engineer with only a high school diploma, as given in his example, has the potential to make more than someone with a graduate degree in another field. Bhattacharyya et al. (2004) argue in their collection of studies, that human capital in India is a more important means of attaining civic outputs than social capital. The authors argue that caste politics, strong individual self interest, and lack of faith/knowledge of a very cumbersome bureaucracy make attaining strong social capital difficult in India.

Explored in this study, is whether high levels of human capital (as measured by ownership, income and education) have an effect on the level of confidence one may have in the police. Reasonably, according to the literature, we could surmise that varying levels of human capital are associated with one's community status, since that status is one basis through which individuals interact with police.

Social capital factors

Bourdieu (1986) defined social capital as social relations that increase the ability of an actor to advance her/his interests. These social relations create communities with rules and understandings associated with membership. Halpern (2005) further refined the concept of social capital to include both binding and bridging forms. Binding social capital refers to associations and actions that create more closely bound communities. Bridging social capital refers to the networks that these communities have with other communities and, more importantly, government institutions (Halpern, 2005). In essence, the current study is attempting to link binding forms of social capital (e.g., associationism and civic engagement) to bridging forms (e.g., confidence in public institutions). Previous studies have found that this link does, in fact, exist.

For instance, in Putnam's 1993 classic work on social capital, he compared the North and South regions of Italy and found that the more closely knit north was more civically engaged than the south. Associationism, trust and cooperation, according to Putnam, were the most significant differences between the regions. These relationships, as Putnam posited, allow for increased civic engagement which in turn leads to good governance and economic prosperity, and one would assume a greater degree of confidence in public institutions.

Since Putnam's piece, social scientists have linked all sorts of social phenomena to higher rates of social capital, including mental and physical health (Halpern, 2005). Research in the area of social capital also indicates that there are significant correlations between social capital variables such as associationism and civic engagement with community stability. The study of social capital has not been lost in terms of criminal justice phenomena either. For example, Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) examined 343 neighborhoods in Chicago and found

correlations between social cohesion (binding social capital) and violent crime rates. Also, Kawachi (2000) found that neighborhoods with low social trust had significantly higher homicide rates.

Additionally, some community-policing studies that have utilized social capital measures to evaluate police have found significant positive correlations (see Pino, 2001). Because the application of such research is new to India, no significant studies have been done indicating the relationship between community-policing and social capital. There are, however, studies that suggest a relationship is likely. One study, for instance, did find significantly less corruption in high social capital areas of India (Kingston, 2005).

By and large, however, there continue to be skeptics of the application of COP in India. Mukerjee (2008) notes that most of these efforts do not involve community-police relationship building or problem solving, but rather are stand alone initiatives or sponsorships designed to soften the image of the police. Based on this critique, if COP programs are going to take hold in India, it will be necessary to explore community-police relationships. This is the focus of the current study. Specifically, this study explores the relationship between social and human capital and confidence in policing in India.

METHODS

While the literature indicates that both human capital and social capital are important variables in several segments of Indian society, it also indicates a need to explore more closely the extent to which police confidence is related to human and social capital in India. To date, however, no such studies have been conducted. Additionally, discussion continues as to which set of variables (human or social) is *more* closely associated with responsive and/or effective government. As a first step, therefore, this study explores *which variables tend to be most strongly associated with police confidence*.

Data

Data for this study were originally collected as part of the India Human Development Survey (IHDS). The IHDS was conducted from 2004 to 2005. Principal investigators of the survey were made up of representatives of both the University of Maryland and the National Council of Applied Economic Research in New Delhi. Funding for the IHDS was made possible through a grant by the National Institutes of Health. The study consisted of two, one hour interviews in each selected household covering topics of employment, health, gender relations, fertility, economic status and social capital.

The sample was nationally representative across all states of India. The survey was distributed to 41,554 households in 1,503 villages and 971 urban neighborhoods. The response rate for the study was 92 percent. The current study analyzes data from the entire sample of households included in the IHDS. Descriptive statistics for the independent and dependent variables are presented in Table 1.

Dependent variables

The dependent variables used in the current study include confidence in various governmental and social institutions. Most central to the current analysis was a comparison of

confidence in police to confidence in other institutions (i.e., Politicians, Military, State Government, Newspapers, Panchayats, Schools, Medical, Courts, and Banks). Each of these variables was measured with a single question item in the survey (i.e., "confidence in the police to enforce the law"). Respondents then chose from a battery of three possible choices, 1=a great deal, 2=only some and 3=hardly any. For the purposes of the current analysis, response categories were reverse-coded so that a higher score indicates a higher degree of confidence. In addition, the items measuring confidence in institutions other than the police were combined in an additive scale in order to create a global measure of confidence in other government/social institutions.

Cao and Stack (2004) used a similar attitudinal scale in their comparative study of police confidence in the United States and Japan. They interpret a question and scale of this type to be general as to assessing the "global" attitude of confidence. The questions are, therefore, designed to assess the institutions in India, not any particular member of those institutions.

Independent variables

Social capital factors

Generally, studies of social capital operationalize the term by means of associationism, community cohesion, and civic engagement (Grootaert et al, 2004; Lin, 2004; Putnam, 1993). This study utilized items from the IHDS pertaining to membership in organizations (associationism); those regarding looking out for neighbors, community conflict, or conflict with caste classes (community cohesion); and, questions regarding voting behavior, public meeting attendance and relationships with community leaders (civic engagement).

Respondents had nine choices of organizations that they may have belonged to (unions, NGOs, youth/sports groups, etc). Membership questions were assigned 1=yes and 0=no. Response choices for community cohesion varied in assignment of value (conflict in village: 1=a lot, 2=some, 3=get along; community problem solving: 1=community bonds together, 2=families take care of problems themselves; conflict between castes, 1=a lot, 2=some, 3=not much). Lastly, civic engagement was measured with four items (voting behavior in 2004 election: 1=yes, 0=no; knowing a village elder: 0=nobody close, 1=somebody close, 2=someone in household; attending public meetings: 1=yes, 2=no; and, PTA participation: 1=yes, 2=no). When necessary, items were reverse-coded so that a higher score indicates a higher degree of membership, cohesion, and/or civic engagement.

Human capital factors

Assessing human capital tends to involve the measurement of wealth and education as these are seen as primary vehicles for skill acquisition (Solow, 1956; Becker, 1975; Hall, 1999). As such, the current analysis includes measures of total family income and highest level of education gained by adult household members. In addition, the IHDS asked respondents questions involving other human capital factors. Five items addressed the respondent's ownership of material goods (e.g., telephone, cell phone, car, computer, credit card). These items were combined in an additive scale ranging from 0 (does not own any of these items) to 5 (owns all of these items).

Demographic/environmental factors

Because of the extensive diversity of religion and the impact of caste in Indian society, the analysis includes a question on the survey involving which caste or religion the respondent belongs to (see Table 1 above). For purposes of analysis, each response on this item was transformed into a dummy variable (Hindu High Caste used as reference category). Additionally, a single item used to measure whether the household was in a rural, urban, or slum setting was included in the current analysis (transformed into dummy variables with Rural as reference category).

Finally, threatened and/or actual victimization experiences have been shown to impact confidence in police (Jackson & Sunshine, 2007). The IHDS includes three items that measure actual or threatened victimization. These three items ask respondents to indicate whether or not (0=no; 1=yes) they or someone in their household experienced theft, a break-in, or actual/threatened attacks during the previous twelve months (e.g., "During the last twelve months, was anything stolen that belonged to you or to somebody in your household?"). These items were combined to form an additive scale, with higher scores indicating a greater degree of actual or threatened victimization.

State/Union Territory (UT)

Any analysis of policing in India must take into consideration its extensive regional and geographic diversity. As described previously, India is both geographically expansive and densely populated. Therefore, each State/Union Territory within the country may approach policing differently based on its unique make-up. The current study takes this dynamic into consideration by analyzing data across the entire country and within each State/UT individually. Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for each of the State/UTs included in the IHDS sample.

RESULTS

Analyses were conducted in two stages. First, bivariate correlations were computed for all of the variables included in the analyses. A correlation matrix is presented in Table 3. Second, a series of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models were estimated for both confidence in police and confidence in other social institutions. These models were first run for all State/UTs combined and then for each of the individual States/UTs with a sufficient sample size (see Table 2 above). All of the independent variables described above were included in the analyses (except for those excluded by SPSS due to insufficient number of cases within a particular State/UT).

Bivariate Correlations

Overall, the correlations reported in Table 3 do not indicate potential problems with colinearity. The largest correlation coefficients, excluding the negative association between living in a rural and urban neighborhood setting, are the associations between human capital and the measures of income and education ($r = .433$ and .535, respectively). This, however, is expected since both income and education are directly related to the likelihood of owning material goods.

Multivariate Results

In order to test the impact of each independent variable on the dependent variables, a series of OLS multiple regression models were estimated. As described earlier, Model 1 estimated the impact of the independent variables on confidence in police, while Model 2 estimated their impact on confidence in other social institutions. Each of these models was estimated for all States/UTs combined and for each of the individual State/UTs with a sufficient sample size (a total of 44 models). Only those models that pertain to the discussion presented later in this article are included here; however, readers interested in exploring those relationships not discussed in detail are urged to refer to Appendix A.

Combined State/UT models

Table 4 presents the findings of the two regression models that estimated the impact of the independent variables across all of the States/UTs combined. Based on the findings presented in Table 4, it is clear that confidence in police is impacted by a wide variety of factors, including those associated with human and social capital. Specifically, two of the three measures of human capital (i.e., income and ownership) were significantly related to confidence in police in India. Interestingly, while income was negatively related to confidence in police (indicating that those with higher incomes have less confidence in the police), ownership was positively related. In terms of social capital, all three measures (i.e., memberships, involvement, and community cohesion) were significantly related to confidence in police. Additionally, all three of these measures indicate that a greater degree of social capital is associated with a higher degree of confidence in the police.

Consistent with prior research, actual and/or threatened victimization was significantly and negatively associated with confidence in police. In other words, those who have experienced actual and/or threatened victimization are less likely to have confidence in the police. This particular finding will be discussed in more detail later, considering the lack of measures dealing with interactions with the police and police responses to victimization.

When considering the categorical variables, both neighborhood setting and six of the seven religion/caste categories showed significant relationships with confidence in police. First, respondents living in both urban and slum neighborhoods show higher levels of confidence than those who live in rural areas. This finding is somewhat surprising considering that prior research has suggested the reverse relationship (see Jackson and Sunshine, 2007). Second, respondents who reported being Brahmin and Sikh/Jain have significantly less confidence in police than do those who reported being part of the Hindu High Caste. On the other hand, those who reported being part of the Obc, Dalit, Adivasi, and Christian faiths/castes have significantly higher degrees of confidence in the police when compared to the Hindu High Caste. There was no significant difference between Hindu High Caste and Muslim in this model. As will be discussed later, the relationship between religion/caste and confidence in police becomes much more complex when a State/UT analysis is conducted.

In contrast to the findings from the confidence in police model, fewer variables were significantly associated with confidence in other institutions. For instance, only one of the three human capital measures (i.e., education) was significantly related to confidence in the other social institutions. The relationship between education and confidence in other social institutions was, however, in the expected direction; indicating that those with household members who

obtain higher levels of education also experience greater confidence. Similar to the findings from the confidence in police model, all three measures of social capital were significantly and positively related to confidence in other social institutions. Also similar to the confidence in police model, actual and/or threatened victimization was significantly and negatively associated with confidence in other social institutions.

Finally, in terms of the categorical variables, those who reported living in an urban setting reported significantly less confidence in social institutions when compared to those who reported living in a rural area. This relationship, unlike that between neighborhood setting and confidence in police, is in the direction expected from the review of prior literature. No significant differences were found between those who reported living in a slum neighborhood and those who reported living in a rural area in this model. In terms of religion, only two of the eight caste/religion categories were significant in this model. Specifically, those who reported being part of the Obc reported significantly greater confidence in social institutions than those in the Hindu High Caste. This finding is consistent with the findings from the confidence in police model. Additionally, those who identified as Muslim had significantly less confidence in other social institutions compared to those who identified as Hindu High Caste. Muslim identification did not, however, show significant differences from the Hindu High Caste in the confidence in police model.

These two models suggest a somewhat complex relationship between the various independent variables and confidence in police and other social institutions. One thing is clear, both human and social capital can have an impact on the relationship between community members and the institution of police in India. It is important to keep in mind, however, that painting India with a broad stroke can be problematic. This becomes all the more clear when one compares the findings from the analyses across the individual States/UTs included in the IHDS.

Individual State/UT models

Although worthwhile, a complete report of the findings from each of the 42 models associated with the individual States/UTs included in the current analyses would be extremely cumbersome and space prohibitive. Instead, the authors have decided to concentrate on those models that best illustrate the complex relationships revealed in the analyses in order to best inform the continued study of confidence in police in India. Therefore, the results that follow relate directly to the discussion presented later in this article. Again, those who are interested in a more detailed analysis of each individual State/UT are encouraged to review Appendix A and/or contact the authors for additional information.

The first set of models presented here illustrates the complex relationship between religion/caste and confidence in police. Table 5 presents the OLS regression models for both Assam and West Bengal. Focusing on the relationship between religion/caste and confidence in police, these models illustrate the importance of taking regional/geographic characteristics into consideration.

Table 5 shows that among those living in Assam, respondents who identify as Muslim report significantly higher degrees of confidence in police when compared to those in the Hindu High Caste. Conversely, those in Assam who identify as Christian report significantly less confidence in police when compared to those in the Hindu High Caste. Similarly, in West Bengal, when compared to the Hindu High Caste, those who identify as Brahmin report significantly less confidence in police while those who identify as Christian report significantly

more. When one considers the unique characteristics of Assam and West Bengal, it becomes clear why these relationships were found. If, however, researchers ignore these unique characteristics (i.e., only conduct national level analyses), they will miss the intricate interrelationships among religion/caste, confidence in police, and regional and historical characteristics of the individual States/UTs that constitute contemporary India.

Though representation of Christianity is similar between Assam and West Bengal, their histories are quite different. Throughout most of British colonial rule, Assam was a home to an at times, violent independence movement. Post-colonial Assam has been marred by interethnic conflict and a refugee influx coming from a predominantly Muslim Bangladesh. The influx of these immigrants may explain the positive confidence in police by Muslims (Singh, 2007). Christian Assamese, although similarly represented with West Bengal, may feel largely ignored in a state that contains a significant Muslim population and native Assamese tribes determined to protect their culture, language and beliefs.

On the other hand, West Bengal and in particular the port city of Calcutta (Kolkata) was long the focus of British India. In one of the author's recent trip to Kolkata, the influence of the British was clear. Significant portions of the city display European-style architecture. British sports such as cricket are followed with great fanaticism. The Kolkata police department features a soccer tournament as part of their community policing initiatives. Additionally, West Bengal has been home to a long standing communist movement (Singh, 2007). A communist or a Christian may feel more accepted in this type of more tolerant culture that is accepting of Western ideas.

The second set of models (presented in Table 6) illustrates the complex relationship between social capital and confidence in police. More specifically, the models presented in Table 6 relate to the two types of social capital discussed in the literature review; binding and bridging. Remember that binding social capital is related to relationships among community members (e.g., community cohesion), while bridging social capital is related to the extension of those relationships to social institutions like the police, the local government, etc. To illustrate these important distinctions, and the complexity of the relationships among binding and bridging social capital, confidence in police, and regional/geographic characteristics, Table 6 presents findings from the regression analyses of Kerala and Tamil Nadu.

In Kerala, both memberships and community cohesion were significantly and positively related to confidence in police. In contrast, in Tamil Nadu, a geographically adjacent region of India, all three measures of social capital were significantly and negatively associated with confidence in policing. In other words, while binding social capital (i.e., community cohesion and memberships in social clubs/groups) in Kerala seems to also bridge the relationship between community members and the police, in Tamil Nadu no such bridging occurs. When one considers the unique characteristics of these geographically adjacent regions of India, however, these conflicting findings begin to make more sense.

The state of Tamil Nadu has had a long history of conflict from the Chera Dynasty to Post-British colonization. Tamil Nadu, as with Assam, has historically been in conflict with the national government for largely cultural and ethnic reasons. For example, there has been a strong movement from within Tamil Nadu to make Tamil the official language of the state, not Hindi. This act has put the state, at times, at odds with the national government (Singh, 2007).

Merely separated by the Western Ghats Mountains, the state of Kerela shares much of the same history with Tamil Nadu. However, Kerala is quite different. The culture of Kerala is more matriarchal than the rest of India. The state is approximately 56% Hindu with Christians,

Muslims, Jews and a significant number of atheists (due to the influence of the Communist Party of India) making up much of the remainder. The state was home to Portuguese, Syrian Christian, Arab and Jewish traders (Singh, 2007). Like West Bengal, the influx of diverse ideas along with the accommodating philosophy that accompanies trade, may help to explain why Kerala's social capital seems to have greater bridging capability.

While other examples exist within the current analyses, the results presented here point to an important consideration for anyone who wishes to gain a deeper understanding of policing in India. Specifically, researchers must address regional/geographic dynamics in their studies. National level data, while certainly important, will not provide the type of information needed to inform policing strategies in a country as expansive and religiously diverse as India.

DISCUSSION

It is problematic to study any aspect of India too broadly. The present study of confidence in police in India clearly illustrates this point. Painting confidence in police in India with too broad a brush would have overshadowed several important relationships found only when one examines confidence in police at the state level. While the findings of this study are not generalizable to other Asian countries, it does remind us of the importance of intra-national differences. India has stark differences in levels of confidence in policing even between neighboring states. Any nationwide policing initiative in India must take this variance into account during planning and implementation phases. For example, in many cases COP programs in the United States are federally overseen by regional oversight organizations but initiated by local law enforcement agencies. If India chooses to emphasize community-policing, they too may benefit from such a direction. Of course, this assumes local agencies will in fact respect the social capital factors of their jurisdictions.

Of these intra-national factors, social capital variables were found to have a significant impact on India at the state level. The state to state differences in direction of association were quite surprising to the researchers. Several states exhibiting strong binding social capital factors also had strong confidence in police (e.g. Kerala), while for others the inverse was true (e.g. Tamil Nadu). This illustrates that while a community may be tight knit or bound, this cohesion does not necessarily translate into having social capital that bridges relationships with public institutions like the police. Confidence in police is an appraisal of the local agency's competency and in many ways speaks to that community's bridged social capital. Again, one must appreciate at the *state level* those historical, religious and cultural artifacts that may be associated with these differences in social capital.

Human capital variables seem to be mixed at best when related to confidence in police. The current research found ownership variables to be weak. This may not be a surprising finding, considering that the population universe for the study is a developing nation. The results of the study may simply reflect the fact that a large number of people still own few of the possessions that were included in the study.

The association between Caste/Religion and confidence in policing is not surprising to the researchers. As mentioned in previous literature, caste and religious affiliation continue to impact Indian life. What is surprising, however, are the differences in confidence in police at the *state level* when caste and religious affiliation are considered. In the current analyses, no two states in India were alike in terms of the relationships among the various castes/religions and confidence in police. In some states, for instance, Muslims were strongly associated with higher

degrees of confidence in policing than the Hindu High Caste, while in other states this was not so. Similarly, in some states being a member of the Brahmin caste was associated with higher levels of confidence in policing than the Hindu High Caste, while in others this was not evident. The striking variation in responses shows just how different the experiences of those who identify with these castes and religions are across states.

Caste, it would seem, still plays a significant role in Indian police-citizen interaction. The strong association between caste, caste association membership and caste conflict were all significantly correlated to some degree with confidence in police. This suggests the complexity of the question of police confidence. There can, in fact, be many possible explanations for differences in levels of confidence, and each may need to be considered when attempting to implement regionally-based changes in police practices.

The primary weakness of the current study is the lack of generalizations that can be made in India nationally. The diversity and stark differences between states makes nationwide assumptions problematic. The dearth of cultural artifacts possessed by each state makes generalizations about India as problematic as one would encounter if one were to make generalizations about Europe as a whole. The country is simply too varied by language, religion, cultural tradition and governance. Fortunately, the IHDS provided for data rich enough to make the necessary state by state comparisons that allowed for the current research question to be explored.

On the other hand, the IHDS was missing one important set of measures; responses to victimization on the part of police and police/community interaction. The inclusion of these measures may help to better explain the complex relationships addressed in the current study. It may be that positive experiences with police responses to victimization can create healthier relationships between the police and community members and, therefore, pave the way for more effective implementation of community-oriented policing strategies in India.

Future research in the area of social capital and criminal justice in India can go in a number of directions. First, because of the varied manifestations of Indian society from state-to-state, a more in-depth examination of each state should be undertaken. In this case, particular attention should be given to observing social capital and criminal justice in light of the unique cultural artifacts to those particular states. Secondly, there appears to be a serious lack of qualitative research in the area of criminal justice in general. Our knowledge of criminal justice in India is limited to a small number of qualitative studies. This is particularly the case when speaking of police behavior itself. Most studies in this area have been limited to only survey data and a handful of anecdotes from former police personnel. An in depth, qualitative study of patrol officer behavior is the next logical step given the research presented here. Knowing the impact of social capital on police confidence, the addition of qualitative studies examining officer behavior would give the field a deeper, more holistic understanding of law enforcement in India.

CONCLUSION

The events of several natural disasters and responses to terrorism have seemingly brought about a shift in how law enforcement thinks and responds in the United States. This response seems to have brought about a divergence from community-oriented initiatives that defined policing in the 1990s. India, on the other hand, has had centuries of national disasters happening on a regular basis. Additionally, India has had a much longer history of dealing with terrorism, both domestic and international; the most notable of these events being the terrorist attacks in

several Mumbai locations, supposedly by Lashkar-e-Taiba. In spite of the history of these issues, Indian jurisdictions are attempting, at least at the surface, to become more community oriented if not adopting COP itself. The research presented here shows that there is certainly fertile ground for such efforts in India if there is a reaching out across castes and to the emerging Indian middle class. The organizations these middle class Indians will likely join could provide prime points of contact for community-oriented police initiatives.

The purpose of this research was to explore what factors are associated with confidence in police in India. While this study suggests that a variety of factors are significantly associated with confidence in police, the importance of each factor varies from state to state. Variables such as human and social capital factors, as well as caste and religion are best observed at this state level. If any fruits are to be had with changes on the sub-continent, they will have to involve improved citizen-police interactions. Understanding how social capital works could make these community friendly initiatives much more effective. Should COP and COP-like programs become successful in India, India may end up becoming a blueprint for other post-colonial, developing nations.

WORKS CITED

Apple, Nancy and O'Brien, David. (1983). Neighborhood Racial Composition and Residents' Evaluation of Police Performance. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 11: 76-84.

Becker, GS. (1975). *Human Capital 2nd Edition*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Berkman, L. and Kawachi, I**.** (2000). *Social cohesion, social capital and health. In Berkman, L. and Kawachi, I. Social Epidemiology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bhattacharyya, Dwaipayan. (2004). *Interrogating social capital: the Indian experience*. New Dehli: Sage Publications.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1986). The forms of capital. In: John G. Richardson (ed.): *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood Press. s. 241-258.

Cao, Liqun and Burton, Velmer. (2005). Spanning the continents: assessing the Turkish public confidence in the police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*. 29(3).

Cao, L., Stack, S.J., and Sun, Y. (1998). Public Confidence in the police: a comparative study between Japan and America. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 26(4).

Cappelli, Peter. (2008) Schools of Dreams: More Education Is Not an Economic Elixir. *Issues in Science and Technology*. 24(4). pg. 59.

Center for Media Studies. (2005). *India Corruption Study 2005*. http://ipc498a.files.wordpress.com/2008/03/ti-india-police-corruption-study-2005.pdf.

Cole, G., Stanislaw, J. & M. Gertz (eds.) (1981). *Major criminal justice systems*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Decker, S. (1981). Citizen attitudes towards police: a review of past findings suggestions for future policy. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*. 9, Pp. 80-87.

Denis, J. (1976). Who supports the Presidency. *Society*. 13(5). Pp.48-53.

Desai, Sonalde, Amaresh Dubey, B.L. Joshi, Mitali Sen, Shariff, Abusaleh, and Reeve Vanneman. INDIA HUMAN DEVELOPMENT Bibliographic Citation: SURVEY (IHDS), 2005 [Computer file]. ICPSR22626-v2. Maryland: Sonalde Desai, Mitali Sen, and Reeve Vanneman, University of Maryland, India: Amaresh Dubey, B.L. Joshi, and Shariff Abusaleh, National Council of Applied Economic Research, New Delhi [producers], 2007. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2008-08-22.

Ebbe, O. (ed.) (1996). *Comparative and international criminal justice systems*. Boston: Butterworth Heinemann.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. NY: Free Press.

Grootaert et al. (2004). *Measuring Social Capital: An Intergrated Questionnaire.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Hall, R. E., and Jones, C. I. (1999). Why Do Some Countries Produce So Much More Output Per Worker Than Others? *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114(1), pages 83-116.

Halpern, David. (2005). *Social Capital*. Malden MA: Polity Press.

Institute for Conflict Management (2007). *India 2007*. India Assessment retrieved on 2/07/08, http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/index.html

Jackson, J. and Sunshine, J. (2007). Public Confidence in Policing: A Neo-Durkheimian Perspective. *British Journal of Criminology.* 47. pp. 214-233.

Khanna, Tarun. (2007). *Billions of entrepreneurs: how China and India are reshaping their futures and yours*. Cambridge MA. Harvard Business School Press.

Kingston, Christopher. (2005). *Social Capital and Corruption: Theory and Evidence from India*. Amherst College.

Knack, Stephen & Keefer, Philip. (1997). Does Social Capital Have an Economic Payoff? A Cross-Country Investigation. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 112(4), pp 1251-88.

Mayer, Peter. (2004). As found in Bhattacharyya, D. (2004). *Interrogating social capital: the Indian experience*. New Dehli: Sage Publication.

Ministry of Home Affairs. (2005). www.mha.nic.in

Mitra, Aparna and Singh, Pooja. (2007). Human Capital Attainment and Gender Empowerment: The Kerala Paradox**.** *Social Science Quarterly*. 88(5).

Mukerjee, Doel. (2008). *Community policing experiments/outreach programmes in India*. Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative. Retrieved 3/20/2008. www.humanrightsinitiative.org

Nacos, Brigette. (1994). *Terrorism and the Media*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Pakes, Francis. (2004). Comparative criminal justice. Devon: Willan Publishing.

Pino, Nathan. (2001). Asia and Pacific; The State of India's Democracy. *Policing*. 24(2).

Putnam, Robert. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Putnam, Robert. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Pye, Lucian W. (2008). India's democratic challenge. *Foreign Affairs*. 87(3) pp. 157.

Raghavan, RK. (1999). *Policing A Democracy : A Comparative Study of India and the US*. New Delhi: Verma Books..

Registrar General. (2001). *Census of India*. www.censusofindia.net

Rudolph, Susanne and Rudolph, Lloyd. (2002). South Asia Faces the Future: New Dimensions of Indian Democracy. *Journal of Democracy*. 13(1). pp: 52

Singh, Sarina. (2007). *India.* KHL Printing Co Sdn Bhd: Malaysia.

Smith, Adam. (1776). *The Wealth of Nations*. www.bibliomania.com/2/1/65/112/frameset.html

Solow, Robert M., (1956). A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 70(1). pp: 65 - 94.

Subramanian, KS. (2007). *Political Violence and the Police in India*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Thomas, Charles W. and Hyman, Jeffrey M. (1977). Perceptions of Crime, Fear of Victimization, and Public Perception of Police Performance. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 5: 305-317.

Varshney, Ashutosh. (2007). New dimensions of Indian democracy. *Foreign Affairs*. 86(2): pp. 93.

Verma, Avrind, and Gavermeni, Srinagesh. (2006). Measuring police efficiency in India: an application of data development analysis. *Policing*. 29(1).

Verma, Arvind. *The Indian Police: A Critical Evaluation*. New Delhi: Regency Publications.

Weakliem, David L. (2002). The effects of educations on political opinions: an international study. *International journal of public opinion research*. 14(2).

Webb, Vincent J. and Marshall, Chris E. (1995). The Relative Importance of Race and Ethnicity on Citizen Attitudes toward the Police. *American Journal of Police* 14: 45-66.

Wolf, Robert V. (2008). Community Justice: An international overview. *Judicature*. 91(6).

Zhao, J., Scheider, M. and Thurman, Q. (2002). The effect of police presence on public fear reduction and satisfaction: a review of the literature. *The Justice Professional*. 15(3): pp. 273-99.

APPENDIX

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	SD	N	Range/Percent of Sample
Independent Variables				
Caste/Religion			41554	
Brahmin			2421	5.8% Brahmin
High Caste			7151	17.2% High Caste
Obc			14068	33.9% Obc
Dalit			8333	20.1% Dalit
Adivasi			3439	8.3% Adivasi
Muslim			4708	11.3% Muslim
Sikh/Jain			683	1.6% Sikh/Jain
Christian			751	1.8% Christian
Human Capital				
Education	7.56	5.09	41499	# of years: Range = 0 - 15
Income	32,420.87*	67039.10	41120	Range = 0 - 992000.000
Ownership	.31	.71	41552	Range = 0 - 5
Social Capital				
Memberships	.67	1.14	41495	Range = 0 - 9
Involvement	1.23	.62	41495	Range = 0 - 4
Community Cohesion	5.64	1.18	41434	Range = 0 - 7
Victimization	.07	.32	41466	Range = 0 - 3
Neighborhood Setting			41554	
Rural			27011	65% Rural
Urban			13818	33.3% Urban
Slum			725	1.7% Slum
Dependent Variables				
Confidence in Police	1.95	.72	41192	Range = 1 - 3
Confidence in other institutions	20.96	3.37	41420	Range = 1 - 27

* to control for outliers, median income is reported instead of mean.

Table 2: State/Union Territories (State/UT)

State/UT	N	% of total sample
All Combined	41554	
Jammu & Kashmir	715	1.7% = Jammu & Kashmir
Himachal Pradesh	1372	3.3% = Himachal Pradesh
Punjab	1593	3.8% = Punjab
Chandigarh*	90	.2% = Chandigarh
Uttaranchal	458	1.1% = Uttaranchal
Haryana	1618	3.9% = Haryana
Delhi	960	2.3% = Delhi
Rajasthan	2485	6.0% = Rajasthan
Uttar Pradesh	3512	8.5% = Uttar Pradesh
Bihar	1430	3.4% = Bihar
Sikkim*	105	.3% = Sikkim
Arunachal Pradesh*	165	.4% = Arunachal Pradesh
Nagaland*	130	.3% = Nagaland
Manipur*	105	.3% = Manipur
Mizoram*	105	.3% = Mizoram
Tripura*	229	.6% = Tripura
Meghalaya*	161	.4% = Meghalaya
Assam	1017	2.4% = Assam
West Bengal	2380	5.7% = West Bengal
Jharkhand	924	2.2% = Jharkhand
Orissa	2064	5.0% = Orissa
Chhatishgarh	1175	2.8% = Chhatishgarh
Madhya Pradesh	2805	6.8% = Madhya Pradesh
Gujurat	2078	5.0% = Gujurat
Daman & Diu*	60	.1% = Daman & Diu
Dadra & Nagar Haveli*	60	.1% = Dadra & Nagar Haveli
Maharashtra	3203	7.7% = Maharashtra
Andhra Pradesh	2435	5.9% = Andhra Pradesh
Karnataka	4021	9.7% = Karnataka
Goa*	165	.4% = Goa
Kerala	1731	4.2% = Kerala
Tamil Nadu	2098	5.0% = Tamil Nadu
Pondicherry*	105	.3% = Pondicherry

* included in “All States Combined” model, but excluded from “State/UT” models due to insufficient sample size.

Table 3: Correlation Matrix

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Education	1									
2. Income	.419**	1								
3. Ownership	.433**	.535**	1							
4. Memberships	.101**	.070**	.061**	1						
5. Involvement	.024**	.018**	-.007	.145**	1					
6. Cohesion	.047**	.048**	.049**	.008	.051**	1				
7. Victimization	-.032**	-.027**	-.024**	.056**	.002	-.111**	1			
8. Rural	-.314**	-.250**	-.280**	.070**	.202**	-.019**	.024**	1		
9. Urban	.321**	.256**	.290**	-.065**	-.189**	.023**	-.026**	-.962**	1	
10. Slum	-.010*	-.010*	-.027**	-.020**	-.055**	-.016**	.006	-.182**	-.094**	1

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11. Brahmin	.185**	.116**	.120**	-.040**	-.015**	-.012*	-.010*	-.100**	.109**	-.026**
12. High Caste	.192**	.151**	.163**	-.018**	.010*	.031**	-.023**	-.097**	.109**	-.038**
13. Obc	-.009	-.065**	-.075**	.037**	-.007	-.012*	.005	.058**	-.057**	-.005**
14. Dalit	-.160**	-.112**	-.120*	-.035**	.004	-.041**	-.019**	.075**	-.085**	.031**
15. Adivasi	-.138**	-.070**	-.085**	.048**	.050**	.024**	-.005	.129**	-.128**	-.009
16. Muslim	-.093**	-.026**	-.033**	-.017**	-.034**	.000	.015**	-.085**	.073**	.045**
17. Sikh/Jain	.075**	.099**	.117**	-.036**	-.022**	.017**	-.018**	-.025**	.030**	-.016**
18. Christian	.080**	.048**	.096**	.071**	.011*	.036**	-.003	-.021**	.020**	.005
19. Confidence Police	.015**	.002	.018**	.071**	.037**	.045**	-.061**	-.011*	.009	.008
20. Confidence Others	.128**	.053**	.052**	.073**	.077**	.040**	-.084**	.009	-.008	-.003

Variable	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
11. Brahmin	1									
12. High Caste	-.113**	1								
13. Obc	-.178**	-.326**	1							
14. Dalit	-.125**	-.228**	-.358**	1						
15. Adivasi	-.075**	-.137**	-.215**	-.150*	1					
16. Muslim	-.089**	-.163**	-.256**	-.179**	-.107**	1				
17. Sikh/Jain	-.032**	-.059**	-.092**	-.065**	-.039**	-.046**	1			
18. Christian	-.034**	-.062**	-.097**	-.068**	-.041**	-.048**	-.018**	1		
19. Confidence Police	-.040**	-.015**	.037**	-.016**	.047**	-.022**	-.051**	.038**	1	
20. Confidence Others	.012*	.029**	.033**	-.021**	.013**	-.068**	.014**	.018**	.411**	1

* $p < .05$ level (2 tailed)
** $p < .01$ level (2 tailed)

Table 4: OLS Regression (all State/UTs combined)

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
All States Combined (N=41554)	Income	-1.345E-7*	.000	-.013	Education	.080***	.004	.121
	Ownership	.023***	.006	.023	Memberships	.159***	.015	.054
	Memberships	.039***	.003	.062	Involvement	.319***	.028	.058
	Involvement	.033***	.006	.028	Community Cohesion	.063***	.014	.022
	Community Cohesion	.021***	.003	.034	Victimization	-.863***	.052	-.082
	Victimization	-.136***	.011	-.061	Urban	-.230***	.039	-.032
	Urban	.041***	.008	.027	Obc	.103*	.050	.014
	Slum	.074**	.027	.014	Muslim	-.521***	.064	-.049
	Brahmin	-.088***	.017	-.029				
	Obc	.075***	.011	.049				
	Dalit	.025*	.012	.014				
	Adivasi	.147***	.015	.056				
	Sikh/Jain	-.257***	.029	-.045				
	Christian	.187***	.028	.035				
	Constant	1.719***	.021		Constant	19.692***	.100	
R^2	.021				.036			
F	53.369***				95.352***			
df	16				16			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 5: OLS Regression Models (Assam & West Bengal)

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
Assam (N=1017)	Memberships	.075***	.016	.159	Ownership	-.356*	.168	-.072
	Community Cohesion	.050*	.024	.067	Memberships	.462***	.068	.221
	Urban	-.157***	.042	-.131	Victimization	-1.854***	.268	-.208
	Muslim	**.136***	**.060**	**.117**	Urban	-.521**	.179	-.098
	Christian	**-.764***	**.386**	**-.062**	Dalit	-.926**	.332	-.105
	Constant	1.424***	.154		Constant	20.217***	.652	
R^2	.074				.154			
F	4.899***				11.201***			
df	16				16			
West Bengal	Education	-.014***	.004	-.100	Education	.141***	.018	.204
	Income	-1.054E-6***	.000	-.090	Memberships	.252*	.122	.043
	Ownership	.121***	.030	.103	Involvement	.642***	.145	.095
	Involvement	.175***	.030	.128	Community Cohesion	-.260***	.064	-.081
	Victimization	-.253***	.033	-.152	Victimization	-.947***	.164	-.116
	Urban	-.128***	.038	-.086	Urban	.675***	.185	.092
	Brahmin	**-.121***	**.061**	**-.043**	Obc	.769**	.272	.062
	Christian	**.499***	**.227**	**.044**	Dalit	1.016***	.212	.126
	Constant	1.936***	.092		Constant	17.710***	.451	
R^2	.094				.098			
F	16.127***				17.034***			
df	15				15			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 6: OLS Regression (Kerala & Tamil Nadu)

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
Kerala (N=1731)	**Memberships**	**.052*** **	**.009**	**.138**	Memberships	.384***	.044	.214
	Community Cohesion	**.057*** **	**.013**	**.107**	Community Cohesion	.234***	.061	.093
					Obc	.461*	.216	.071
	Constant	1.793***	.116		Constant	18.969***	.540	
R^2	.035				.070			
F	4.340***				9.141***			
df	14				14			
Tamil Nadu (N=2098)	Education	.007*	.003	.052	Memberships	.124**	.045	.069
	Income	8.142E-7*	.000	.067	Involvement	-.292**	.109	-.061
	Memberships	**-.044*** **	**.011**	**-.096**	Urban	.267-	.124	.053
	Involvement	**-.060***	**.027**	**-.049**	Obc	-.687*	.318	-.135
	Community Cohesion	**-.057*** **	**.013**	**-.106**	Dalit	-.865**	.330	-.153
	Victimization	-.151*	.072	-.046	Muslim	-1.539***	.399	-.135
	Urban	.098**	.031	.076	Christian	-1.036*	.413	-.081
	Constant	2.618***	.119		Constant	21.738***	.471	
R^2	.034				.024			
F	5.235***				3.586***			
df	14				14			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Appendix A: OLS Regression Models by State/UT

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
All States Combined (N=41554)	Income	-1.345E-7*	.000	-.013	Education	.080***	.004	.121
	Ownership	.023***	.006	.023	Memberships	.159***	.015	.054
	Memberships	.039***	.003	.062	Involvement	.319***	.028	.058
	Involvement	.033***	.006	.028	Community Cohesion	.063***	.014	.022
	Community Cohesion	.021***	.003	.034	Victimization	-.863***	.052	-.082
	Victimization	-.136***	.011	-.061	Urban	-.230***	.039	-.032
	Urban	.041***	.008	.027	Obc	.103*	.050	.014
	Slum	.074**	.027	.014	Muslim	-.521***	.064	-.049
	Brahmin	-.088***	.017	-.029				
	Obc	.075***	.011	.049				
	Dalit	.025*	.012	.014				
	Adivasi	.147***	.015	.056				
	Sikh/Jain	-.257***	.029	-.045				
	Christian	.187***	.028	.035				
	Constant	1.719***	.021		Constant	19.692***	.100	
R^2	.021				.036			
F	53.369***				95.352***			
df	16				16			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
Jammu &	Memberships	.106**	.036	.119	Education	.056*	.025	.088

Kashmir (N=715)	Victimization	-.217*	.107	-.078	Ownership	-.311*	.143	-.096
	Obc	.639**	.209	.125	Memberships	.815***	.154	.194
					Involvement	.794***	.179	.160
					Community Cohesion	.315**	.117	.094
					Dalit	-1.183*	.466	-.109
					Muslim	-2.176***	.352	-.331
	Constant	1.777***	.194		Constant	17.717***	.810	
R^2	.050				.218			
F	2.333**				12.471***			
df	15				15			
	Education	-.017**	.005	-.100	Education	-.085***	.022	-.119
	Community Cohesion	.066***	.021	.088	Involvement	.674***	.138	.140
Himachal Pradesh (N=1372)	Brahmin	.129*	.063	.059	Community Cohesion	.532***	.086	.165
	Dalit	.101*	.049	.061	Obc	-.969**	.314	-.084
	Adivasi	-.196*	.099	-.056				
	Constant	1.589***	.146		Constant	18.138***	.608	
R^2	.038				.083			
F	3.757***				8.707***			
df	14				14			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	B	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
Punjab (N=1593)	Income	5.157E-7*	.000	.061	Education	.092***	.020	.137
	Ownership	.067**	.024	.087	Memberships	-.872***	.200	-.109

	Memberships	-.118**	.040	-.074	Involvement	1.117***	.142	.198
	Involvement	.208***	.029	.184				
	Urban	.076*	.036	.057				
	Obc	-.148*	.059	-.091				
	Dalit	-.142**	.054	-.106				
	Adivasi	.686*	.276	.062				
	Constant	1.239***	.099		Constant	19.384***	.490	
R^2	.088				.099			
F	9.753***				11.213***			
df	15				15			
	Community Cohesion	.112***	.028	.191	Involvement	.998***	.271	.176
Uttaranchal (N=458)					Community Cohesion	.834***	.136	.283
					Muslim	-1.636**	.610	-.148
	Constant	1.085***	.198		Constant	15.130***	.951	
R^2	.077				.158			
F	2.626***				5.912***			
df	14				14			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
	Memberships	.110***	.021	.139	Education	.050**	.019	.073
Haryana (N=1618)	Community Cohesion	-.054***	.014	-.098	Memberships	.187*	.094	.050
	Victimization	-.244*	.109	-.056	Community Cohesion	-.769***	.065	-.294

	Urban	.145**	.053	.077	Victimization	-1.530**	.495	-.074
	Constant	2.090***	.107		Constant	24.847***	.485	
R^2	.044				.119			
F	5.127***				15.086***			
df	14				14			
	Education	-.012*	.005	-.090	Memberships	-.250*	.123	-.070
	Involvement	-.131***	.037	.119	Community Cohesion	-.260***	.063	-.137
Delhi	Community Cohesion	-.039**	.014	-.091	Victimization	-1.364***	.342	-.129
(N=960)					Urban	.798**	.294	.094
					Dalit	-.547*	.271	-.078
	Constant	2.041***	.132		Constant	22.128***	.580	
R^2	.039				.062			
F	2.525***				4.139***			
df	15				15			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
Rajasthan (N=2485)	Community Cohesion	-.045***	.011	-.081	Education	.148***	.017	.210
	Brahmin	-.184**	.062	-.070	Memberships	.243**	.093	.052
	Sikh/Jain	.267*	.110	.052	Involvement	.691***	.166	.083
					Community Cohesion	-.504***	.061	-.163
					Adivasi	-1.443***	.329	-.102
	Constant	2.115***	.086		Constant	21.767***	.461	
R^2	.021				.094			
F	3.611***				18.074***			
df	14				14			
Uttar Pradesh (N=3512)	Community Cohesion	.030**	.010	.054	Education	.102***	.012	.179
	Urban	.093***	.026	.069	Memberships	-.276*	.133	-.036
	Slum	.531***	.163	.056	Involvement	.690***	.090	.131
	Obc	.078*	.038	.058	Community Cohesion	.208***	.046	.077
					Urban	-.382**	.125	-.058
					Slum	1.654*	.781	.036
	Constant	1.405***	.065		Constant	17.885***	.311	
R^2	.014				.060			
F	3.110***				13.810***			
df	16				16			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

State/UT Model 1: Confidence in Police Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions

	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
Bihar (N=1430)	Involvement	.061*	.026	.065	Memberships	-.152*	.077	-.053
	Community Cohesion	.064***	.015	.120	Involvement	.697***	.112	.162
	Urban	-.117**	.044	-.081	Community Cohesion	.373***	.066	.158
					Victimization	-.258*	.128	-.056
					Urban	-1.010***	.190	-.157
					Adivasi	-2.871*	1.139	-.067
	Constant	1.459***	.118		Constant	17.586***	.511	
	R^2	.050			.102			
	F	4.517***			9.846***			
	df	16			16			
Assam (N=1017)	Memberships	.075***	.016	.159	Ownership	-.356*	.168	-.072
	Community Cohesion	.050*	.024	.067	Memberships	.462***	.068	.221
	Urban	-.157***	.042	-.131	Victimization	-1.854***	.268	-.208
	Muslim	.136*	.060	.117	Urban	-.521**	.179	-.098
	Christian	-.764*	.386	-.062	Dalit	-.926**	.332	-.105
	Constant	1.424***	.154		Constant	20.217***	.652	
	R^2	.074			.154			
	F	4.899***			11.201***			
	df	16			16			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta

West Bengal (N=2380)	Education	-.014***	.004	-.100	Education	.141***	.018	.204
	Income	-1.054E-6***	.000	-.090	Memberships	.252*	.122	.043
	Ownership	.121***	.030	.103	Involvement	.642***	.145	.095
	Involvement	.175***	.030	.128	Community Cohesion	-.260***	.064	-.081
	Victimization	-.253***	.033	-.152	Victimization	-.947***	.164	-.116
	Urban	-.128***	.038	-.086	Urban	.675***	.185	.092
	Brahmin	-.121*	.061	-.043	Obc	.769**	.272	.062
	Christian	.499*	.227	.044	Dalit	1.016***	.212	.126
	Constant	1.936***	.092		Constant	17.710***	.451	
R^2	.094				.098			
F	16.127***				17.034***			
df	15				15			
Jharkhand (N=924)	Involvement	.106*	.046	.077	Memberships	.447***	.140	.108
	Urban	-.191***	.058	-.135	Involvement	1.240***	.204	.193
	Slum	-.451*	.198	-.074	Cohesion	-.359***	.092	-.121
	Adivasi	.289***	.082	.185	Urban	-1.059***	.257	-.162
					Slum	-2.015*	.878	-.071
					Adivasi	1.015**	.362	.140
	Constant	1.718***	.167		Constant	22.512***	.741	
R^2	.091				.168			
F	5.675***				11.370***			
df	16				16			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
Orissa	Ownership	-.110**	.039	-.085	Involvement	.505***	.141	.083

(N=2064)	Community Cohesion	-.040***	.012	-.078	Community Cohesion	-.487***	.059	-.181
	Constant	2.490***	.093		Constant	23.080***	.475	
R^2	.026				.047			
F	3.447***				6.227***			
df	16				16			
	Community Cohesion	.118***	.022	.160	Education	.079***	.023	.123
					Community Cohesion	.941***	.094	.282
Chhatishgarh (N=1175)					Urban	-1.135**	.368	-.127
					Slum	-.976*	.435	-.066
	Constant	1.156***	.163		Constant	16.220***	.710	
R^2	.048				.120			
F	3.633***				9.744***			
df	16				16			
	Income	9.816E-7**	.000	.065	Education	.088***	.016	.122
	Ownership	-.109**	.039	-.067	Ownership	-.488**	.186	-.061
	Victimization	-.165***	.033	-.096	Involvement	-.252*	.102	-.047
	Urban	.090*	.043	.045	Community Cohesion	.553***	.066	.157
Madhya Pradesh	Brahmin	-.141*	.068	-.050	Victimization	-1.060***	.157	-.126
(N=2805)					Urban	-.623**	.205	-.064
					Slum	-1.222***	.292	-.088
					Brahmin	-.763*	.323	-.056
					Adivasi	-.677*	.280	-.071
	Constant	1.712***	.096		Constant	18.116***	.456	
R^2	.022				.074			
F	3.851***				13.563***			
df	16				16			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
Gujarat	Education	.012**	.004	.078	Education	.083***	.020	.116

(N=2078)	Ownership	-.062*	.028	-.066	Involvement	.337*	.135	.058
	Memberships	-.052**	.018	-.069	Community Cohesion	.191**	.066	.065
	Involvement	.067*	.029	.055	Urban	-.551**	.197	-.077
	Urban	.131**	.042	.086	Brahmin	1.195***	.353	.078
	Obc	.295***	.043	.187	Obc	1.493***	.202	.200
	Dalit	.199***	.056	.088	Dalit	.835**	.265	.078**
	Adivasi	.377***	.063	.149	Adivasi	1.670***	.297	.140
	Muslim	.300***	.065	.115	Muslim	.964**	.305	.079
	Constant	1.762***	.096		Constant	18.818***	.450	
R^2	.048				.056			
F	6.279***				7.426***			
df	16				16			
	Ownership	.068*	.029	.051	Education	.072***	.013	.111
	Memberships	-.046***	.010	-.087	Ownership	.277*	.120	.049
	Involvement	-.052*	.024	-.040	Memberships	-.172***	.040	-.077
	Community Cohesion	-.082***	.014	-.107	Community Cohesion	-.442***	.059	-.136
Maharashtra (N=3203)	Obc	-.062*	.031	-.041	Brahmin	-.668*	.333	-.036
					Obc	-.346**	.129	-.055
					Adivasi	-1.289***	.209	-.118
					Muslim	-.595*	.240	-.046
					Sikh/Jain	-1.066*	.532	-.035
	Constant	2.612***	.090		Constant	24.647***	.369	
R^2	.033				.063			
F	6.594***				13.265***			
df	16				16			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
Andhra Pradesh	Memberships	.023*	.009	.054	Education	.089***	.015	.146
	Involvement	.080***	.019	.093	Memberships	.139**	.052	.057

(N=2435)	Slum	.207***	.046	.101	Involvement	.209*	.106	.042
					Urban	-.995***	.169	-.142
					Dalit	.396*	.200	.053
					Christian	1.710*	.853	.042
	Constant	1.896***	.082		Constant	19.808***	.466	
R^2	.024				.045			
F	3.885***				7.501***			
df	15				15			
	Education	.014***	.002	.106	Education	.088***	.011	.141
	Ownership	.089***	.018	.097	Income	-2.221E-6**	.000	-.057
	Memberships	-.090***	.008	-.177	Ownership	.526***	.085	.118
	Involvement	-.055**	.018	-.048	Memberships	-.238***	.039	-.096
Karnataka (N=4021)	Community Cohesion	.057***	.009	.103	Community Cohesion	.719***	.042	.265
	Slum	.336*	.165	.032	Urban	-.413***	.117	-.059
	Brahmin	.126*	.063	.037				
	Obc	.114**	.039	.087				
	Constant	1.956***	.070		Constant	17.161***	.328	
R^2	.078				.132			
F	20.648***				37.103***			
df	16				16			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

State/UT	Model 1: Confidence in Police				Model 2: Confidence in Other Institutions			
	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta	Significant Variable(s)	b	Standard Error	Beta
	Memberships	.052***	.009	.138	Memberships	.384***	.044	.214
Kerala (N=1731)	Community Cohesion	.057***	.013	.107	Community Cohesion	.234***	.061	.093
					Obc	.461*	.216	.071

	Constant	1.793***	.116		Constant	18.969***	.540	
R^2	.035				.070			
F	4.340***				9.141***			
df	14				14			
	Education	.007*	.003	.052	Memberships	.124**	.045	.069
	Income	8.142E-7*	.000	.067	Involvement	-.292**	.109	-.061
	Memberships	-.044***	.011	-.096	Urban	.267-	.124	.053
Tamil Nadu	Involvement	-.060*	.027	-.049	Obc	-.687*	.318	-.135
(N=2098)	Community Cohesion	-.057***	.013	-.106	Dalit	-.865**	.330	-.153
	Victimization	-.151*	.072	-.046	Muslim	-1.539***	.399	-.135
	Urban	.098**	.031	.076	Christian	-1.036*	.413	-.081
	Constant	2.618***	.119		Constant	21.738***	.471	
R^2	.034				.024			
F	5.235***				3.586***			
df	14				14			

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001