

Chapter 3

Implicit Bias, the Power of Institutions, and How to Reduce Racial Disparities in Policing

Rebecca C. Hetey

INTRODUCTION

Across America, tensions between police and communities are at an all-time high. The fatal police shooting of Michael Brown, an unarmed Black eighteen-year-old, by Darren Wilson, a White police officer, in Ferguson, Missouri on August 9, 2014, has been called “America’s great awakening” to long-standing issues of race and fractured police-community relations (Lowery, 2016, p. 18). This relationship has been fraught for generations and implicates a centuries old history of systems of policing to enforce social control and explicit discrimination against Blacks in America (Hawkins & Thomas, 1991). Whereas much public attention has focused on well-publicized fatal incidents, trust between police and communities is also eroded through mundane everyday encounters (Epp, Maynard-Moody & Haider-Markel, 2014). Routine stops are the most common interaction the public has with the police. In a given year in the United States, one in four people of driving-age will have an interaction with the police, and nearly half (44 percent) of those interactions are traffic stops (Eith & Durose, 2011). By examining these routine police contacts, researchers have consistently uncovered evidence of racial disparities throughout the entire course of the interaction.

Racial disparities in policing have broad implications and can undermine citizens’ sense of trust and legitimacy in the police who are supposed to serve and protect them (see President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015). Public perception of policing as unfair can reduce support for law enforcement and is associated with community members becoming less willing to cooperate with police (Tyler & Wakslak, 2004). Racial disparities in policing are also important because law enforcement is the entry point to the

massive apparatus that is the American criminal justice system (CJS). Law enforcement is what we might call the “entry stage.” Police officers create the first link between an individual and an alleged crime; and, with an arrest, they set in motion the process that can go on to prosecution, adjudication, sentencing, and ultimately corrections (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1997). Thus, one might argue that the role of race at the entry stage is especially important because the activities of law enforcement essentially color the complexion of the entire criminal justice process that follows. As evident in the chapters of this book, the disparate effect of race can compound as a person moves through the subsequent stages of the system.

It can be tempting to equate racial disparities in policing with racist police officers and make the common mistake of singling out the “few bad apples” of policing. Rather than a problem that only a few police officers face, decades of social scientific research show that, through normal mental processes, race affects the judgments and decisions we all make. Race can affect us in profound ways because of our susceptibility to the influence of implicit bias and pervasive racial stereotypes linking African Americans and crime, violence, and aggression (Eberhardt, 2019). A common conclusion drawn from the evidence of racial disparities in policing is that police officers are “bad people.” Another reading, which I would argue is more complete, is that police officers are human (Glaser, 2015), which means they are powerfully shaped by their environments, experiences, and expectations. Focusing too narrowly on individuals and on particular officers’ motives and actions obscures the larger forces at play, namely, institutions and institutionally supported practices that prompt officers to rely on implicit stereotypes when judging suspicion and potential criminality (Epp et al., 2014). As representatives of powerful institutions, police officers are themselves bound up in systems and are subject to many policies, practices, and laws that put them in a position to produce and reproduce racial disparities and systemic inequality—albeit subtly and inadvertently—without personally endorsing disparity or inequality. Though this might sound bleak, the hopeful news is that by shifting some energy away from the hunt for the “few bad apples” and toward systems, we can begin to tackle racial disparities by intervening directly with institutions to change their cultures, priorities, practices, and policies, and we can use those institutional levers to reduce the influence of implicit bias.

In this chapter, I argue that we should broaden the dialogue around race and policing so that it goes beyond debates about particular police officers’ motives. We should begin to focus on the science of implicit bias and the power of institutions to guide the behavior of their agents. As a result, stakeholders will be better able to find solutions and work to reduce racial disparities in policing. To that end, in the first section of this chapter, I gather and

distill the empirical evidence on racial disparities in policing. In the second section, I discuss why evidence of disparities does not immediately support the conclusion that differential outcomes by race must be caused by the “few bad apples” of policing, but rather implicates the underlying psychology of implicit bias and the role of institutions. Finally, in the third section, I advocate for an increased focus on institutional change as a means to reduce racial disparities in policing. In particular, I highlight collecting data, leveraging body-worn cameras, and changing local law enforcement agency policy.

EVIDENCE OF RACIAL DISPARITIES IN POLICING

Racial disparities have been documented throughout the entire course of the police-community interaction, ranging from the initial decision to conduct a stop and the underlying basis for that stop to whether the stop ends with an arrest or the use of force. For many people, evidence of racial disparities in policing has come to be synonymous with “proof” that police are intentionally racist and are engaging in deliberate racial profiling. There can be a reluctance on the part of law enforcement to even engage in conversations about racial disparities in policing to the extent that they fear it will open their agencies and the broader profession to finger-pointing and attack. But, as I have personally said to police officials, ignoring unflattering evidence will not make it go away. The term “disparity” as typically used by scholars, and as I use it here, means there is some observable difference between the likelihood of a given outcome (e.g., being searched during a traffic stop) for different groups. The term does not convey what *causes* the difference and is certainly not automatic proof of deliberate racism. In the approach that my collaborators and I take in our research on race and policing, and in our many conversations with the members of law enforcement with whom we partner, finding disparities is not an indictment of racism nor is it the final word, but rather it is the starting point for a dialogue about how to improve police-community relations.

Racial Disparities in Stops, Searches, Handcuffing, and Arrests

As part of a collaboration with the Oakland Police Department (OPD), my colleagues and I conducted a statistical analysis of 28,000 OPD pedestrian and traffic stops. We found a consistent pattern of racial disparities across the entire course of the police-community interaction, from an officer’s initial decision to stop a person to subsequent decisions to search, handcuff, and arrest that person (Hetey, Monin, Maitreyi, & Eberhardt, 2016a). The raw

disparities were striking: 60 percent of all OPD stops were of Blacks, even though Blacks made up only 28 percent of Oakland's population. Members of all other racial groups were underrepresented among those stopped relative to their share of the population, leading us, and many other researchers studying race and policing, to focus on the disparities between Blacks and Whites. Once stopped, Blacks were significantly more likely to be handcuffed, searched, and arrested. When we examined the decision to handcuff, even after excluding all arrests, a Black man was handcuffed in one of every four stops, compared to one of every fifteen stops of White men. Moreover, the disparities we found remained statistically significant after we controlled for more than two dozen factors that could plausibly explain the apparent racial differences, including crime rates and the demographics of the neighborhood where each stop was made (see Hetey, Monin, Maitreyi, & Eberhardt, 2016b, for a summary).

A similar pattern of results has been found in cities across the United States, including Boston, Chicago, Greensboro, North Carolina, Los Angeles, and New York City (American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Massachusetts & American Civil Liberties Union Racial Justice Program, 2014; Ayres & Borowsky, 2008; LaFraniere & Lehren, 2015; New York Civil Liberties Union, 2013; U.S. Department of Justice, 2017). The New York Civil Liberties Union's (NYCLU) analysis of the New York City Police Department's (NYPD) stop-and-frisk rates in 2012 found that although young Black and Latino males made up only 4.7 percent of NYC's population, they accounted for 40.6 percent of stops (NYCLU, 2013). Even in the majority of the ten precincts with the lowest representation of African American and Latino residents in the city (comprising between 8 percent and 14 percent of the population), more than 70 percent of stops were of African Americans and Latinos.

In response to claims that law enforcement target people of color, a common refrain is that police are simply "going where the crime is." If high crime areas have higher concentrations of African Americans and if it is seen as an effective policing strategy to stop more people in these high crime areas, then a consequence, even if an indirect one, is that more African Americans will be stopped. Further, there is evidence of racial disparities in rates of violent crime (Federal Bureau of Investigations, 2013; 2016; Morgan & Truman, 2018). To the extent that different groups commit crimes at different rates, we would expect police contact and stop rates to mirror those differences. In these scenarios, race is not the driving factor; crime is. While crime certainly shapes enforcement patterns, the evidence demonstrates that higher rates of police contact with community members of color, relative to Whites, cannot be fully explained by general crime rates (e.g., Hetey et al., 2016a) or by differential rates of criminal activity between racial groups (Gelman, Fagan, & Kiss, 2007).

In the largest analysis to date—consisting of nearly 100 million traffic stops conducted by dozens of agencies between 2011 to 2017—an interdisciplinary team of researchers led by Sharad Goel as part of the Stanford Open Policing Project found that Black drivers were stopped more often than White drivers (Pierson et al., 2019). Trying to isolate the influence of race from other factors such as crime, the researchers used daylight saving time as a type of naturalistic experiment (Grogger & Ridgeway, 2006). They found that Black drivers were less likely to be stopped after dusk, when it is dark and presumably harder to ascertain a driver's race, than at the same time of day during parts of the year when it is still light out and easier to ascertain a driver's race. In our analysis of pedestrian and traffic stops in Oakland, we also found that the magnitude of racial disparities in stops was greater when officers indicated they could determine the community member's race prior to making the stop.

It is difficult to pinpoint the independent role race plays in an officer's decision to pull someone over because the underlying base rates for being stopped are unclear. In other words, in what proportions would we *expect* people of different races to be pulled over? Representation in the general population is the obvious point of comparison. If, for example, Blacks make up 25 percent of a city's population, then it might immediately seem equitable for Blacks to also comprise approximately 25 percent of those pulled over by police. Matters quickly become more complicated if, hypothetically, Blacks tend to spend more time driving because of longer commutes, resulting in a statistically higher risk of committing traffic violations. If this were the case, then the 25 percent stop rate among Black community members might be disproportionately low. Driving behavior would become a factor, or *benchmark*, to take into account when trying to isolate and quantify the influence of race in police decision-making above and beyond legitimate reasons an officer may have in conducting a stop (see Ayres & Borowsky, 2008, for a discussion of benchmarks). Crime rate, as I have already mentioned, is another important benchmark.

To get around the thorny issues of selecting benchmarks and establishing base rates, researchers have studied how police treat and interact with people of different races *once they have already been stopped*. A common area of focus is the decision to search. Searches are unique in that they have their own objective outcome, namely whether any contraband was recovered. Following this approach, Pierson and colleagues (2019) found that stopped Black and Hispanic drivers were searched at more than double the rate of stopped White drivers. Despite being searched more often, Hispanic drivers were found with contraband less often than searched White drivers (26 percent vs. 36 percent), and searched Black drivers were found with contraband somewhat less of the time (32 percent) than Whites. These results suggest that

the bar for officers to conduct a search may be lower for community members of color. These findings are in line with a body of evidence showing that, although police officers generally search Black drivers more frequently than White drivers, those searches are less likely to yield contraband (Baumgartner, Epp, & Shoub, 2018; Glaser, 2015; Goel, Rao, & Shroff, 2016; Simoiu, Corbett-Davies, & Goel, 2017).

Racial Disparities in the Language Officers Speak and in the Reasons for Stops

In addition to disparities in being stopped and searched, Black drivers feel they are treated with less respect than White drivers during routine stops (see Epp et al., 2014). Indeed, racial disparities are borne out in how officers speak to the people they stop. Using footage from officers' body-worn cameras, our team developed novel computational linguistic methods to quantify and analyze the respectfulness of police officers' language directed toward White and Black community members during routine traffic stops in Oakland, California. We found that officers' language was consistently less respectful when directed toward Blacks compared to Whites, even after controlling for factors such as the race of the officer, the severity of the infraction, the location of the stop, and the outcome of the stop (Voigt et al., 2017). We observed racial differences, for example, in how an officer refers to the driver: a Black driver was more likely to be addressed as "bro," whereas a White driver was more likely to be called "sir." Importantly, we found differences in language beginning from the first seconds of the interaction, before the driver even had much of a chance to speak, suggesting that officers' language was not solely driven by the behavior of the driver.

Our team also found that the larger context of these routine police stops qualitatively differed based on the race of the driver (Camp, Prabhakaran, Hetey, Monin, Jurafsky, & Eberhardt, in prep). We focused on the reasons drivers were stopped and, specifically, the degree of discretion the officer had in deciding whether or not to enforce a specific law and make a particular stop. The amount of discretion police exercise in deciding to conduct a stop varies from the low end (e.g., when an officer observes a severe traffic violation that poses a threat to public safety) to the high end (e.g., when an officer observes a minor equipment violation, such as driving with a broken license plate light or an expired registration). We found racial disparities in the discretionary context of stops, such that Black drivers were more likely than White drivers to be stopped for more minor offenses, which officers have greater discretion in enforcing (Camp et al., in prep). This was the case both in Oakland, California, based on the coding of 9,000 first person narratives officers wrote about the underlying justification for the stops they made, and

across the United States, based on a meta-analysis of over 18 million traffic stops conducted by hundreds of police departments. This gap is important because it means that, in general, when White drivers are pulled over, they are in circumstances in which the officer had little choice but to stop them, making the underlying justification readily apparent to all involved. Black drivers, in contrast, are more likely to be stopped in ambiguous situations in which the officer had more of a judgment call to make. This added ambiguity potentially breeds distrust and opens the door to anxiety and concern among people of color that they are being stereotyped by the officer (Najdowski, Bottoms, & Goff, 2015). The finding that Black drivers tend to be stopped for more minor offenses than White drivers provides additional context for the racial disparities discussed above. Because African Americans tend to be searched, handcuffed, and arrested at higher rates than Whites, one might expect that it is because they were stopped for more severe reasons, but the opposite appears to be the case.

Racial Disparities in the Use of Force

Moving from the mundane to the more extreme, there is evidence of racial disparities in police use of force. A lack of available and complete data on the frequency and nature of use of force incidents makes it hard to draw definitive conclusions. In response, news outlets and community groups, such as *The Guardian*, *The Washington Post*, and the research collaborative Mapping Police Violence, have begun to collect information on police use of force and assemble their own databases. “The Counted,” *The Guardian*’s database, contains information about 1,146 people in 2015 and 1,093 people in 2016 who were killed during a police encounter, the vast majority of whom were fatally shot. Of these 2,239 people, 573 (25.6 percent) were Black and 1,158 (51.7 percent) were White. Taking into account representation in the general population, the odds—in 2015 and 2016, respectively—were 2.6 and 2.3 times higher for Blacks to be fatally shot by police compared to Whites. Dying from police use of force is a leading cause of death for young men of color (Edwards, Lee, & Esposito, 2019). Researchers estimated that the lifetime risk of mortality associated with police use of force is approximately 1 in 2,000 for men and 1 in 33,000 for women. Among all groups, Black males are at the greatest risk and, over the course of a lifetime, 1 in 1,000 Black men and boys will be killed by police.

Examining lethal as well as nonlethal use of force, researchers from the Center for Policing Equity (CPE) compiled a data set of nearly 15,000 uses of force incidents that occurred between 2010 and 2015 and involved a dozen law enforcement agencies across the country (Goff, Lloyd, Geller, Raphael, & Glaser, 2016). On average, 43 percent of use of force incidents involved

a Black community member, compared to 33 percent that involved a White community member. Accounting for population demographics, the rate at which force was used with Blacks was 2.5 times the overall use of force rate and 3.6 times the rate for Whites.

As I previously discussed in relation to stop rates, it is hard to isolate and quantify the impact of race given other factors that influence police decision-making. Because not all members of the general population are equally likely to come into contact with police or to end up in the type of situations in which police officers use force, it is beneficial to go beyond population demographics to more fully contextualize police use of force. For example, officers use force approximately 1 percent to 2 percent of the time across all contact with community members, but about 15 percent to 20 percent of the time when making an arrest (cited in Smith, Kaminski, Alpert, Fridell, MacDonald, & Kubu, 2010). Crime rate is an important benchmark. Measures of specific kinds of crime, such as arrests for violent crime as opposed to arrests for property crime, can serve as a proxy for the types of provocative or criminal behavior officers are trained to perceive as a threat and respond to with force (Cesario, Johnson, & Terrill, 2018; Goff et al., 2016). Researchers have controlled for arrest rates and other metrics of crime rates in their analyses, which amounts to statistically “allowing for” an increased number of use of force incidents to accompany increasing crime, an assumption Goff and colleagues (2016) point out may or may not be warranted given that arrest and crime rates are likely racially skewed. After accounting for crime, the raw and population-indexed racial disparities in use of force tend to narrow to the point of no longer being statistically significant, or the gap is even reversed, such that Whites become statistically more likely than Blacks to have force used against them (Cesario et al., 2018; Goff et al., 2016). Finer grained analyses reveal that the degree of racial disparities in the use of force varies depending on the severity of the force and whether the community member was armed. After controlling for crime, statistically significant racial disparities have been found for less lethal force, but not lethal force (Fryer, 2019; Goff et al., 2016). Disparities are more severe for unarmed civilians who were fatally shot by police, compared to civilians who were armed with a lethal weapon (Charbonneau, Spencer, & Glaser, 2017). Overall, it can be hard to draw definitive conclusions about the independent role of race in police use of force from the existing evidence.

To get around some of the complicating factors, Charbonneau and colleagues (2017) examined racial disparities in a very particular kind of use of force: cases in which police officers fatally used force against *other* police officers. From 1981 to 2009, ten off-duty police officers, all of whom were armed, were mistaken for civilians and were fatally shot by a fellow officer. Of the killed officers, eight were Black, one was Hispanic, and one was

White, during a time period when at least 75 percent of all police officers in the United States were White. The likelihood of a Black off-duty officer being misidentified as a civilian offender and being fatally shot by another officer was more than fifty times as high as the likelihood that the same thing would happen to a White off-duty officer. The magnitude of this disparity was larger than that among civilians killed during interactions with police.

The Far-Reaching Effects of Racial Disparities in Policing

There is consistent evidence of racial disparities in policing, including in stops, searches, handcuffing, arrests, the words spoken during the interaction, the justification and reasons for the stop, and the use of force. In addition to these discrete behaviors, the role of race in police decision-making can have an impact that lasts beyond the duration of a specific interaction. It also can have effects beyond the specific individuals involved in a police encounter. For example, even controlling for demographics and measures of criminality, contact with the CJS reduces one's likelihood of voting (Weaver & Lerman, 2010), illustrating that encounters with the system can shape a person's civic involvement and sense of citizenship. This was the case even for a minor encounter with police that did not end in an arrest. Contact with the police can also set into motion a process that can change a person's life trajectory. Research by Del Toro and colleagues (2019) shows that being stopped by police predicts additional criminal behavior six to eighteen months later among Black and Latino male youth, even independent of prior delinquency. This was especially true among younger youth: the younger the boy was when he was first stopped by police, the larger the increase in delinquent behavior six months later. This relationship was partially driven by psychological distress, illustrating that the interactions police have with the community, and particularly with those who are marginalized and vulnerable, can have long-lasting effects on people's life trajectories, even when those contacts do not result in an arrest. Moreover, these types of effects are counterproductive, cutting against law enforcement's own objective to lower crime.

Emerging evidence also points to the public health effect of racial disparities in policing on entire communities. Using a population-based, quasi-experimental study design, Bor, Venkataramani, Williams, and Tsai (2018) examined the causal impact of fatal police shootings of unarmed Blacks on the mental health of Black Americans. On average, participants were exposed to one fatal police shooting of an unarmed Black person in a three-month window. Every additional fatal shooting was associated with 0.14 poor mental health days among Black Americans in the general population of the state where the shooting occurred. Applying these estimates on a broader scale implies that fatal police shootings of unarmed Black people could contribute 1.7 additional poor

mental health days per person per year, or, on the scale of the entire U.S. population, 55 million additional poor mental health days among African American adults. Thus, the effects of police decision-making in specific encounters can spill over to impact the wider population. Importantly, there was no impact of these shootings of unarmed Blacks on the mental health of White Americans living in the same states, and there was no demonstrable effect of police shootings of *armed* Blacks on the mental health of African Americans. Thus, the negative effects are tied specifically to “the meaning ascribed to police killings of unarmed black Americans, in light of the historical and institutional context in which they occur” (Bor et al., 2018, p. 308).

TOSSING OUT THE “FEW BAD APPLES” NARRATIVE

Evidence of racial disparities in police decision-making leads many people to jump to the conclusion that the underlying problem must be racist police officers deliberately acting on bad intentions. Discussions in the media on the challenges of modern-day policing often assume the language of the “few bad apples” of policing, and those within law enforcement invoke it:

Is all of law enforcement good? No, there are some bad apples out there. But the majority of us are good and we are trying to do the right thing. (Chief of Police, an agency in California, see Norman, 2019)

Police are being made to be the bad guys and I’m not saying that there aren’t a few bad apples, but the majority of us are trying to help people and do our jobs. (President of Sergeants Benevolent Association, New York Police Department, see O’Reilly, 2017)

This rhetoric sets up a moral framework wherein “good” officers are trying to help people and do the right thing, while “bad” officers, through their intentional actions, are solely to blame for the recent challenges facing the profession.

The Problem with the “Few,” the “Bad,” and the “Apples”

The “few bad apples” narrative of policing suffers from a number of shortcomings. The overreliance on this narrative is problematic and impedes both our ability as a society to fully reckon with the influence of race on human decision-making and behavior and law enforcement’s eagerness to harness the power of institutional change as a response. Indeed, the narrative runs counter to social scientific evidence that demonstrates the profound ways race can influence us.

Highlighting “few” implies the probability that race will influence officers is low. It implies that race will only affect a small percentage of law enforcement. However, in our research in Oakland, for example, the disparities we uncovered were not concentrated in the behavior of just a handful of officers. In a thirteen-month period, three-quarters of all officers who made stops never handcuffed, searched, or arrested a White person they stopped. The majority of these same officers, however, had performed these actions on the African Americans they had stopped (Hetey et al., 2016a).

Beyond law enforcement, the influence of race on human perceptions, judgments, and behaviors is not rare, but pervasive. There are stark racial disparities across virtually all domains of life—from health to wealth to education to criminal justice. Racial bias cuts across industry and one’s particular role in society (see Eberhardt, 2019). The production of such racial disparities is intimately tied to the underlying human psychology of race and stereotyping.

The focus on “bad” is in line with many people’s commonsense notions of bias as a moral failing that requires some degree of animus and bad intention (DiAngelo, 2018). Decades of empirical social scientific research, however, demonstrate that bias requires no intention or awareness at all. Bias is often *implicit*, meaning that we have thoughts and feelings about others of which we are unaware but which nonetheless can profoundly affect our judgments and behavior—even when we do not want to be influenced and even when we are consciously committed to egalitarianism (Devine, 1989). Empirical evidence of racial disparities in policing echoes the voices of people of color who, for generations, haven spoken of being treated differently by law enforcement. At the same time, police officers overwhelmingly deny that explicit racial profiling occurs in their agencies. The science of implicit bias tells us both can be simultaneously true, which paves the way for us to focus more on impact, instead of exclusively on intention. Much of that impact can only be appreciated at the level of the institution.

Indeed, highlighting “apples” draws our attention to the individual actors and can blind us to the importance of “the barrel”—or the institution—in which the officers are situated. In a Pew survey, for example, 39 percent of community members and 67 percent of police officers said the deaths of Blacks during encounters with police in recent years were isolated incidents, rather than signs of a broader problem (Morin, Parker, Stepler, & Mercer, 2017). It might not be immediately clear what role institutions play in police-community interactions. After all, these interactions involve people. In recent years, we have grown accustomed to parsing the behavior and intentions of individuals to arrive at accounts of a particular police encounter and determine if an officer’s actions were justified. Through this lens, individuals—and their behavior, judgment, and tendencies—loom large, whereas the

institutional norms, policies, practices, and culture that guide officers' actions recede into the distance.

Why Institutions Matter in Producing Racial Disparities

In interacting with the public, police officers are acting not only as themselves, but also as extensions and agents of their organizations and as representatives of the state and of the CJS (Camp & Eberhardt, under revision). My colleagues Nicholas Camp and Jennifer Eberhardt write of the power of institutions to “standardize and coordinate the behavior of agents. By promulgating of norms, practices, and formal rules, institutions can exceed the capacities of any one individual and persist over time” (p. 7).

Even in the absence of actors who are vulnerable to the effects of bias, institutions themselves can be biased by having policies and structures in place that harm some people and favor others, even in unintended and unanticipated ways. This is what the sociologist Eduardo Bonilla-Silva has referred to as “racism without racists” (2003). For example, policies that specifically apply to people who have criminal records (e.g., probation/parole searches by police) can seemingly have nothing to do with race. To the extent that Blacks are disproportionately incarcerated in this country (see Alexander, 2010; Western, 2006), however, those policies will have a disparate impact on the Black community. In turn, the institutional actors responsible for carrying out those policies will enact racial disparities, even if unwittingly. In this way, bias can be built into structures and institutions and can contribute to how individuals police and are policed. Though this might sound bleak, the encouraging news is that by changing institutional priorities, norms, practices, and policies, we can mitigate disparities. In the same vein, an underappreciated, and perhaps underutilized, function of institutions is their ability to put into place policies and practices that act as guard rails that curb the expression of potentially problematic individual tendencies, such as implicit bias.

What the Science of Implicit Bias Reveals about Racial Disparities in Policing

The expanding science of implicit racial bias as it pertains to the perceptions, judgments, and behaviors of law enforcement sheds light on racial disparities in policing. An in-depth review of implicit bias is beyond the scope of this chapter (see Eberhardt, 2019), but my aim in highlighting selected studies is to show that, at best, it is too easy and, at worst, it is misguided for members of society at large to sit back, point fingers, and cast all blame for racial inequities in policing on individual police officers. Central to the

production of racial disparities in policing are implicit bias and the effects of stereotypical associations linking Black Americans with crime, violence, and threat. Representations of Blacks as violent and animalistic date back centuries (Duru, 2004), but the effects are not confined to the past and live on today as mental associations that undergird biased perception and judgment (Goff, Eberhardt, Williams, & Jackson, 2008). These stereotypes are part of the culture in which not only police officers, but also the general American public is immersed. Within the context of the CJS, in the words of scholar Khalil Gibran Muhammad, race is written into crime and crime is written into race (2010). Implicit racial bias is transmitted in subtle ways, including from parents to their preschool-aged children (Castelli, Zogmaister, & Tomelleri, 2009) and by watching popular television shows, many of which contain negative nonverbal behavior directed at Black characters, which has been shown to increase viewers' bias even though viewers could not consciously detect it (Weisbuch, Pauker, & Ambady, 2009).

The Black-crime association is so strong that it alters basic perception and attention, including what we see, where we look, and what we remember. My colleague Jennifer Eberhardt and her collaborators (2004) have documented that, in a mutually reinforcing way, exposure to Black people prompts thoughts of crime, and the concept of crime draws attention to Black people (Eberhardt, Goff, Purdie, & Davies, 2004). In a subliminal priming procedure, in which information was presented to participants so quickly (e.g., mere fractions of a second) that they could not consciously detect what they had seen, undergraduate participants were exposed to either Black or White faces (or non-faces in a baseline control condition). After being exposed to Black faces, participants more readily detected degraded images of weapons as part of an object recognition task. After being exposed to White faces, however, their ability to detect those same weapons was inhibited. Thus, the Black-crime association acts as a visual tuning device, sharpening perception in some cases, helping us see what we expect to see, and dulling it in others by blinding us to what we do not expect. In the reverse direction, subliminal exposure to crime led people to pay more attention to Black faces than to White faces. Eberhardt and colleagues found that this was the case for police officers as well as civilians. When officers were subliminally primed with crime by being exposed to words like "arrest" and "shoot," they too became more likely to pay attention to Black faces. If the mere concept of crime makes it more likely that a Black face will draw police officers' attention, we need to consider the potential implications of that vigilance for enforcement practices and crime rates. The concept of crime systematically distorts the Black image. Being primed with crime led police officers to misremember a Black face as more stereotypically Black (e.g., more phenotypically Black) than it actually was. This finding suggests we project the images linking race

and crime in our minds onto the people we encounter. Eberhardt and her colleagues asked police officers directly “Who looks criminal?” In response, the officers chose more Black faces than White faces, and the more stereotypically Black, the more likely they were to report that the face looked criminal. Across these studies, the race of participants and their level of prejudice did not change the results, illuminating that what is at work is a prevalent societal stereotype that casts Blacks as the “prototypical embodiment” of crime, and not personal endorsement of the stereotype (Eberhardt et al., 2004, p. 889).

In addition to basic perception, the Black-crime association influences judgment, decision-making, and behavior. A now classic demonstration relevant to law enforcement is the shoot/don't shoot task created by Joshua Correll and colleagues (Correll, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2002; 2007; Correll, Urland, & Ito, 2006; for a review, see Correll, Hudson, Guillermo, & Ma, 2014). In a video game-like computer simulation, participants see static scenes in which Black and White male targets are holding either a gun or a harmless object, such as a cell phone or wallet. Participants' task is to press a button corresponding to “shoot” if the target is armed or to press a different button labeled “don't shoot” if the target is unarmed and holding a harmless object. In some versions of the task, participants are forced to respond within very short time frames (e.g., 630 ms) to increase the likelihood they will make errors. Correll and colleagues consistently find that undergraduate and community samples are faster to “shoot” an armed target if he is Black than if he is White. Looking at error rates, the researchers find that participants are more likely to mistakenly “shoot” unarmed Black targets than they are to mistakenly “shoot” unarmed White targets. Participants in the original studies are also faster to press “don't shoot” in response to an unarmed target when he is White than when he is Black, and they err more on the side of not “shooting” armed White targets than armed Black targets (Correll et al., 2002). Similar to the Eberhardt et al. (2004) studies, participants' race typically does not affect the results, again implicating awareness, rather than endorsement, of racial stereotypes. Indeed, researchers have demonstrated that the strength of the so-called shooter bias in these simulations is predicted by stereotypical associations linking Blacks with crime and danger (Glaser & Knowles, 2008). The relationship between these stereotypes and degree of shooter bias is mediated by fluctuations in brain activity that register heightened threat in response to Black targets, compared to White targets (Correll et al., 2006). Experimentally strengthening the association between Blacks, danger, and crime (e.g., through exposure to newspaper articles highlighting Black criminals) has been shown to increase shooter bias (Correll et al., 2007).

Police officers have served as participants in the shoot/don't shoot task. Police officers' overall performance on the task was better than that of civilians in a number of ways, including being faster to make correct “shoot”/“don't

shoot” decisions. Unlike community samples, police officers did not make the same errors: they were no more likely to “shoot” an unarmed Black target than an unarmed White target (Correll, Park, Judd, Wittenbrink, Sadler, & Keesee, 2007). Police officers, however, did exhibit the same average magnitude of response time bias and were faster to “shoot” armed Blacks than similarly armed Whites. This response time bias was greatest among officers who worked in larger districts with a high rate of violent crime and a larger population of Blacks and other people of color; in other words, environments that reinforce racial stereotypes linking Blacks and crime.

The apparent discrepancies between police officers demonstrating bias in their response times, but not “shooting” decisions, as well as the lack of bias in experimental simulations but evidence of racial disparities in actual use of force can be reconciled when time and other situational factors are taken into account. Because stereotypes can operate implicitly and have automatic components (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998), they tend to set up a prepotent response, which is akin to a dominant, knee-jerk reaction. These reflexive-like, category-based responses tend to manifest most strongly when time is limited (Pratto & Bargh, 1991; Stepanikova, 2012). This is analogous to being asked to blurt out the first word that comes to mind upon hearing “peanut butter.” Unsurprisingly, contingent upon culture and experience, the dominant response will be “jelly,” but with ample time people could come up with any number of responses. These quick reactions occur at the neural level. For example, when people are subliminally exposed to Black faces, compared to White faces, there is greater activation in the amygdala (Cunningham et al., 2004)—a part of the brain that registers fear and threat. The amount of amygdala activation is associated with the amount of implicit bias. But, present the faces for half a second, which is long enough for conscious awareness, and the heightened amygdala response disappears. People are consciously overriding the stereotypes: relative to White faces, Black faces caused more activity in the prefrontal cortex (Cunningham et al., 2004), which is associated with cognitive and behavior regulation. The same conscious overriding of biases appears to take place during the shoot/don’t shoot task. Because of police officers’ use of force training, they have the expertise and experience to exert cognitive control and override the dominant response and the psychological tendency to “shoot” (Correll et al., 2007). That said, certain factors make it more difficult to exert this type of cognitive control. These factors include fear, stress, fatigue, and ambiguity (Correll et al., 2014; Lambert, Payne, Jacoby, Shaffer, Chasteen, & Khan, 2003; Stepanikova, 2012), all of which set the laboratory simulation apart from the real-life situations officers face.

A critical part of a police officer’s job is judging threat. The determination of whether someone poses a threat is a key component of the legal

justification for an officer's use of force (*Graham v. Connor*, 1989; *Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985). Race, however, systematically influences the perception of threat. Classic social psychological studies demonstrate that people make biased judgments and deem the behavior of a Black person to be significantly more aggressive than the identical behavior of a White person (Duncan, 1976; Sagar & Schofield, 1980). Compared to White men, Black men are judged to be bigger, stronger, and more threatening. When participants were shown only the faces of young Black and White target men, they judged the Black targets to be taller, heavier, more muscular, and physically stronger (Wilson, Hugenberg, & Rule, 2017). Both Black and White study participants showed this bias. Differences by participant race emerged, however, when White participants, but not Black participants, judged young Black targets as more capable of doing harm in a physical altercation than young White targets. Going further, when non-Black study participants were shown a series of faces and asked to imagine that each target person "had behaved aggressively toward a police officer but was not wielding a weapon," they rated police use of force against Black men as more justified than police use of force against White men (Wilson et al., 2017, p. 70).

In the real world, race is associated with police officers' judgments of threat from Black body movements. In a study I conducted with my colleague Jennifer Eberhardt (see Eberhardt, 2019), we analyzed data collected by the NYPD on its stop-and-frisk practices. Each time NYPD officers conducted a stop they were required to fill out a form, which asked about the reason for the stop and offered ten options officers could select. The available reasons included wearing clothes commonly used in the commission of a crime and having a suspicious bulge that might indicate a weapon. "Furtive movement" was another reason, for which no further information was required about what made the movement furtive or suspicious. We examined whether there was a relationship between the race of the person stopped and so-called furtive movement as the basis for the stop. Our analysis of 1.3 million stops conducted by the NYPD in 2010 and 2011—the height of stop-and-frisk—revealed that furtive movement was the most common reason NYPD officers stopped someone and accounted for half of all stops. Of all stops made for furtive movement, 54 percent were of Blacks, though they made up 23 percent of the New York City population. Compared to Whites stopped for furtive movement, Blacks who had been stopped for furtive movement were significantly more likely to be frisked and to be subjected to the use of physical force, despite the fact that they were less likely to be found with a weapon.

In summary, implicit bias and the stereotypes linking Blacks and crime conspire to color who we think of as threatening, criminal, and dangerous. At the individual level, implicit racial bias systematically affects our perceptions, judgments, and behavior in ways that disadvantage Black

Americans. In the aggregate, acting on these psychological inclinations can create worlds characterized by disparities between groups that mirror what is implicitly in our minds, even when those images are counter to our explicit goals and values. As a society, we build systems and structures that reflect and reinforce these biases. Ironically, when these disparities and the inequality that characterizes various systems are brought to the public's attention, people can seize upon the disparities, potentially as "evidence" of the underlying stereotypes, and use them to double down on and rationalize the inequality (Hetey & Eberhardt, 2014; Peffley & Hurwitz, 2007). People take evidence of what is and use it to justify how the world should be (Kay et al., 2009). One way to interrupt this vicious cycle and combat ideas that inequity is "natural" or "inevitable" is to highlight the power of institutions to create inequality. A focus on institutions may enable advocates for social change to draw the public's attention away from individual and group-based stereotypical traits and toward an acknowledgment of the role structural bias plays in creating the disparities (Hetey & Eberhardt, 2018). This can set the stage for discussions of what steps might be taken at the institutional level to reduce racial inequality and lessen the underlying disparities.

CHANGING INSTITUTIONS TO MITIGATE RACIAL DISPARITIES IN POLICING AND IMPROVE POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

As the social scientific research makes clear, each of us has biases and can fall prey to the effects of bias on our perception, judgments, and behavior, all without awareness or intention. Police officers are no exception. Acting on racial biases can produce disparities in outcomes, like those found in policing and in the broader CJS. Institutions potentially provide an important avenue to curtail the effects of bias by putting up guard rails aimed at preventing the expression of bias and avoiding its pitfalls and consequences. Put another way, institutions have tremendous power that individuals do not have. Under the guidance and direction of institutional policies and practices that are non-egalitarian—whether by design or as an inadvertent by-product—even the most fair-minded individual officers will nonetheless reproduce racial disparities.

As the entryway to our vast CJS, law enforcement may be an especially important place to focus in order to bring about change to the entire system. In calls to reform the CJS and end mass incarceration, scholars and activists often advocate for sentencing reform or for a reduction in prosecutorial discretion (e.g., Frederick & Stemen, 2012; The Sentencing Project, 2018).

Because police are usually the initial contact citizens have with the CJS and, as such, determine whether someone is formally drawn into the system (Roeder, Eisen, & Bowling, 2015), starting “upstream” in the process is critical to making change. After all, there is no prosecutorial discretion without the would-be suspects. There is no sentencing without the would-be defendants, and there is no mass incarceration without the would-be inmates. Through their activities, law enforcement can effectively constrain and determine the complexion of later phases of the system. Various stakeholders have called for an array of solutions, including diversifying police forces, supporting community policing, acknowledging the role of policing in past and present injustice, and requiring diversity trainings (Hall, Hall, & Perry, 2016; President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015). Here, I highlight three particular avenues of institutional change that directly build upon the research my colleagues and I have done on race and policing. Specifically, I will focus on collecting data, leveraging body-worn cameras, and changing local law enforcement agency policy as a means to reduce racial disparities in policing.

Collect Data on Law Enforcement Activity

Local law enforcement agencies should collect more data about their routine enforcement activity. Collecting stop data, for example, allows agencies to take inventory of their enforcement activities and practices, as well as the impact of that activity on the public. By having this information, an agency is able to continuously assess whether its officers’ actions are in line with the agency’s policies, priorities, values, and goals. Without this information, it can be hard to empirically assess what is occurring on the ground and what it might mean for wider police-community relations. As discussed, it can be difficult to have informed debates about the role of race in police use of force because the data are often not collected. When the data are collected, the information tends to be incomplete and unstandardized, making systematic analysis difficult, if not impossible. As such, there have been frequent calls for law enforcement to collect standardized use of force data broken down by race and other demographics (Apuzzo & Cohen, 2015; United States Commission on Civil Rights, 2018).

To fully unlock the power of routinely collected data, the broader understanding and norms around what this information is and what its purposes are must shift. Many law enforcement agencies conceive of the information they collect, such as forms about stops or arrest reports, as evidence. Evidence is something that can be called upon during an investigation or court proceedings to shed light on a specific case. In these contexts, evidence is typically used to exonerate or incriminate, which makes evidence collection a sensitive

issue. Personally, I have been in meetings in which law enforcement officials resisted the collection of additional data because they were afraid it would be used as “gotcha data,” and provide ammunition to point fingers and cast blame. This fear on the part of law enforcement about the potential downsides of transparency is understandable. In the current climate, bias has gone from a psychological observation to a political accusation commonly levied against police officers (Bazelon, 2016). In the long term, however, a reluctance to embrace empirical approaches comes with an even higher cost. Fear and defensiveness can get in the way of the openness required to take an honest accounting of the impact on the ground of an agency’s practices carried out in the aggregate.

Thus, to make the most of the information agencies collect, it should be understood as data, as records that are neither “good” nor “bad.” Rather, such data can serve as feedback from which to learn and continuously refine an agency’s priorities and practices. Stop data, for example, are a veritable treasure trove of information that can help an agency accomplish its goals more precisely, safely, and equitably. Our research team put forth fifty recommendations to tackle racial disparities and improve police-community relations and, in so doing, we advocated that law enforcement agencies reimagine themselves as “learning institutions—that is, as places that collect and use high-quality data based on the goals and values they share with their communities” (Eberhardt, 2016, p. 40). It should go without saying that, in order to maximize the power of data, it must be analyzed. Collecting data but not putting the information to use is counterproductive and can frustrate community members and other stakeholders (Niles, 2016).

At the state level, in California, the nation’s most populous state, The Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 is gradually being implemented and will require virtually all law enforcement agencies in the state (more than 500 agencies) to collect uniform stop data, broken down by race and other demographics. The California Department of Justice will analyze these data annually with the ultimate goal of eliminating racial and other demographic-based disparities in stops and post-stop outcomes in the state. Already, stakeholders have posed questions about how these data will be used, contextualized (e.g., benchmark selection), and analyzed in a standardized fashion across jurisdictions. Those mainly in law enforcement have voiced reservations about the potential downsides of mandating stop data collection, namely decreased officer productivity because of additional paperwork and increased administrative burdens on law enforcement agencies, which may potentially cause upticks in crime. Time will tell if these concerns are borne out. California joins several other states, including Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, Missouri, and North Carolina, which require law enforcement agencies to record data on stops.

Within these data is not only information about potential problems in enforcement activities and how they impact the community, but also clues about effective solutions. As an example, in Oakland, our report uncovered stark racial disparities in handcuffing, an enforcement practice that researchers rarely examine, but which community members talk about frequently as something that can be traumatic. Among police officials the common assumption is that frequent handcuffing must be tied to arrests, but the data revealed that the racial disparities in handcuffing persisted even among stops in which no arrest was made (Hetey et al., 2016a). What else, then, accounted for the relatively high rates of handcuffing? The answer, it turns out, was searches: 83 percent of searches involved handcuffing. In particular, searches of people on probation and parole were implicated. As a term of their probation or release on parole, some people have conditions placed on them that can include search clauses that give law enforcement blanket authority—without needing any probable cause—to search them. The underlying theory is that such searches play a deterrent role, though there is no systematic evidence that this practice is effective and only modest evidence that parole supervision more broadly reduces recidivism (Lewis, 2004; Solomon, Kachnowski, & Bhati, 2005). In Oakland, OPD officers often used handcuffs while conducting searches, resulting in high rates of handcuffing. About 93 percent of probation/parole searches conducted by the OPD were of African Americans and Latinos. Thus, this practice, which on its face has nothing to do with race, effectively created racial disparities in handcuffing at the agency level. In response to our analysis, OPD command staff reexamined the policy and amended it to state that probation/parole searches did not automatically mandate handcuffing and that officers could exercise discretion in deciding whether or not to conduct these searches. The handcuffing rates plummeted. This is a concrete example of data collection and analysis leading to meaningful changes in police practice that can pave the way for better relations with the community.

Leverage Body-Worn Cameras to Improve Police-Community Relations

For a long time, in response to police encounters that went awry, stakeholders had to rely on conjecture and the testimonies of the people who were directly involved and/or were witnesses to try to piece together what had happened. But now, technology can solve that problem in the form of officers' body-worn cameras. As is the case for stop data, the footage from these cameras is not just evidence, but data that can shed light on the nature of police-community interactions in ways that simply were not possible before.

An emerging literature is documenting the efficacy of implementing body-worn cameras. In a number of agencies that have adopted body cameras, the use of force has been reduced. For example, in Mesa, Arizona; Rialto, California; and Orlando, Florida, use of force incidents decreased by 75 percent, 60 percent, and 53 percent, respectively (Ariel, Farrar, & Sutherland, 2015; Jennings, Lynch, & Fridell, 2015; cited in Miller, Toliver, & Police Executive Research Forum, 2014). The rate at which civilians filed complaints also dropped at these agencies. An 18-month randomized controlled trial of more than 2,000 Metropolitan Police Department officers in Washington, DC, however, found that body-worn cameras did not have a significant effect on officer behavior (Yokum, Ravishankar, & Coppock, 2017). Specifically, officers randomly assigned to wear the cameras used force and received civilian complaints at the same rate as officers who were not equipped with the cameras. To more fully explore whether body-worn cameras have benefits, researchers and law enforcement alike need to go beyond the metrics of use of force incidents and civilian complaints.

Body-worn cameras can be used as a window into the substance of the actual interactions that transpire between police officers and community members. As discussed earlier, our research team developed a method to analyze the footage from these cameras to quantify police-community relations (Voigt et al., 2017). We transcribed the interactions shown in the footage and built computer models that reliably predict respect based on linguistic features—such as apologies, expressions of gratitude, and the use of formal versus informal titles—that mark politeness, power, and social distance. In so doing, we were able to systematically examine the respectfulness of the actual words officers speak to the drivers they pull over. We found racial disparities in the level of respect: officers spoke to Black drivers less respectfully than they spoke to White drivers. Based on these findings, our team has developed officer trainings that are designed to help officers better leverage language to build trust and make members of the community feel more respected, while at the same time deescalating stops and increasing safety.

The potential use and benefits of body-worn camera footage are far-reaching. Among our team's fifty recommendations, we noted that the footage could be used in a wide variety of ways, including as an educational tool to help train officers and as a means of self-reflection and self-improvement through routine review of officers' own footage (see Eberhardt, 2016, chapter 6). The footage could also be used to evaluate the impact of agency policies and determine the actual rate of compliance with those policies. For example, in Oakland, officers are required to inform members of the public of their right to refuse a consent search. Command staff could potentially audit the footage to determine whether officers are complying by informing citizens

of their rights. Going a step further, police officials could examine the footage and uncover how policies are actually implemented on the ground. For example, does the race of the person stopped affect the likelihood that officers will inform them of their rights? Once informed, are Black community members less likely than White community members to refuse a consent search? In this case, the footage could be used to explore unanticipated implications of seemingly race-neutral policies. African American community members might not feel that they have a choice in refusing a police officer's request, or they might be more fearful about the possible consequences of a refusal; in response, they may submit to consent searches at higher rates than similarly situated White community members. If this were the case, having this information would help a law enforcement agency tease apart that the racial disparities in consent searches that would ensue were not the result of officers "targeting" certain groups, but of how the community members themselves differentially responded. All in all, body-worn cameras are an important tool that can aid law enforcement professionals in improving their relationships with their communities. Rather than being restricted to high-profile, fatal incidents, hopefully the footage from officers' body-worn cameras will increasingly come to be used to literally show the positive changes in policing.

Change Specific Local Law Enforcement Agency Policies to Reduce Racial Disparities

Changing local law enforcement agency policy as a direct response to existing racial disparities in enforcement activity is an effective means of reducing disparities. For instance, racial disparities in the use of consent searches (LaFraniere & Lehen, 2015; Palomino, 2016) have led to policy changes that mandate officers to obtain written consent or explicitly tell community members that they have the right to deny an officer's request to search them (LaFraniere, 2015). In Oakland, this policy change has led to a large reduction in consent searches, importantly without an increase in crime.

Other changes aimed at strengthening the underlying justification for police stops can potentially reduce the effects of implicit bias and, on the community member's side, reduce the ambiguity and uncertainty that can surround police encounters. In 2013, the NYPD mandated via a departmental memo that officers submit narrative descriptions to their supervisors justifying the reasons they had made stops during their shifts. This policy change was made less than two weeks before the start of a trial that would result in a federal judge ruling that how the NYPD had implemented its stop-and-frisk program was unconstitutional and racially discriminatory (*Floyd v. City of New York*, 2013). Analyses of NYPD stop data demonstrate that this policy

change improved the quality of policing by increasing the rate of justified stops (Mummolo, 2016). The researcher specifically examined whether a stop that was made due to the suspected criminal possession of a weapon in fact yielded a weapon, which provides a more objective marker of whether or not an officer's suspicion and the stated basis for making the stop was justified (e.g., Goel, Rao, & Shroff, 2016). In the 30 days prior to the policy change, 8,626 individuals were stopped for criminal possession of a weapon but were later found not to have been in possession of a weapon. In the 30 days after the policy change, this number dropped by 40 percent, to 5,182. In this same period, the number of stops that yielded a weapon fell by 5 percent (from 322 to 306), a decline of, on average, 0.53 stops per day. The majority of people (85 percent) stopped by the NYPD in 2013 were Black or Hispanic. After the policy change, the numbers of Black and Hispanic community members stopped for criminal possession of a weapon decreased the most, falling by approximately 36 percent for each group. Thus, requiring police officers to clearly articulate their objective reasons for making a stop, as opposed to checking out people who look suspicious or like they might be "up to no good" (Epp et al., 2014), kept thousands of individuals and in particular people of color, from being contacted by police, while at the same time not posing a threat to public safety or hampering law enforcement's ability to recover weapons (see also Goel et al., 2016).

Routine police stops, even when they do not end with a citation or arrest, have a human toll. In response to continually being stopped by the police, African Americans describe fear, resentment, and a sense of feeling violated—all of which can cause them to call into question their status as equal citizens who are free to move about without the intrusion and surveillance of the state (Epp et al., 2014). Over time, the feeling of being a target can undermine a person's dignity and erode community members' trust and sense of the police as fair and legitimate (Tyler, 2003). By aiming to reduce the overall number of stops and prioritizing the *quality* of enforcement activity over sheer quantity, which is in line with an industry move toward "precision policing" that prizes efficiency (Bratton et al., 2018), law enforcement can reduce the negative impact on people's lives while simultaneously maintaining public safety.

CONCLUSION

There are challenges facing policing, but there are also opportunities. A greater appreciation of the role of implicit bias and the power of institutions can help law enforcement work to reduce racial disparities and lessen the potential harmful impact of policing on communities. To make meaningful

change, local law enforcement agencies must abandon the sole focus on fighting crime and commit to engaging in positive interactions with the community and finding new approaches to making policing more equitable. Implementing solutions takes willingness to question the status quo, creativity and innovation, and leadership, all of which are exactly what this moment requires.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, M. (2010). *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Massachusetts & American Civil Liberties Union Racial Justice Program. (2014). *Black, Brown and Targeted: A Report on Boston Police Department Street Encounters From 2007–2010*. Retrieved from <https://www.aclum.org/sites/default/files/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/reports-black-brown-and-targeted.pdf>.
- Apuzzo, M., & Cohen, S. (2015, August 11). Data on use of force by police across U.S. proves almost useless. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/12/us/data-on-use-of-force-by-police-across-us-proves-almost-useless.html>.
- Ariel, B., Farrar, W. A., & Sutherland, A. (2015). The effect of police body-worn cameras on use of force and citizens' complaints against the police: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *31*, 509–535. doi:10.1007/s10940-014-9236-3.
- Ayres, I., & Borowsky, J. (2008). *A Study of Racially Disparate Outcomes in the Los Angeles Police Department*. Prepared for ACLU of Southern California. Retrieved from <https://www.aclusocal.org/sites/default/files/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/11837125-LAPD-Racial-Profiling-Report-ACLU.pdf>.
- Baumgartner, F. R., Epp, D. A., & Shoub, K. (2018). *Suspect Citizens: What 20 Million Traffic Stops Tell Us About Policing and Race*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bazon, E. (2016, October 18). How “bias” went from a psychological observation to a political accusation. *The New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/23/magazine/how-bias-went-from-a-psychological-observation-to-a-political-accusation.html?rref=collection/byline/emily-bazon&action=click&contentCollection=undefined@ion=stream&module=stream_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=35&pgtype=collection
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bor, J., Venkataramani, A. S., Williams, D. R., & Tsai, A. C. (2018). Police killings and their spillover effects on the mental health of black Americans: A population-based, quasi-experimental study. *The Lancet*, *392*(10144), 302–310. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(18)31130-9.

- Bratton, W., Eide, S., Goldsmith, S., Hendrix, M., Husock, H., Miller, J., . . . Salins, P. (2018). *Urban Policy 2018*. Manhattan Institute. Retrieved from https://media4.manhattan-institute.org/sites/default/files/MI_Urban_Policy_2018.pdf.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1997). *What is the Sequence of Events in the Criminal Justice System?* [infographic]. Retrieved from <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/cjsc/publications/misc/cinc/BJSflowchrtFCColor.pdf>.
- Camp, N. P., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2019). *Where Black and White Meets Blue: How Institutional Interactions Erode Police-Community Trust*. Manuscript under revision.
- Camp, N. P., Prabhakaran, V., Hetey, R. C., Monin, B., Jurafsky, D., & Eberhardt, J. L. (in prep). *Racial Disparities in the Discretionary Context of Police Encounters*.
- Castelli, L., Zogmaister, C., & Tomelleri, S. (2009). The transmission of racial attitudes within the family. *Developmental Psychology, 45*(2), 586–591. doi:10.1037/a0014619.
- Cesario, J., Johnson, D. J., & Terrill, W. (2018). Is there evidence of racial disparity in police use of deadly force? Analyses of officer-involved fatal shootings in 2015–2016. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 10*(5), 586–595. doi:10.1177/1948550618775108.
- Charbonneau, A., Spencer, K., & Glaser, J. (2017). Understanding racial disparities in police use of lethal force: Lessons from fatal police-on-police shootings. *Journal of Social Issues, 73*(4), 744–767. doi:10.1111/josi.12246.
- Correll, J., Hudson, S. M., Guillermo, S., & Ma, D. S. (2014). The police officer's dilemma: A decade of research on racial bias in the decision to shoot. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 8*(5), 201–213. doi:10.1111/spc3.12099.
- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2002). The police officer's dilemma: Using ethnicity to disambiguate potentially threatening individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(6), 1314–1329. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1314.
- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2007). The influence of stereotypes on decisions to shoot. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37*(6), 1102–1117. doi:10.1002/ejsp.450.
- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., Wittenbrink, B., Sadler, M. S., & Keesee, T. (2007). Across the thin blue line: Police officers and racial bias in the decision to shoot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(6), 1006–1023. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1006.
- Correll, J., Urland, G. R., & Ito, T. A. (2006). Event-related potentials and the decision to shoot: The role of threat perception and cognitive control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 42*(1), 120–128. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2005.02.006.
- Cunningham, W. A., Johnson, M. K., Raye, C. L., Gatenby, J. C., Gore, J. C., & Banaji, M. R. (2004). Separable neural components in the processing of black and white faces. *Psychological Science, 15*(12), 806–813. doi:10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00760.x.
- Del Toro, J., Lloyd, T., Buchanan, K. S., Robins, S. J., Bencharit, L. Z., Smiedt, M. G., . . . Goff, P. A. (2019). The criminogenic and psychological effects of police stops on adolescent black and Latino boys. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116*(17), 8261–8268. doi:10.1073/pnas.1808976116.

- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(1), 5–18. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.56.1.5.
- DiAngelo, R. (2018). *White Fragility: Why It's So Hard for White People to Talk About Racism*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Duncan, B. L. (1976). Differential social perception and attribution of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping of blacks. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(4), 590–598. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.34.4.590.
- Duru, N. J. (2004). The Central Park Five, the Scottsboro Boys, and the myth of the bestial black man. *Cardozo Law Review*, 25, 1315–1366. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=814072.
- Eberhardt, J. L. (Ed.). (2016). *Strategies for Change: Research Initiatives and Recommendations to Improve Police Community Relations in Oakland, Calif.* Stanford, CA: SPARQ.
- Eberhardt, J. L. (2019). *Biased: Uncovering the Hidden Prejudice that Shapes What We See, Think, and Do*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V., & Davies, P. G. (2004). Seeing black: Race, crime, and visual processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6), 876–893. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.876.
- Edwards, F., Lee, H., & Esposito, M. (2019). Risk of being killed by police use of force in the United States by age, race–ethnicity, and sex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1073/pnas.1821204116.
- Eith, C., & Durose, M. R. (2011). *Contacts between Police and the Public, 2008*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cpp08.pdf>.
- Epp, C. R., Maynard-Moody, S., & Haider-Markel, D. P. (2014). *Pulled Over: How Police Stops Define Race and Citizenship*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Federal Bureau of Investigations. (2013). Murder: Race, ethnicity, and sex of victim by race, ethnicity, and sex of offender, 2013 [single victim/single offender] [graph]. Retrieved from https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/offenses-known-to-law-enforcement/expanded-homicide/expanded_homicide_data_table_6_murder_race_and_sex_of_victim_by_race_and_sex_of_offender_2013.xls.
- Federal Bureau of Investigations. (2016). Table 21: Arrests by Race and Ethnicity, 2016 [graph]. Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2016/crime-in-the-u.s.-2016/topic-pages/tables/table-21>.
- Floyd v. City of N.Y., 959 F. Supp. 2d 540 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).
- Frederick, B., & Stemen, D. (2012). *The Anatomy of Discretion: An Analysis of Prosecutorial Decision Making*. Retrieved from https://storage.googleapis.com/vera-web-assets/downloads/Publications/anatomy-of-discretion/legacy_downloads/anatomy-of-discretion-summary-report.pdf.
- Fryer, R. G. (2019). An empirical analysis of racial differences in police use of force. *Journal of Political Economy*, 127(3), 1210–1261. doi:10.3386/w22399.
- Gelman, A., Fagan, J., & Kiss, A. (2007). An analysis of the New York City Police Department's "stop-and-frisk" policy in the context of claims of racial

- bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(479), 813–823. doi:10.1198/016214506000001040.
- Glaser, J. (2015). *Suspect Race: Causes and Consequences of Racial Profiling*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Glaser, J., & Knowles, E. D. (2008). Implicit motivation to control prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(1), 164–172. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2007.01.002.
- Goel, S., Rao, J. M., & Shroff, R. (2016). Precinct or prejudice? Understanding racial disparities in New York City's stop-and-frisk policy. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 10(1), 365–394. doi:10.1214/15-aos897.
- Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human: Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(2), 292–306. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.292.
- Goff, P. A., Lloyd, T., Geller, A., Raphael, S., & Glaser, J. (2016). *The Science of Justice: Race, Arrests, and Police Use of Force*. Center for Policing Equity. Retrieved from https://policingequity.org/images/pdfs-doc/CPE_SoJ_Race-Arrests-UoF_2016-07-08-1130.pdf.
- Graham v. Connor, 490 U.S. 386 (1989).
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102(1), 4–27. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.102.1.4.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1464–1480. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464.
- Grogger, J., & Ridgeway, G. (2006). Testing for racial profiling in traffic stops from behind a veil of darkness. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(475), 878–887. doi:10.1198/016214506000000168.
- Hall, A. V., Hall, E. V., & Perry, J. L. (2016). Black and blue: Exploring racial bias and law enforcement in the killings of unarmed black male civilians. *American Psychologist*, 71(3), 175–186. doi:10.1037/a0040109.
- Hawkins, H., & Thomas, R. (1991). White policing of black populations: A history of race and social control in America. In E. Cashmore & E. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Out of Order? Policing Black People* (pp. 42–64). London, UK: Routledge.
- Hetey, R. C., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2014). Racial disparities in incarceration increase acceptance of punitive policies. *Psychological Science*, 25(10), 1949–1954. doi:10.1177/0956797614540307.
- Hetey, R. C., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2018). The numbers don't speak for themselves: Racial disparities and the persistence of inequality in the criminal justice system. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(3), 183–187. doi:10.1177/0963721418763931.
- Hetey, R. C., Monin, B., Maitreyi, A., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2016a). *Data for Change: A Statistical Analysis of Police Stops, Searches, Handcuffings, and Arrests in Oakland, Calif., 2013–2014*. Stanford SPARQ. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/1CbKlWxIvQvbuTfhOQhnlrXOjf_xduIC/view.

- Hetey, R. C., Monin, B., Maitreyi, A., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2016b). Summary of the methods and results in Data for Change. In J. L. Eberhardt (Ed.), *Strategies for Change: Research Initiatives and Recommendations to Improve Police-Community Relations in Oakland, Calif.* (pp. 8–13). Stanford, CA: SPARQ. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/1q0Lyfb-Z9pX1ggooGAND0_gZag-fbbZn/view.
- Jennings, W. G., Lynch, M. D., & Fridell, L. A. (2015). Evaluating the impact of police officer body-worn cameras (BWCs) on response-to-resistance and serious external complaints: Evidence from the Orlando Police Department (OPD) experience utilizing a randomized controlled experiment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(6), 480–486. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2015.10.003.
- Kay, A. C., Gaucher, D., Peach, J. M., Laurin, K., Friesen, J., Zanna, M. P., & Spencer, S. J. (2009). Inequality, discrimination, and the power of the status quo: Direct evidence for a motivation to see the way things are as the way they should be. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(3), 421–434. doi:10.1037/a0015997.
- LaFraniere, S. (2015, November 11). Greensboro puts focus on reducing racial bias. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/12/us/greensboro-puts-focus-on-reducing-racial-bias.html>.
- LaFraniere, S., & Lehen, A. W. (2015, October 24). The disproportionate risks of driving while black. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/25/us/racial-disparity-traffic-stops-driving-black.html>.
- Lambert, A. J., Payne, B. K., Jacoby, L. L., Shaffer, L. M., Chasteen, A. L., & Khan, S. R. (2003). Stereotypes as dominant responses: On the “social facilitation” of prejudice in anticipated public contexts. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 84(2), 277–295. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.84.2.277.
- Lewis, M. R. (2004). Lost in probation: Contrasting the treatment of probationary search agreements in California and federal courts. *UCLA Law Review*, 51, 1703–1750.
- Lowery, W. (2016). *They Can't Kill Us All: Ferguson, Baltimore, and a New Era in America's Racial Justice Movement*. New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.
- Mapping Police Violence. (n.d.). [Interactive map of police killings in the United States]. *Police Violence Map*. Retrieved from <https://mappingpoliceviolence.org/>.
- Miller, L., Toliver, J., & Police Executive Research Forum. (2014). *Implementing a Body-Worn Camera Program: Recommendations and Lessons Learned*. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov/iso/opa/resources/472014912134715246869.pdf>.
- Morgan, R. E., & Truman, J. L. (2018). Criminal victimization, 2017. Bureau of justice statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv17.pdf>.
- Morin, R., Parker, K., Stepler, R., & Mercer, A. (2017). *Behind the Badge: Amid Protests and Calls for Reform, How Police View Their Jobs, Key Issues and Recent Fatal Encounters between Blacks and Police*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/01/11/behind-the-badge/>.
- Muhammad, K. G. (2010). *The Condemnation of Blackness: Race, Crime, and the Making of Modern Urban America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mummolo, J. (2016). *Can New Procedures Improve the Quality of Policing? The Case of Stop, Question and Frisk in New York City* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

- Najdowski, C. J., Bottoms, B. L., & Goff, P. A. (2015). Stereotype threat and racial differences in citizens' experiences of police encounters. *Law and Human Behavior, 39*(5), 463–477. doi:10.1037/lhb0000140.
- New York Civil Liberties Union. (2013). *Stop-and-Frisk 2012: NYCLU Briefing*. Retrieved from New York Civil Liberties Union website: https://www.nyclu.org/sites/default/files/publications/2012_Report_NYCLU_0.pdf.
- Niles, H. (2016, January 13). Despite mandate, traffic-stop race data remain elusive in Vermont. *Seven Days*. Retrieved from <https://www.sevendaysvt.com/vermont/despite-mandate-traffic-stop-race-data-remain-elusive-in-vermont/Content?oid=3111020>.
- Norman, G. (2019, May 9). California police chief says proposed use-of-force law will further put officers in danger. *Fox News*. Retrieved from <https://www.foxnews.com/us/police-chief-california-proposed-law-change>.
- O'Reilly, A. (2017, August 21). Blue racism? New York police association says cops are victims of racism. *Fox News*. Retrieved from <https://www.foxnews.com/us/blue-racism-new-york-police-association-says-cops-are-victims-of-racism>.
- Palomino, J. (2016, April 8). Racial disparities in SF traffic searches raise concerns of bias. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from <https://www.sfchronicle.com/crime/article/Racial-disparities-in-SF-traffic-searches-raise-7235690.php>.
- Peffley, M., & Hurwitz, J. (2007). Persuasion and resistance: Race and the death penalty in America. *American Journal of Political Science, 51*(4), 996–1012. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2007.00293.x.
- Pierson, E., Simoiu, C., Overgoor, J., Corbett-Davies, S., Ramachandran, V., Phillips, C., & Goel, S. (2019). *A Large-Scale Analysis of Racial Disparities in Police Stops across the United States* (Working paper). Retrieved from <https://5harad.com/papers/100M-stops.pdf>.
- Pratto, F., & Bargh, J. A. (1991). Stereotyping based on apparently individuating information: Trait and global components of sex stereotypes under attention overload. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 27*(1), 26–47. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(91)90009-u.
- President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*. Retrieved from https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/taskforce_finalreport.pdf.
- Roeder, O., Eisen, L., & Bowling, J. (2015). *What Caused the Crime Decline?* Brennan Center for Justice. Retrieved from https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/publications/What_Caused_The_Crime_Decline.pdf.
- Sagar, H. A., & Schofield, J. W. (1980). Racial and behavioral cues in black and white children's perceptions of ambiguously aggressive acts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*(4), 590–598. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.39.4.590.
- Simoiu, C., Corbett-Davies, S., & Goel, S. (2017). The problem of infra-marginality in outcome tests for discrimination. *The Annals of Applied Statistics, 11*(3), 1193–1216. doi:10.1214/17-aos1058.
- Smith, M. R., Kaminski, R. J., Alpert, G. P., Fridell, L. A., MacDonald, J., & Kubu, B. (2010). *A Multi-Method Evaluation of Police Use of Force Outcomes, Executive Summary* (Report No. 231177). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/231177.pdf>.

- Solomon, A. L., Kachnowski, V., & Bhati, A. (2005). *Does Parole Work? Analyzing the Impact of Postprison Supervision on Rearrest Outcomes*. The Urban Institute. Retrieved from: https://www.urban.org/research/publication/does-parole-work/view/full_report.
- Stepanikova, I. (2012). Racial-ethnic biases, time pressure, and medical decisions. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 53(3), 329–343. doi:10.1177/0022146512445807.
- Tennessee v. Garner, 471 U.S. 1 (1985).
- The Guardian. (n.d.). *The Counted: Tracking People Killed by Police in the United States*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/series/counted-us-police-killings>.
- The Sentencing Project. (2018). *Report of The Sentencing Project to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Contemporary Forms of Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance: Regarding Racial Disparities in the United States Criminal Justice System*. Retrieved from <https://www.sentencingproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/UN-Report-on-Racial-Disparities.pdf>.
- Tyler, T. R. (2003). Procedural justice, legitimacy, and the effective rule of law. *Crime and Justice*, 30, 283–357. doi:10.1086/652233.
- Tyler, T. R., & Wakslak, C. J. (2004). Profiling and police legitimacy: Procedural justice, attributions of motive, and acceptance of police authority. *Criminology*, 42(2), 253–282. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2004.tb00520.x.
- United States Commission on Civil Rights. (2018). *Police Use of Force: An Examination of Modern Policing Practices*. Retrieved from <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2018/11-15-Police-Force.pdf>.
- United States Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, & United States Attorney's Office Northern District of Illinois. (2017). *Investigation of the Chicago Police Department*. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov/opa/file/925846/download>.
- Voigt, R., Camp, N. P., Prabhakaran, V., Hamilton, W. L., Hetey, R. C., Griffiths, C. M., . . . Eberhardt, J. L. (2017). Language from police body camera footage shows racial disparities in officer respect. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(25), 6521–6526. doi:10.1073/pnas.1702413114.
- Weaver, V. M., & Lerman, A. E. (2010). Political consequences of the carceral state. *American Political Science Review*, 104(4), 817–833. doi:10.1017/s0003055410000456.
- Weisbuch, M., Pauker, K., & Ambady, N. (2009). The subtle transmission of race bias via televised nonverbal behavior. *Science*, 326(5960), 1711–1714. doi:10.1126/science.1178358.
- Western, B. (2006). *Punishment and Inequality in America*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Wilson, J. P., Hugenberg, K., & Rule, N. O. (2017). Racial bias in judgments of physical size and formidability: From size to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(1), 59–80. doi:10.1037/pspi0000092.
- Yokum, D., Ravishankar, A., & Coppock, A. (2017). *Evaluating the Effects of Police Body-Worn Cameras: A Randomized Controlled Trial* (Working paper). Retrieved from The Lab @ DC website: <http://iapa-il.org/news/TheLabDC.pdf>.