**National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice:
Research Roundtable**

Yale Law School
November 19-20, 2015

Table of Contents

Overview

The National Initiative for Building Community Trust (National Initiative) is a three-year project that is funded by the Department of Justice designed to improve the relationship between the police and the communities they serve. In particular, the Initiative aims to increase public trust and confidence in both officers and in the legal system that they represent. These increases will build the popular legitimacy of law enforcement — a critical policing reform goal according to the President's Task force on 21st Century Policing.

The National Initiative draws upon the social science insights regarding legitimacy contained within three literatures: procedural justice; implicit bias; and reconciliation. To facilitate this effort, the Initiative brings together leading researchers in each of these three areas of study: Tracey Meares and Tom Tyler (procedural justice); Phillip Goff (implicit bias); and David Kennedy (reconciliation). The National Initiative also benefits from the experience of Tracie Keesee, a former police executive, who directs the effort at John Jay College.

The Initiative aims guide groundbreaking social science research on popular legitimacy and trust-building and to develop and implement interventions based on extant findings. These programs will be carried out in six demonstration cities, where their efficacy will be tested empirically. Additionally, the National Initiative was charged with convening a roundtable, the goal of which was to identify an agenda for future research in the areas mentioned. This is a report of the primary recommendations of that roundtable.

The Roundtable

The Initiative seeks to push forward theory and science in the areas noted above. While there are already clear and applicable findings in what we have described as our three "pillars" of procedural justice, implicit bias and reconciliation, there are also important unanswered questions to be explored if the potential for evidence-based policing and reformation of the criminal justice system is to be fully realized. To define these areas of future research, the roundtable brought together experts in each of the three areas. These experts prepared and presented background papers, and then each panel engaged in a discussion to develop the ideas contained in the background papers.

The discussions began with an understanding of what is already known in terms of basic science within each of the three areas, and the ways in which this knowledge has shaped extant interventions to improve police-community relations. This information is summarized at the beginning of each of the subsections below. The goal of the roundtable, however, was to move *beyond* this application of current findings and identify what we do not know at this time but believe could contribute to future efforts to build police legitimacy. To this end, we here focus in particular on the portions of the panel presentations and discussions in which participants addressed open questions. In communicating these questions here, we separate them into research questions that are already well-defined and on which all panelists were in agreement, and areas in which more research is required, but where the best paths forward have not yet been explicated.

Panel 1: Procedural Justice

This panel was composed of four subject matter experts: Jeffrey Fagan, *Isidor and Seville Professor*, Law School, Columbia University; Rebecca Hollander-Blumoff, *Professor*, Law School, Washington University in St. Louis; Lauren Ouziel, *Assistant Professor of Law*, Temple University Beasley School of Law; and, David Rottman, *Principal Court Research Consultant*, the National Center for State Courts. The panel was moderated by Tracey Meares, *Walton Hale Hamilton Professor of Law*, Yale Law School and Tom Tyler, *Macklin Fleming Professor of Law and Professor of Psychology*, Yale Law School.

Background

During the last several decades a large number of studies have examined the basis of public support for legal authorities. The primary factor that shapes public views about the police is the public's assessment of the fairness of the procedures that the police use to exercise their authority. This is true both when people have personal experiences with police officers and when they are making overall assessments of police actions in their community or in the country at large. People do not principally react to the outcomes they receive or to issues of performance, such as speed of response or effectiveness in controlling crime—they respond to procedural justice. This includes issues related both to how the police make decisions – whether they give people voice and are understood to be making neutral decisions – and how the police treat people – whether they are courteous, respectful and act in ways that suggest a sincere and benevolent concern for the people they serve.

The recognition that procedural justice shapes legitimacy is the basis for several aspects of the National Initiative. First, there is a training component. Through a train-the-trainer model, every department is receiving procedural justice and implicit bias training for all of their officers. There is also a parallel training component for command staff. Second, the initiative involves a

review of the current policies and practices of the involved departments. The goal of this review is to develop a set of best practices that are most likely to build legitimacy.

Panelists

Jeffrey Fagan

One key in the quest to better understand policing is the issue of officers' mental health. Policing is a stressful job, and over time officers develop a variety of types of stress-related conditions, including PTSD. These conditions have important implications, both for the community (insofar as they influence officer behavior on the street) and for the individual officer (in terms of short and long-term well-being).

Despite awareness of this reality, there is relatively little empirical research that aims to better understand the relationship between job conditions, social context, personality, police organizational characteristics, job responsibilities, mental health status, behavior on the street and well-being. These relationships must be better understood, however, in order to more effectively address issues within police departments, and between departments and the communities they serve. As such, they must be the focus of future empirical research. For example, recent studies show direct links between the internal dynamics of police departments and the mental health of officers. This suggests a clear avenue for improvement through organizational design. But, the broader issue of how officer mental health is shaped by the experiencing of policing remains unexamined and in need of empirical research.

Rebecca Hollander-Blumoff

Whereas there have been many studies that aim to characterize the behaviors that we would like for officers to exhibit (specifically those that reflect procedural justice), there has been little

attention to the factors that influence officers' ability to enact these behaviors, including the visceral and emotional states that officers are likely to experience, and which are known to affect decision-making in other areas. Officers are trained to behave rationally and to control their emotions, but the nature of policing is that it involves many stressful and emotionally intense experiences. The nature of self-control in situations that require deliberate decision making, but which are also rapidly evolving and emotionally volatile, is largely unexamined. In particular, how is the ability to exercise self-control related to the capacity to enact positive fair procedures in challenging circumstances?

Similarly, the dynamic and dyadic nature of police interactions, and the way in which this influences behavior and decision making, has not been explored. Police officers do not behave in a vacuum. Rather, their behavior is conditioned by the actions of the people with whom they interact. How does community members' behavior shape that of the police officers? What determines the officer's capacity to enact fair procedures in the face of emotion, especially anger and expressed hostility? What shapes the ability of officers to deescalate emotion, either through the use of respectful procedures, active listening or other approaches?

Finally, another important limitation of existing research is that it tends to be been based upon individual's subjective characterizations of events. The proliferation of videos from police cameras and civilian recordings, however, makes clear that there is often a discrepancy between reports about events and "neutral" ratings of what occurred. This aspect of policing needs to be further examined, with particular attention to the reality that there are at least two versions of events in any situation. Research needs to triangulate among three sources of information: neutral coding of events by observers or from video; the officer's perspective; and the perspective of the civilian. When do these align and, if they do not, why is there a discrepancy?

Lauren Ouziel

Changes in policing must be rooted in an understanding of the incentive structures of police departments. This implicates several questions. First, how do the police define their mission and objectives? Second, what are the metrics of success? Do the police focus on arrests and clearance rates? Officers often focus their efforts on those issues that they believe will lead to being considered good police officers. This includes what leads to promotion, but also what leads to respect and prominence in the department. Who received the commendations and who is spoken of as reflecting the best in the department? The key to developing a strategy of change is better understanding the antecedents of procedural justice in the behavior of field officers. And, this is ultimately related to how the police conceive of their jobs.

Initial training is important, but following their training, officers enter into an ongoing organization with its own dynamics. Research must examine how the police and police departments conceive of their missions and how they develop and implement a structure that encourages officers to address departmental concerns through their actions in the community. Two parallel processes need to be studied. First, what gives meaning to policing? Officers want to be good at their jobs, to legitimatize their actions in their own eyes. This requires them to have a conception, which they share with others, of what constitutes good police work. Second, the department communicates messages about what is desirable through the actions that it commends and rewards. Before change can occur it is important to understand the nature of these internal dynamics to identify potential for for change.

It is further important to recognize that the police function within a larger context that involves prosecutors and judges. Their conception of their behavior is shaped by their understanding of both lawfulness, as defined by these other actors, and what is valuable police

activity. Prosecutors, in particular, are key actors in defining what is "rightful" policing. The police tailor their actions both to the anticipated actions of judges and prosecutors and to the dictates of the Constitution as they understand them through their experiences with these legal authorities. The role of prosecutors, while acknowledged to be crucial, is little studied. Yet, as has become clear in recent police related shooting controversies, the police are attuned to how their actions will be understood by prosecutors.

David Rottman

Research has established that the procedural justice of police actions shapes legitimacy. We now need to develop a better model for understanding how personal experience is combined with vicarious information gained from information about the experiences of others, as well as other forms of information such as that in the media. For many people the most significant proportion of their "experience" with the police is not personal. It comes through second hand information. What is the nature of the processes by which information travels through communities via networks and informal forms of communication such as social media (e.g. Facebook; Twitter; etc.)? Information also is transmitted through day-to-day communications that people have with friends, family members and associates. Without an understanding of how people develop their views, it is hard to identify best strategies for communicating information.

It is also important to recognize that both police legitimacy and judgments about police behavior are not only important on the individual level, but also a distinct and separately important community-level perception. Most procedural justice research has been conducted at the individual level even if it asks individuals if what they think is generally true. But it is equally important to examine the aggregate influences of what people in a community think

about policing. This last issue is critical for collective understandings of procedural justice are not merely aggregations of individual measures.

Discussion and Implications for the Future

Procedural justice must be a strong pillar in any effort to understand and change popular views about the police legitimacy. A large and methodologically diverse literature links procedural justice to legitimacy makes examining what is known about procedural justice is a good beginning point for the Initiative. The position papers described above make clear that there are important areas for further research and that the study of these issues can enhance understandings of procedural justice in ways that will have practical implications for efforts to improve policing.

Panel 2: Implicit Bias

This panel was composed of Lasana Harris, *Senior Lecturer in Experimental Psychology*, University College London; Jack Dovidio, *Carl Iver Hovland Professor of Psychology*, Yale University; and Jennifer Richeson, *Professor of Psychology*, Northwestern/Yale University. The moderator was Phillip Atiba Goff, *Associate Professor of Psychology*, UCLA.

Background

Policing in the United States has long been intertwined with issues of potential bias toward minorities. In part this is an issue because minority group status has been and continues to be linked to economic disadvantage and offending behaviors. In addition, when people do not have avenues to successful social integration due to discrimination and when they live in "poverty

traps" created by the decisions of private and state actors, those places become sites of particular focus for the police.

While the recent history of policing has involved efforts at professionalization, issues of race continue to be distinctly salient and controversial. Recently this issue has been reflected in a series of public controversies, particularly over racial profiling and disparate rates of police shootings by race. The question is whether observed disparities reflect differences in the likelihood of criminality and are therefore connected to crime fighting or result from prejudice. As an example, studies make clear that the police are more likely to stop minorities than whites on the street in many American communities. Does this reflect a reasonable police effort to stop those who are more likely to be committing crimes or who live in areas of high crime? Studies have tried to relate stop rates to relative rates of criminality. They have also examined the outcome of stops, i.e. how frequently those stopped have guns and drugs. These studies suggest that disparate rates of contact are partially but not completely explained by differences in criminality, suggesting that other factors such as bias are also involved.

These issues of racial bias in policing are not new to America; what has changed is our understanding of the nature of bias. Research shows that overt racism has declined strikingly over the last several decades. Americans are less likely to hold, express or act on overtly negative stereotypes toward minorities today than in the past. But social science research makes clear that this does not mean that bias no longer exists. There is evidence that people continue to have and to act upon implicit biases. These are biases that people hold without awareness.

Perception research emphasizes that such biases perform an important function for people because they allow them to respond quickly to others in interactions. Hence, efforts at change should focus on mechanisms for correcting the influence of inaccurate biases upon behavior,

rather than upon efforts to eliminate implicit biases. The key problem is when biases are inaccurate.

As with overt biases, the issue is distinguishing associations from biases. If people associate different characteristics with people of varying ethnicity, age or gender because of past experience, this means that their initial reaction to individuals will differ based upon those past associations. They may react with fear when they encounter a young minority male not because of anything that person is or is not doing, but due to a past association of young minority men with criminality. Such associations are reflected in studies showing that the people are differentially likely to make mistakes and are willing to shoot young minority men in "shoot the shooter" experiments because they erroneously think they are holding weapons. Beyond the problem of applying associations to new experiences with individuals, studies find that many people have misperceptions about minorities that are negative and that are not supported by facts. People are typically not aware that they hold these misperceptions and do not recognize how they influence their perceptions of events. For example, people are found to have stereotypes about young minority men that exaggerate their strength, size and dangerousness. These stereotypes lead people in general and police officers in particular to have irrationally high fears about the risks posed by young minority men.

Biases, overt or implicit, pose a clear threat to efforts to build trust and confidence in the police, especially in the minority community. This has been strikingly revealed in the past year by a series of racially-tinged controversies over the police killing of African-Americas. But, it reflects a long-term issue in American policing. There is a large race-based gap in trust and confidence in the police documented in many years of polling, a gap that has not diminished in

recent years.[1] The issues for the roundtable include both the implications of existing implicit

bias research for police legitimacy and identifying areas that need further study.

Panelists

Jack Dovidio

A number of studies suggest that implicit racial biases exist today. For example, one study

found evidence of their existence in 71.5% of the population. This means that issues of race and

responses to people of differing races continue to be important in all types of everyday

interactions. This includes encounters between the police and members of the community.

A crucial finding of studies of implicit bias is that white and minority group members

interpret the same experiences in different ways. Many misunderstandings occur because both

police officers and members of the public assume that their differential reactions to an event

reflect bad faith on the part of the other party, when research suggests both sides can be acting in

good faith but perceiving and interpreting the event through different lenses. Minority group

members focus on nonverbal behavior and subtle signs of prejudice, often labeled micro-

aggressions. Their focus makes sense in that research suggests that implicit bias is revealed

through these more indirect mechanisms. Whites focus on whether they feel they are acting in a

biased way, and make that determination largely based upon whether they engage in overt

---

[1] A recent poll suggests that nonwhites' views of police officers have rebounded somewhat from the
dramatic low they reached in 2014. But they have not recovered to pre-2014 levels. *See*
http://www.gallup.com/poll/187874/americans-faith-honesty-ethics-police-rebounds.aspx ("Four in 10
nonwhites now rate the ethical standards of police as very high or high — a sharp increase from the 23%
who held this view in 2014. A steep drop in nonwhites' ratings of the police in 2014 was the sole cause of
the profession's overall ratings dip [from 54% to 48% rating officers' ethical standards as high or very
high] last year. While nonwhites' attitudes have not rebounded to their pre-2014 levels, the slight increase
in whites' positive views of the police this year, from 59% to 64%, coupled with the rise in nonwhites'
ratings, pushes the overall percentage back to the 'normal' range seen in recent years.").

racism. Hence, the two parties to an interaction can come to different conclusions about whether racial discrimination is occurring.

Minority group members or those with less power in an interaction also focus upon the behavior of the other party because they are sensitive to whether bias is an issue. Because their status is more secure, white people or people in authority such as police officers focus more strongly upon whether they believe that they are acting in an unprejudiced way as opposed to whether the other party has or is expressing disrespect of bias.

There are two key implications of this for policing. First, it is important to examine the operation of implicit biases in policing. In particular, to what degree and in what ways can the influence of such biases upon behavior be controlled or limited. The operation of biases is a natural part of perception, but the influence of incorrect characterizations of particular groups needs to be muted. Information about the dynamics of implicit bias needs to be incorporated into police training with a focus not on accusations of prejudice but upon developing policies and practices.

Second, police policies and practices need to be reviewed to determine whether they do indeed minimize the operation of implicit biases. One general finding is that biases are most likely to influence behavior in ambiguous situations. Context is critical and combines with bias in shaping the tenor of interactions. Hence, there is a need for specific protocols for action in different circumstances. The effectiveness of these protocols needs to be evaluated empirically.

It is also important to focus on the psychological factors that encourage stereotyping and dehumanization. When people are acting emotionally, when their cognitive resources are depleted and when they feel threatened, they are less able to recognize their commonality with others; more likely to think in terms of group stereotypes; less able to feel empathy; and more

likely to act reflexively and through a need for control. Hence, more research is needed on strategies for keeping police officers out of these modes of thinking and acting. For example, thoughtful action is less likely to occur if the police feel threatened and "fear for their lives". Hence, is important to evaluate police practices through the lens of police perceptions. What leads officers to feel threatened and are there approaches that can diminish such feelings?

Lasana Harris

Research findings emphasize the fundamental nature of group characteristics (race, gender, age) to the perception of others. It is natural for people to use their knowledge of the characteristics associated with group membership to define people when they have no individual information about them. And much of policing activity involves interaction with people who are strangers. Hence, there are several approaches that can be used to address issues of implicit bias.

One is to seek to counter erroneous associations by changing the popular association between groups of individuals and specific traits or characteristics. This involves cultural change, but in the case of the police can be a critically important training issue. For example, when the police are assigned to foot patrol duties in diverse communities, they come in contact with many members of those communities who have positive traits. If they only enter a neighborhood to respond to a crime, they interact with the small group of people in those communities who have negative traits. Another approach is to change the way group membership is framed. Rather than focusing upon race as a group label, we may be able to train officers to focus on superordinate identities (community member; human being).

The other important goal is to change the psychological dynamics of interactions. A focus on group memberships emphasizes the degree to which the public is in a different category from the

police (minority vs. White; civilian vs. officer). Such outgroup designations facilitate the dehumanization of those in other groups. A key aspect of the negative stereotyping of outgroups is linking undesirable characteristics to membership in the outgroup: e.g. dangerous, unintelligent; immoral; etc. The general finding of stereotype research is that such characterizations are typically incorrect and in any event not applicable to all of the members of a group. Hence, it is important to discourage thinking about other people as different, facilitating their dehumanization. Such dehumanization is found to make it more likely that authorities like police officers will treat group members disrespectfully and unfairly.

One particularly destructive consequence of dehumanization is that it undermines the empathy that human beings naturally feel toward others. That empathy leads to acts of respectful treatment and kindness. Hence, it is important to understand how to encourage empathy. An important focus is on education and upon young people since this is a period of opportunity to socialize attitudes of tolerance.

Jennifer Richeson

Discussions of implicit bias have focused upon general findings. However, it is particularly important to identify specific situational factors that shape whether and how biases are related to action. This can then be linked to an effort to define policies and practices that can be recommended to the police.

As has been noted, another critical area of focus is training. But how should training occur? Prior efforts have found that implicit bias training, if it is not well designed, can have negative effects. Police officers can be offended when they perceive that they are accused of being racist and can indicate, quite sincerely, that they are not biased. The unconscious nature of implicit

bias requires another approach. And that approach has to involve an effort to distinguish reasonable associations from unsupported biases. Simply telling officers that they should not associate the status of "young minority male" with danger goes against the experience of many officers and a more complex explanation of bias is needed. This effort needs to involve a discussion of what success and failure means and the development of metrics to reflect those goals.

Discussion and Implications for the Future

Implicit bias is a key issue in policing but one that has proved challenging to address. One important reason is that implicit biases indicate healthy brain functioning. We do not actually want to rid ourselves of the cognitive ability to quickly categorize others, though we do not want those categorizations to manifest in the form of negative behavior. Because the psychological processes that lead to implicit biases are indicative of brains that work, people are typically unaware of them, although research has clearly established their importance in policing in terms of their impacts on racially disparate behaviors of officers. Officers do not feel that they are racist and naturally resent any such implications. The challenge is to acknowledge that biases are a natural part of perception while emphasizing their destructive consequences in the relationship between police officers and minority group members. This requires identifying and empirically validating methods of training as well as developing policies and practices that mitigate the impact of implicit biases on police behavior.

As part of this effort, research is needed on the contexts that lead to threat and through it to processes of outgroup salience and dehumanization. Such processes undermine respect and empathy and encourage rapid decision-making in which implicit biases become more prominent and influential. It is important to develop a situational framework of policies and practices that

can act as a framework within which the impact of implicit biases is minimized. Mechanisms are needed that can humanize and personalize members of the public, reminding officers that they are both human beings and members of the community. One mechanism is to deemphasize race-based designations and focus on discussions of people as members of a common community.

Panel 3: Reconciliation

The panel included Belinda Cooper, Senior Fellow at the World Policy Institute; James L. Gibson, Sidney W. Souers Professor of Government, Washington University in St. Louis; Linda Tropp, Professor of Psychology, University of Massachusetts at Amherst; and Jennifer Richeson, Professor of Psychology, Northwestern/Yale University. The moderator was David Kennedy, Professor, John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

Background

Reconciliation is a method of facilitating frank engagements between minority and other angry and alienated communities, police, and other authorities that allow them to address historical tensions, grievances, and misconceptions and to reset relationships. Respect, collaboration, and effective working relationships between police and the communities they serve are central to both community safety and effective policing. However, in many communities where serious crime is concentrated, mutual mistrust and misunderstanding prevent police and communities from working together.

The reconciliation framework recognizes the very real American history of abusive law enforcement practices toward minority communities, beginning with slavery; the illegal and abusive law enforcement communities have sometimes experienced since; and the perception

that even legal enforcement may have been poorly motivated and disrespectful. It recognizes the concerns law enforcement has about communities, for example with respect to "stop snitching" codes that protect violent offenders. It also recognizes the reality and the power of the sometimes damaging narratives each side has about the other.

Many people in minority communities affected by high levels of violent crime and disorder genuinely believe that police are using drug laws and other law enforcement resources as means to oppress them. Their alienation is fueled by the history of slavery, Jim Crow, and other legal oppression of minorities; high levels of intrusive police tactics like stop-and-frisk; disrespectful behavior by police; and police shootings and other violence. When these communities are furious with the police, they are not inclined to work with the criminal justice system or speak out publicly against violence and crime. Serious offenders may wrongly believe that their own communities tolerate or even support their behavior.

Conversely, some in law enforcement genuinely believe that troubled minority communities are broadly tolerant of—and even complicit in—crime and violence. In fact, both research and national field experience clearly show that high-crime minority communities are the least tolerant of crime and disorder[2] and that in the most apparently dangerous communities the overwhelming majority of people do not behave violently.[3] However, where police believe otherwise, they are more inclined to treat entire communities as criminal and employ aggressive and intrusive tactics.

---

[2] R.J. Sampson and D.J. Bartusch, "Legal Cynicism and (Subcultural?) Tolerance of Deviance: The Neighborhood Context of Racial Differences," *Law and Society Review* 32 (1998), 777–804.
[3] Andrew V. Papachristos, "Murder by Structure: Dominance Relations and the Social Structure of Gang Homicide," *American Journal of Sociology* 115, no. 1 (2009), 74–128; Andrew V. Papachristos, Tracey L. Meares, and Jeffrey Fagan, "Attention Felons: Evaluation Project Safe Neighborhoods in Chicago," *Journal of Empirical Studies* 4, no. 2 (2007), 223–272.

The process of reconciliation addresses these deeply troubled relationships through engagement between law enforcement and community members about the long American history of legal abuse of minorities; the fact that traditional law enforcement has sometimes been both ineffective and caused unintentional damage to individuals, families, and communities; the fact that police have often treated minority individuals and communities with disrespect; and the sincere desire of law enforcement to act differently and do better. In turn, if there is to be community safety, there must be an engagement about the central importance of clear and powerful community norms against violence and other serious crime, and an effective working relationship with law enforcement.

The aim of reconciliation is for communities and law enforcement to come to a position of respect and trust by recognizing real historical harms and experiences; recognizing that that both have been contributing to harms neither desires; addressing misunderstandings; and finding common ground and a mutually supported way forward. We hope here to identify research that will help advance our ability to carry out such a process.

Panelists

Belinda Cooper

The key to community-level reconciliation is the acknowledgement of past harm and an effort to make changes to address past harms. Varying approaches have been used in South Africa, Germany and other post-conflict situations and research is needed concerning the important elements of successful reconciliation approaches. One issue is whether acknowledgement, self-criticism and apology are required, as well as how to deal with insincere

apologies. A second issue is the role of victims versus the general population. To what extent it

the acceptance of change by victims the goal and to what extent is the issue the

acknowledgement of past harms to gain legitimacy in the general population? Finally, how can

victims be helped (compensation; restoration of dignity, etc.)?

There is a natural tendency to want to label past injustice as reflecting the actions of a few

bad actors. A key aspect of acknowledgement is recognizing that harms were institutionalized

and systematic. In this way the reconciliation discussion is a cousin of the implicit bias

discussion above. They involved at least the passive consent of the community, or large

segments of it.

James L. Gibson

The key for reconciliation is societal transformation. The focus is upon the overall group,

not upon specific victims or perpetrators. Consequently, the forum should be concerned with

impartiality and establishing truth. Symbols of justice are key because there are many harms for

which there is no realistic form of reparation in the usual sense of that word. It is important to

acknowledge what has occurred and be neutral and transparent. From the point of view of

societal transformation, victims and perpetrators can become spoilers. The reconciliation

process needs to manage perpetrators with grants of amnesty and victims with promises of

justice.

There are several forms of justice for victims, and research is needed to determine whether or

not they work. One form is compensation (distributive justice). Another is procedural justice (a

fair process of claiming). Third is restorative, which involves a discussion with perpetrators

about a form of reconciliation. The fourth is retributive and involves some punishment for the

offender. In South Africa the primary form of justice that victims received was procedural

justice. Victims had voice and could tell their stories, something referred to as the restoration of

dignity. The forum was also widely viewed as impartial. This was found to be generally

effective in achieving the goal of building legitimacy. However, research is needed to examine

if this approach can be applied to policing in American cities. One issue with translation from

the South African context to this country is the salience of the legal fact of pre and post-

apartheid. This line between pre and post-transition periods might be much clearer in South

Africa than it is in the States. In the United States, openness to believing that changes are needed

varies widely, as does the degree to which different departments are implementing change.

Linda Tropp

The literature on reconciliation can draw upon several messages from the psychological

literature on intergroup interactions. First, majority and minority groups have different

motivations when interacting. Minority groups want voice and respect. They want to talk about

their experiences with injustice. Majority groups want to restrict discussion and avoid topics that

might conflict with their positive images of themselves. As noted, research is needed on how to

craft messages so that the majority group will consider and accept their role in past injustice.

That literature also emphasizes the need to structure interactions in ways that communicate to

all groups that there are desirable ends to be achieved. This is part of the general finding that not

all contact is positive and not all discussion leads to desirable outcomes. It is important to study

the conditions that facilitate favorable intergroup contacts. Contact can lower anxiety and stress,

build empathy and encourage perspective taking and promote superordinate (common group)

identification. But it needs to be cooperative and focused upon goals that are not antagonistic.

Further, it needs to be realistic in its time frame. And it has to emphasize points of common agreement, with people focused upon their areas of joint interest.

When past traumatic events or problems are addressed, it is important to have post-event strategies for change. Systems have to be willing and able to listen and take action. Simple good feeling or even apologies are not sufficient (and may even be counterproductive) if they are not followed by action because they seem insincere. It is important that there is follow through on issues raised and discussed. While these points have been generally found to be true of intergroup conflict, research is needed to connect them to the particulars of police-community interaction.

Jennifer Richeson

Social science research emphasizes that people have difficulty acknowledging and accepting information about the groups to which they belong if that information is negative and therefore undermines their respect for that group and their good feelings about themselves. This is true even when the harm happened in the past and they were not personally involved. When faced with a situation that might undermine their image of themselves as moral and good, people have a defensive reaction. They minimize harm; dehumanize the victims; engage in victim blaming and generally try to make the threat to their view that they are a moral person disappear.

It is important to study the conditions that make it possible for people to accept that their group was involved in harming others; and may be involved now. This requires understanding how to construct redemption narratives. These stories build a framework around acknowledging harm that identifies redemptive potential. That potential comes because acknowledging past

harm and defining potential reparations is built around a story of how it reflects the ultimate goodness and morality of the harm-doing group.

The broader point is that we need more research on how to structure messages directed at harm-doers and harm-doing groups that promote taking responsibility and accepting that the harm occurred and that they have a connection to that harm and need to take action to respond to it. This willingness to acknowledge harm and take responsibility for it is central to the process of reconciliation. Without this willingness the reconciliation process cannot move forward.

Addressing this question also requires applying reconciliation lessons to the case of American policing. In most of the post-conflict situations studied (e.g. South Africa) there has been a change in the political structure and the question is how the new structure should deal with the harms of the old structure. The case with American policing is less clear. There may or may not be a consensus that fundamental change is needed. So the issue is one of creating the political momentum for change. And this involves the antecedent question of creating a climate in which people accept responsibility for past and current harms. Research can draw from reconciliation studies in other societies, but the fundamental question is one of creating conditions within which the harmdoing group can and will acknowledge harm

Discussion and Implications for the Future

People do not exist in a vacuum. They are members of ongoing communities that have histories. This is illustrated by the history of policing in American, which has a troubled relationship to minority communities. The police have played a role in perpetuating racist institutions and have acted as agents of domination in economically depressed communities. As such, there are people today who have grown up in communities that view the police as agents to

be feared and avoided, not people to go to for assistance and the redress of injustice. Part of building legitimacy has to be addressing this history.

Studies of reconciliation have primarily been conducted in other societies that have struggled to make transitions from authoritarian governments. Those lessons offer insights that need to be tested and validated in the American context and with the police. However, they suggest directions for community level policies and practices.

Overall Implications

Studying the three pillars together

The three pillars of legitimacy — procedural justice, implicit bias, and reconciliation —have each been studied by social science researchers. An important contribution of the National Initiative is to bring them together into one project. Doing so reveals that little is known about how they interact. Research is needed in this area. For example, does acting with procedural justice lessen the likelihood of expressing bias? Does addressing past issues on a community level via reconciliation change everyday police and community behavior? A key future direction is to study these processes together.

Defining specific policies and practices

Specifying protocols for action based upon research about what is viewed as fair by the public and what minimizes bias on the part of officers is an important direction for future research. There is a considerable amount of research showing the value of procedural justice in promoting legitimacy and the importance of minimizing the expression of bias in police behavior as another path to building legitimacy. However, these findings need to be linked to specifics.

What policies and practices achieve these goals? Further, how can police officers be trained to enact such policies and practices?

Emphasizing shared identities

The way in which people organize their understanding of the social world has important consequences. This is true both for the public and the police. It is important to emphasize shared group membership (common group identity). This means minimizing discussion about race and emphasizing that everyone is part of a larger group (a superordinate group). For the police, it is important not to define the members of disadvantaged neighborhoods as different and in some way less human than other people, as this facilitates disrespect and violence toward members of that community.

Recognizing and overcoming resistance to change

Strategies for change need to recognize that people in advantaged groups resist acknowledging past or current injustice. It is important to study and identify strategies for encouraging openness and acknowledgement of these issues. This involves thinking about how to create redemptive narratives that recognize that being able to deal with past harms shows moral strength and is evidence of good character and trustworthiness. This forms the basis for a cooperative effort to jointly address current and future community problems

Appendix: Research Agenda

The prior document summarizes the points of view of Round Table panel members, the discussions that resulted from their position papers and panel presentations, and questions that were raised by both the panelists and the members of the audience in response to these discussions. Below, we have taken these issues and developed from them a set of empirically testable questions that may be used as a foundation for future research. These questions are organized according to the panel topic from which they came. They are followed by an additional subsection, in which we highlight questions that pertain to the study of policing and police community interactions more generally, and are equally applicable to each of the panel topics.

Procedural Justice

Below, we detail important open research questions in the area of procedural justice. We begin by addressing ways in which research practices and paradigms currently in use may be adapted so as to allow us to better address the intricacies of interpersonal interactions, and in particular those between police and community members. We then turn to questions of content, which can be roughly subdivided into four areas of psychological research — decision-making, mental and emotional health, motivation and incentives, and social learning. In each area, the discussion during the procedural justice panel highlighted both novel questions for which there is no precedent in the empirical literature. We also pose a list of questions that have previously been addressed in a generic fashion, but which have not been examined within the context of police community interactions. Psychological effects are well known to be sensitive to the context in which they occur. As a result, the basic findings within the extant literature cannot be

assumed to generalize to the context in which we are interested here; they must be re-interrogated with these specific applications in mind.

Research Practices and Paradigms

Although procedural justice is not exclusively interpersonal — one can also have a sense of the procedural justice of an entity such as the legal system — it is most often addressed within this context. Interpersonal interactions, like those between a police officer and a community member, are complex. By definition, they involve multiple actors, each of whom acts in accordance with their perceptions of the way in which events occur — perceptions which likely differ from those of their interaction partners — and who change over time and in reaction to their environment. These actors may also not be consciously aware of the impetus for their actions, or the ways in which their behavior is experience and context-dependent. These characteristics make it difficult to design effective research paradigms. Here we outline five issues of which researchers must remain aware in designing new studies of procedural justice, in order for those studies to yield externally valid results.

Community-police relationships as dynamic, dyadic interactions

Often, procedural justice is examined by asking one of the dyad — typically the community member — to characterize the interaction, as well as his or her reaction to it, and to share his beliefs about what motivated the other individual. These perceptions, while important, are not sufficient to understand what typically occurs during police officers' interactions with community members, and how these actions relate to perceptions of procedural justice. Rather, it is necessary to measure the perspectives of both partners, and to measure how they change, over time, as the interaction develops.

One reason for this is because individuals' behaviors in an interaction cannot be considered to be independent (conceptually or statistically) from their partners' actions. It is well known in social psychology that the beliefs and behavior of one person tend to invite complementary behavior from the other person (Markey, Over & Lunder, 2003). In other words, in the context of an interaction, both people can behave in ways more similar to how the other person *expects* them to act than to how they might behave if they were on their own. It is therefore impossible to understand a person's actions without understanding the beliefs and behavior of the other individual upon which they were conditioned.

Related to this is the fact that the nature of an interaction changes over time (as both individuals behave in ways that influence each other). Sampling only part of the interaction, therefore, is insufficient to characterize the situation as a whole. Sampling perceptions at the end of the interaction, after it has concluded — the approach taken in the preponderance of extant research designs — for example, is likely to reflect only reactions only to the very *end* of the incident, due to "recency bias." This would *not* capture the impetus for the interaction (e.g. an officer's choice to pull someone over), nor the initial response (e.g. the way in the person who was pulled over responded when the officer approached his or her vehicle) — those actions that are (presumably) most likely to determine how the interaction as a whole plays out, and those that are most informative, therefore, in designing interventions.

Future research designed to address procedural justice must strive, therefore, to measure the perspective of both sides, and to take these measurements (to the degree possible) at multiple points throughout the interaction. This is most likely to be possible in lab-based experiments, which do not have the significant logistical constraints of real-world interactions, but any insights that result from more controlled experiments can still be integrated into the design of

research in more externally valid circumstances. Research in "real world" circumstances, for example, can be conducted with and without these lab-based insights in mind, so as to determine their utility in better understanding the outcomes in which we are ultimately interested.

Moving beyond subjective characterizations

Related to the need to sample both interaction partners' perceptions is the need to obtain more objective measures of participants' behavior and the context in which they occurred. Peoples' perceptions of how they act, how others act, and why are often different – both from each other, and from reality.   People often project their own feelings onto those with whom they are interacting, and their beliefs as to what precipitated those feelings are often based on their own beliefs and stereotypes, which are likely to be inaccurate (or, at the very least, imprecise). Studies of people watching videotapes of the police, for example, demonstrate that prior attitudes influence the perception of what the police are doing (Granot, Balcetis, Schneider & Tyler, 2014)

A better understanding of the objective characteristics of police community interactions will help researchers to understand how and when differences in beliefs between the officer and the community member develop, as well as their magnitude. Better understanding the objective characteristics of situations in which procedural justice is more or less likely to be realized is also important for policy makers, as they develop regulations that will structure future interactions.

As with the characterization of dyadic, dynamic interactions, better measuring the objective nature of interactions is more easily done in a laboratory setting than in a real world environment. It will be important therefore to conduct lab-based, controlled, studies in addition to studies in more externally valid situations. It is also possible to collect, even in applied settings, observations from third parties. Whereas not technically objective (to the extent that the

observer may identify more or less with one of the participants, and/or observe only part of an interaction), these characterizations still lend valuable, additional perspective, especially where more standardized measures may not be possible. (They may also help us to understand the behaviors and perceptions of the community members at large — those who were not directly involved in a given incident — which are important in their own right.)

Finally, recordings — made, for example, by dashboard cameras, body cameras or bystanders — may also be used to make relatively more objective measurements than are currently employed in most research. On this topic, however, there is an important caveat to keep in mind: such recordings combine the façade of absolute objectivity with the potential for incomplete capture of information, which can be misleading. As a result, there is a real risk of overconfidence, on the part of the viewer, that he or she understood (and understood accurately) the entirely of what occurred. This is not to say that all recordings are flawed, but just that the potential for them to be so should be considered, in studies where they are used as a benchmark to assess the relative accuracy of either party's perception.

Longitudinal studies

An individual's behavior is based not only on what happens in the specific situation in question, but also everything that he or she brings to that situation – specifically, his or her previous experience, the experience of his or her peers, and the beliefs that these experiences inspire. To the degree that these experiences (and thus beliefs) change over time, the behaviors that they engender should as well. In order to better understand the impact of one's experiences and social group therefore, it is necessary to conduct longitudinal studies that capture one's practice of procedural justice both before and after the events in question. For example, one

might wish to characterize the influence of joining a police department on one's beliefs about and practice of procedural justice. In order to do this properly, it is necessary to have measurements of the relevant beliefs and behaviors both before these individuals are integrated into the department, and (ideally) at multiple points after. Indeed, following both officers and community members longitudinally — even without a particular procedural justice-influencing event in mind — may allow for valuable exploratory research, insofar as it can help to identify inflection points in individuals' beliefs and behaviors, which can be correlated temporally with events occurring at the same time, and used to identify variables that may be influential, but non-obvious within the framework of current theoretical models, and which have therefore been heretofore overlooked.

Community-level effects

The preponderance of the extant literature on procedural justice discusses its practice and perception by the individual. Research from other areas — in particular sociological research on violence and community members' beliefs about their efficacy in preventing and addressing it (e.g. Sampson, Raudenbush & Earls, 1997) — has demonstrated, however, that to consider only the perspective of the individual is to miss another, potentially equally important, factor: the beliefs of the community as a whole. As noted above, behavior is influenced not only by one's own beliefs and experience, but also that of one's neighbors. (Humans are, after all, fundamentally social animals, and as such, the ability and tendency to attend to our peers, and to integrate our beliefs as to how they will think and act into the construction of our own beliefs and actions, is integral to our success and survival.) As a result, one cannot measure the attitude of a community as a simple summation of the attitudes of each of its members. Rather, community-

level beliefs (the accuracy of which can be measured in terms of its ability to predict relevant behaviors, e.g. hostility towards the police) may be better modeled as a combination of both individuals' beliefs, and an additional, emergent, factor, which represents community members' beliefs as to what their neighbors think, and do, of or in a specific situation.

Concretely, this means researchers must both measure beliefs about peers' behavior, and they must move beyond simple regression models, to multi-level, hierarchical approaches, in order to better understand and characterize community members' beliefs, the ways in which these beliefs influence behavior, and the relative contributions of individual and community-level effects (see, e.g. Kashy & Kenny, 2000). This is important from an applied as well as a theoretical perspective as well, because community and individual level effects may have different causes, and may call for different policies to address them.

Reverse correlations

Finally, it is important to note that the existing literature on procedural justice, including all of the empirically supported insights discussed within the context of the panel described herein, is the result of research designs that tested hypotheses specified *a priori*. This is not a negative characteristic in and of itself — indeed, such an approach is the gold standard of empirical research, and these hypotheses were founded on prior research that has shown support for the theoretical model from which they were derived — but it means that the universe of insights that we have available to us at this point is time is limited to the support, or lack thereof, of these theoretical models. Phenomena that are not immediately related to these models (but which may nonetheless be relevant to topic of procedural justice) may be missed entirely, because they are never raised as possibilities to be tested. In other words, it is difficult by taking only this

approach to expand our knowledge beyond the bounds of our original beliefs as to what should be important.

Attempting to expand our research beyond these bounds is fundamentally important, however, if we are to truly advance the literature on procedural justice — a fact that is highlighted in no small part by the wave of research over the past decade demonstrating the degree to which our beliefs and behaviors are constructed sub-consciously. Indeed, there is now a large literature devoted entirely to characterizing the ways in which our intuitive models of decision-making and behavior differ from reality (often because the true determinants operate outside of conscious awareness). Given this, it is reasonable to assume that theoretical models of procedural justice that have their origin in introspection and self-reports as to what makes a process fair may be missing important pieces of the puzzle.

Addressing this limitation requires exploratory research. One approach to doing this is to conduct a reverse correlation, wherein one records both perceptions — the variable in which we're ultimately interested in predicting — as well as any and every other measurable characteristic of the situation that preceded them. In this way, it is possible to take all situations that resulted in perceptions of effective procedural justice (and all that resulted in perceptions of a lack of procedural justice) and examine what these situations have in common, without an a priori filter as to which characteristics are likely to be important. This technique — popular in psychophysiology, but only recently adapted to social psychology — has proved effective in uncovering the internal representations and decision strategies of individuals, and may prove fruitful in this domain as well, where the complexity of the interactions in which researchers are interested has long nudged them to simply and streamline the set of variables in which they are interested, so as to make studies both statistically and logistically tractable.

In fact, the use of this approach is not limited to attempts to identify in an unbiased fashion behaviors and situational characteristics that may be related to perceptions of procedural justice, as measured by standard survey instruments. It can also be used to examine the nature of those perceptions as well. Indeed, our *a priori beliefs* about procedural justice shape not only those variables to which we tend to turn when we are considering what makes a process seem more or less just, but also the way in which we measure perceptions of justice itself. Current instruments, in other words, measure procedural justice by querying respondents on a priori dimensions. It may be, however, that people are thinking of more than just these dimensions, when considering for themselves (independent of experimenter influence) whether a procedure was just, and, as a result, how they should react. To address this issue, one could measure (for example) behaviors that are likely to result from perceptions that a process is fair and just (e.g. cooperation), as well as characteristics of the individual's perceptions, though in as wide ranging and unbiased manner as is logistically feasible (e.g. a free-response narrative). In this case, the behaviors would be the benchmark; those that are believed to result from a general perception of fairness would be grouped together, as would those which were thought to be associated with the perception that a process was not just. A researcher could then examine what words, phrases, or narrative forms (for example) were shared within each group. In this way, it may be possible to identify additional dimensions of beliefs about procedural justice, which may not be captured in current instruments, but which may nonetheless add important explanatory power to existing models.

Decision Making

The subsections above outline generic ways in which typical psychological and sociological paradigms for research can be adapted to the idiosyncracies of interpersonal interactions and the measurement of procedural justice, so as to allow for research that may measure more accurately

and precisely the issues in which we are interested. The procedural justice panel also highlighted issues related to content, rather than methodology, however. One of these content areas was decision-making, and on this topic, the panelists and audience members raised questions both about how known effects might play out in the specific context of police community interactions, as well as novel issues, for which there is relatively little precedent within the empirical literature. Three of these questions are highlighted below, along with potential approaches for addressing them.

The influence of stress and emotion on decision-making

The day-to-day of policing may be both stressful and emotionally evocative. The experience of stress and strong emotions are known, furthermore, to influence decision-making. Stress, for example, has been demonstrated to negatively influence decision-making by hampering the systematic consideration of all relevant alternatives (Keinan, 1987; see also, Svenson & Maule, 1983; Starcke, Wolf, Markowitsch & Brand, 2008; Janis & Mann, 1976). This has obvious consequences for police officers, who are charged with making consequential decisions like that of whether to use deadly force. The experience of emotion during decision-making may similarly influence one's ability to assess the value of any given response alternative, and to predict the long-term consequences of that response (see for reviews, Lerner, Li, Valdesolo & Kassam, 2015; Naqvi, Shiv & Bechara, 2006; Schwarz, 2000; Toda, 1980). This has clear implications for officers' ability to understand the psychological impact and ramifications of, for example, the way in which they approach someone they desire to detain.

The consequences of this research for our understanding of police community interactions and of the factors that may influence officers' ability to practice procedural justice are based

primarily, however, on deduction; they have, by and large, not been themselves tested directly and empirically. This is important, because context is known to influence both decision-making (Plous, 1983), and the experience of stress and emotion (Barrett, Mesquita, Ochsner & Gross, 2007). It is therefore necessary to examine the ways in which these effects may be realized within the context of police community interactions and the practice of procedural justice specifically.

To begin, it is necessary to better explicate the types of stress and emotions experienced by officers, the degree to which they're experienced, and the timing with which they occur. Whereas we state above that policing may be both stressful and emotional, and whereas such statements are made frequently within the literature, there is very little research seeking to empirically validate these observations, and to flesh them out in the sort of detail that is typically seen in the psychological literatures on these topics. Developing our understanding of what officers experience and when will not only allow us to narrow our focus in terms of the most relevant portions of the psychological literature, but also inform any subsequent efforts to design interventions to prevent or ameliorate any undesirable effects of these states on decision making.

Similarly, it is necessary to catalogue the types of decisions with which officers are faced and that influence community members' perceptions of procedural justice. In order to understand how the range of mental states experienced by officers influences their behavior, we must know something about how those behaviors can be categorized. Each of these decisions (for example to approach a person, to explain one's decision making process, or to allow the person to express his or her point of view) may be influenced differently, and by different emotions — a fact that might be lost if we were not to examine them separately, and systematically.

This research can be carried out in the lab and in the field. Many of the decisions an officer might be asked to make can be recreated (in a simplified form) in the lab, where they may be more easily manipulated and more systematically and comprehensively examined. The extant laboratory research on stress, emotion, and decision-making has focused on decisions relevant only to the individual decision maker (e.g. economic games, in which a participant is required to choose between a smaller, immediate, reward and a larger, delayed, one). Even highly stylized paradigms that focus on *interpersonal* decision making (like the decision as to whether or not to explain one's decision making process to another person who is impacted by it), may therefore produce novel insights, despite their relative lack of external validity. Laboratory studies like these should also be supplemented with field work, examining how these processes operate in practice. The inventories of both officers' mental states, and of the procedural justice-relevant decisions they are required to make are necessarily conducted in the field, but it will be necessary as well to conduct experimental research — including adaptations of any successful laboratory based studies — in more realistic settings, such that one can gauge, for example, true effect sizes.

The influence of cognitive biases

Mental states like stress and emotion are not the only factors known to influence decision-making. The psychological literature outlines a range of cognitive biases whose effects on decision making generally have been well characterized, but whose influence on police officers and their ability to enact procedural justice have not yet been tested. Nonetheless, they may prove important in better understanding the practice of procedural justice.

The illusion of transparency, for example, refers to peoples' tendency to overestimate the degree to which their mental state is perceptible to others (Gilovich, Savitsky, & Medvec, 1998). This is relevant to procedural justice insofar as one would likely not expend as great of an effort to explicate one's decision making process to another person if one believes that process to be already apparent.

Naïve realism — or the belief that our perceptions reflect the world as it really exists, objectively and without bias, and that people whose perceptions differ must be uninformed, irrational, or biased (Ward & Ross, 1997) — may also affect the tendency to practice procedural justice. If any belief that differs from our own is by definition flawed, then the value of giving voice to a person who holds those beliefs is diminished.

The fundamental attribution error (also known as correspondence bias) may also be important here. This bias — or the tendency to overemphasize internal characteristics (e.g. personality) relative to external factors like the context or situation (which in reality are often more influential) when attempting to explain another person's behavior (Jones & Harris, 1967) — may influence the practice of procedural justice insofar as it may influence officers' beliefs as to the impact that their procedurally just behaviors would have. If an officer believes that an individual's lack of cooperation is due to his or her being an inherently uncooperative and unmotivated person, then the value to the officer of expending the extra effort to act in a just manner is unclear. If, however, the officer appreciates the true degree to which situational factors, including his or her own actions, shape that individual's behavior and can be used as a means to an end that the officer desires, then the value of acting in a just fashion is likely more obvious and the likelihood that the officer acts in this way is likely greater.

This is obviously an incomplete list of known cognitive biases, but they serve as examples of the ways in which this literature can be used as a framework for generating hypotheses about barriers to procedurally just decision making in police community interactions. In each case, these questions could be tested both in laboratory environments and in more realistic settings. In the latter case, one would need to be able to query officers as to their beliefs about the people with whom they interacted, as well as their perceptions of the other individual's beliefs. Given this data, however, the paradigms developed within the cognitive bias literature could be applied in a relatively straight-forward and unaltered fashion to the decision to enact procedurally just behaviors.

Effective decision-making policies and practices

Listed above are multiple factors that may negatively impact officers' decisions to demonstrate procedural justice, and which need to be tested and characterized empirically. Even if the hypothesis that these generic psychological findings hold even in the idiosyncratic context of police community interactions is empirically supported, however, this does not necessarily tell us anything about how we can lesson their negative impact. Understanding the problem is important, in other words, but designing an effective solution requires additional knowledge.

Relative to the volume of research devoted to characterizing cognitive biases, there is very little research on how to make more effective decision-making procedures that help people to avoid these traps. Whereas it is commonly assumed that decision-making aids like checklists and rubrics should help decision-makers to remember what the important factors are, and how they should be weighted relative to one another, this assumption has not yet been tested empirically. It is likely the case, furthermore, that the effective use of such aids is influenced by

officers' mental state in the moment, any time pressure, and the availability of cognitive resources — conditions that do not hold in the more calm, detached, environments in which decision-making is typically studied (e.g. a business decision as to how much money to invest, or whether or not to hire someone). It is therefore necessary not only more generally to test the efficacy of decision-making procedures designed to lessen the impact of common biases, but also their application to policing specifically.

Mental and Emotional Health

Just as acute stress and emotion can negatively impact decision-making, the chronic experience of these states (and the mental health problems that this chronic experience represent) can influence individuals' choices as well, in ways that can be detrimental to the practice of procedural justice. Chronic stress, for example, can result in the reorganization of areas of the brain integral to decision-making (e.g. the frontostriatal regions), potentially affecting one's ability to attend to the consequences of one's actions and associate those with the different strategies one took to get there (Dias-Ferreira et al., 2009). This is important, because chronic and acute stress have to be addressed in different ways — specifically, the influence of acute stress will dissipate relatively quickly, whereas the influence of chronic stress can only be overcome with prolonged and effortful intervention, usually by a mental health professional — and the negative effects of chronic stress are especially difficult to overcome. When it comes to chronic conditions, the focus therefore should be on prevention, rather than treatment, to the degree possible.

Unfortunately, we do not currently have a complete picture of either the incidence or the causes of mental health problems among police officers. Whereas there does exist a literature on the incidence of post-traumatic stress disorder and alcohol use amongst officers (e.g. Ballenger et

al., 2011; Liberman, Best, Metzler, Fagan, Weiss & Marmar, 2002; Marmar et al., 2006; Neylan et al., 2006), these are far from the only conditions that are likely to influence procedural justice relevant decision-making. Indeed, there exists no basic inventory of the emotions experienced by officers on a day to day basis, nor of how officers regulate these emotions, despite the fact that the nature and frequency of certain emotions are integral to the diagnosis of every mental health disorder currently recognized by the medical community (Kring, 2008).

Better understanding these conditions, their etiology, and their influence on officers is crucial to improving the practice of procedural justice. Not only do mental health problems influence officers' decision-making ability, they also have a negative impact more generally on officers' quality of life. This hazard likely makes it difficult to recruit and train good officers (though recruits' awareness of the potential for mental health problems, and the importance that they place on avoiding these problems is a question that could be empirically tested) who are more likely to understand, practice, and place importance on procedural justice, and it may also negatively impact department morale more generally, which can discourage even the officer who might otherwise be optimistic and motivated (another question which could be tested empirically, and which we address below in another subsection).

Motivation and Incentives

Perhaps most immediately relevant to policy interventions are issues related to the understanding of the incentive structures that exist within police departments, and the influence that these structures have on officers' behavior. As cited above, the fundamental attribution error — one of the foundational discoveries of social psychology — refers to our tendency to overemphasize internal, individual characteristics when attempting to understand others' behavior, and under-emphasize situational factors, including incentive structures that may well

be under the department's voluntary control. The corollary is that there may well be opportunities to realize significant changes in behavior if we are able to better characterize the police department environment, the behaviors that it currently incentivizes, and the way(s) in which it could be changed, so a to encourage more procedurally just behavior.

The first step is to better understand the incentive structure as it currently exists. This means conducting research into how officers understand their responsibilities, and what they believe their goals and "best practices" (for which they would be recognized or rewarded) to be. For example, what are the metrics of success? Do officers focus more on arrests or clearance rates? As discussed in the Round Table report above, officers will focus their efforts on behaviors that they believe will lead to them being considered to be doing their job well.

If officers report that the metrics of success are unclear, or if the metrics that they cite are not in line with those that are desired by the department, the second step for researchers is to attempt to understand where these undesired metrics are coming from and how to change them. For example, there may be unofficial incentive structures in place, which may be influencing what officers believe to be the most important metrics. Although the department may not officially reward the use of force, for example, it may be that officers receive social rewards from their peers (e.g. recognition) that support this behavior. Inventorying these unofficial incentive structures will be an important task for researchers as well. Subsequent research focused on changing beliefs as to the most important metrics of success can build on this knowledge, and try to exploit both official and unofficial reward structures in order to achieve this goal.

Finally, it is important to note that police departments cannot be considered in isolation; each of the research aims listed above must be understood in the context of the incentive structures and metrics for success for the legal system as whole. Departments must coordinate, for

example, with prosecutors, whose goals, while aligned, are unique. Any change in incentive

structures for the police officers, therefore, must be made in conjunction with these other

components of the legal system.

Social Learning

Perceptions of what constitutes a procedurally just practice, and of who is a procedurally just

person or entity are based not only on first-hand information, but also on peoples' vicarious

experiences. Understanding where people obtain their information is crucial, therefore, to

understanding how they view the legal system, and to any attempt to change these perceptions,

when and where necessary.

First-hand experience vs. second and third hand information

The first research priority under this heading is to take an inventory of where people are

obtaining their information regarding the legal system. It will also be important to assess the

weight people assign to each of these different sources of information. Experiences reported by

one's family members, for example, may be weighted more heavily than that of one's

acquaintances. Understanding whose opinions people consider to be most consequential is

crucial to any effort to influence those opinions, and the ability to influence is important.

Notwithstanding the *actual* degree to which a department's officers act in a procedurally just

way, the benefits of this behavior will not accrue to the department unless the community also

believes the department to be just — and, as discussed in previous subsection above, perceptions

are not always based on reality. In addition to working to ensure that officers' behavior matches

that which is desired, therefore, it is also important for departments to understand how to

properly communicate their priorities, desires, and practices to the community, and to do this,

they must know from whom the community receives it's information, and in whom it places its trust.

Finally, it may also behoove researchers to conduct these surveys with the influence of developmental changes in mind. From whom one receives one's information, and in whom one places one's trust may change, over the course of a lifetime. The degree to which one can be influenced by others' experiences and opinions (relative to one's own) may also change. Indeed, one's openness to change *at all* may change. For example, it may be that juveniles are open to influence regarding the content of their perceptions of the police as they mature, but that once they reach a critical point (e.g. the end of adolescence) their perceptions solidify, and become significantly more difficult to change. This is important information for policy makers, insofar as this informs any decision as to when interventions must occur.

Implicit Bias

The recognition of the existence of unwanted bias in policing, and its negative consequences for the community and for the legal system's ability to effective carry out its responsibilities, is not new. Researchers and policy makers have grappled for decades with the issue of how to identify, measure, and reduce these biases. What *has* changed are the ways in which these biases are realized: Before the end of the 20th century, there were few barriers (official or unofficial) to expressing one's beliefs about different social, racial, and ethnic groups, and their inherent associations with various negative characteristics. Due in part to the success of this prior research in characterizing and demonstrating the lack of factual basis for, and damage done by, these associations, however, they are no longer as frequently encountered. This does *not* mean that they are no longer held, though, nor that they do not still influence behavior. More recent

research, over the past two decades, has demonstrated that these associations are alive and well, though they are now held *implicitly*, rather than explicitly.

This observation is important insofar as it makes clear that any policy that assumes that one has to voice a belief in order to act in accordance with it — or that even one has to be aware of a belief in order for this to be true — will be only superficially efficacious. Even updated to reflect this recognition, however, our theoretical models are incomplete: We do not, for example, have a full understanding of the ways in which biases are developed, nor do we have an explicit, and widely agreed upon, definition for what, specifically, constitutes an unwanted bias in the first place. Researchers have heretofore struggled to identify effective methods for attenuating unwanted biases, where they do exist. Finally, our extant models are not generative — they do not help us to predict how biases may change (in response, for example, to demographic changes, or changes in cultural tolerances for different types of associations), and what problematic behaviors or beliefs (implicit or explicit) might look like in the future. Addressing each of these limitations will be integral to making real progress.

Research Practices and Paradigms

One reason why there are still so many open questions regarding the nature of bias, its effects, and its future, is because our research paradigms have not evolved as quickly as has our understanding of how biases operate today. A crucial step in furthering the literature on this topic is to update our research practices, such that we may address the limitations of this literature most effectively. Below we detail two ways in which this may be done.

Distinguishing between reasonable associations and biases

First and foremost it is necessary to distinguish between reasonable associations and "biases," in the colloquial, "undesirable," sense of the word. We are not born hardwired with beliefs about associations between specific groups of people and specific physical or social characteristics. Rather, these associations develop over time, based on either first-hand experience, or second-hand information, communicated by others with whom we interact directly or through cultural means. In this sense, "biases" are not irrational, as commonly assumed. Indeed, when talking about policing specifically, research has shown that police are more likely to stop minorities than Caucasians on the street, but they have also demonstrated that there exist real differences in rates of criminality (though these differences do not fully explain the differential rates of contact).

This presents a problem: specifically, where do we set the threshold for inaccuracy, after which an association should be labeled a "bias," and if these biases are based on real information (accurate or not), how do we help people to distinguish between that data which is useful, and on which it is appropriate to act, and that which is myopic or otherwise misleading, and with which they should be more careful?

This first question — to what degree are we willing to be inaccurate about associations between people and behavioral traits, based solely on characteristics beyond their control — is, at its heart, one of preference and risk tolerance, and must ultimately be resolved by society at large. Researchers can contribute, however, by providing a factual basis for this conversation. One question, for example, is the degree to which the people who are profiled are sensitive to having been so labeled, and the point after which this perception will cause them to become hostile or uncooperative. A lack of cooperation with the police — or an active desire to do them harm — are outcomes that have clear implications for the community at large (beyond just those

who are subject to bias), and as such may represent metrics for harm with which everyone can identify. Other such metrics may be uncovered in a data-driven fashion, by surveying community members regarding biased-based behaviors that they believe to be clearly unacceptable. Using these metrics, researchers may then collect data on the relationship between the threshold use (more or less stringent), and the frequency of "undesirable" behavior (as defined by that threshold).

The second question — of individuals' ability to distinguish between accurate and inaccurate correlations between social groups and behavioral traits — can be more directly addressed from an empirical standpoint. Extant research suggests that our minds are tuned both to categorize (e.g. by skin color), and to uncover associations between those categories, and characteristics that are relevant to our own success and survival (e.g. criminality). This is, in a nutshell, the way in which we learn, and it has been integral to our survival and success as a species (indeed, these are very basic characteristics that we share even with much more basic organisms). The fact that these abilities have proved so important, however, means that our bias, from a psychological perspective, is towards categorizing, and associating, rather than not. This is what makes inaccuracies difficult to detect, and/or accept.

From a research perspective, the question is the degree to which we can get people to stop, to examine these associations, and to distinguish between those biases upon which society has deemed it acceptable to act, and those that are unacceptable — conditioned on the fact that these associations already exist. The existing literature on implicit bias has focused by and large on establishing the fact that associations between social groups and the perception of different traits exist. The smaller literature on methods for attenuating bias, furthermore, is largely limited to explicit anti-bias education (i.e. informing people that they hold biases, that these biases are

problematic, and giving counter-stereotypical examples). In both cases, the focus is on the associations themselves, rather than the behaviors that they engender. To the extent that these associations are easily established, however, and to the extent that, from a policy standpoint, what we are ultimately interested in is behavior, rather than belief, it may prove more efficient for researchers to focus on the link between biases and behaviors, rather than between social groups and specific characteristics.

Examining regional and temporal differences in beliefs and biases

In addition to focusing on changing behaviors rather than beliefs, the literature on implicit bias may be improved by the development and use of paradigms aimed at examining how implicit biases change over time or across different regions, and the degree to which these changes are correlated with other measurable variables, such as demographics, infrastructure, or public policy. Current research methods measure biases as if they were static, associating specific groups with specific traits. History has demonstrated, however, that those groups that are labeled with undesirable characteristics — and indeed those characteristics that are considered undesirable — change, over time. Models built upon specific identities, rather than generic groups and generic traits, are not therefore generative, and are not likely to be of much use in predicting future or emerging associations that might be considered problematic – something which is necessary if we are to intervene before they become culturally embedded to an extent that policy changes cannot reverse.

Better Characterizing Biased Behavior

Whereas methodological changes are necessary to round out the literature on implicit bias, there are still many open questions that can be dealt with using traditional paradigms, and which are of equal importance. Here below we outline two such questions.

Differential criteria for evaluation

One aspect of implicit bias that has heretofore remained unexplored is the way in which perceptions of the same incident can differ depending on one's perspective (e.g. the officer versus the person that he or she stops). We know from circumstantial evidence that such disconnects exist: whereas the existence of implicit bias has been demonstrated both by laboratory methods (e.g. the implicit association test), and by research looking for the consequences of these biases as reflected in behavior (e.g. arrest rates), and whereas the existence of these biases is now accepted by a majority of people surveyed, these same people also report that they themselves do not act in a biased manner (Pronin, Gilovich & Ross, 2004), suggesting that they are unaware of the way in which they behave. What we do not know is why.

One potential reason for this may be a desire for self-protection; it is uncomfortable to acknowledge one's own negative characteristics. This will be difficult to change, however — especially for police officers, for whom the need to protect the self is deliberately made salient to them, as part of their job. Another potential mechanism, and one that may be more easily manipulated, is a differential focus by the parties to an interaction on different aspects of the same situation. More specifically, it is possible that whereas one person (e.g. an officer) focuses on his or her *intentions* when evaluating the potentially biased nature of an interaction, the other

(e.g. the community member) may focus more on the *effects*, intentions notwithstanding. Basic survey work could be conducted, in which researchers asked people involved in interactions with the police, and the officers with whom they interacted, to list the most salient characteristics of that interaction. To the extent that the different groups focus on different aspects, this should be measurable, within such data.

Establishing Shared Identities

Whereas it may be difficult to change or attenuate associations between social groups and certain traits, it may be possible to influence the degree to which these associations engender behaviors that are considered undesirable. Above, we note the need for new research designs that can be used to test ways to encourage people to break the ties between implicit associations and behavior by teaching them to stop and consider the foundations for their decisions (and in particular whether those foundations include associations that have been deemed to be unacceptable). Another approach is to try to change the framework within which they are thinking. More specifically, it may be possible to reduce the incidence of bias-based behaviors, by making more salient identities that officers and community members share, relative to those that differentiate them.

Every person belongs to multiple "groups" — in addition to race or ethnicity-based groups, one could be categorized according to one's age, gender, socioeconomic status, geographical location or origin — to name just a few possibilities. To the extent that we most often discuss bias in terms of race, this suggests that this is one of the more salient characteristics (at least within the U.S. at the present point in time). This does not mean, however, that there is any reason why this *must* be the case. Indeed, the fact that categorization based on skin color is not as prominent in other societies suggests that the salience of skin color versus other traits is

culturally determined. The corollary is that the framework within which we think of others —

and, in particular the characteristics that we use to categorize them — is malleable, and may

represent a potential point of entry for future attempts to attenuate biased behavior.

Research has demonstrated that people think about, and respond to, others differently,

depending on whether they belong to the same group or different groups. More specifically,

individuals demonstrate greater empathy, and a greater willingness to expend effort to help in-

group others. Research has also demonstrated that shared group identities may be established

upon the basis of any range of characteristics, including those that may be relatively superficial

(within a laboratory setting, for example, researchers have been able to establish shared group

identity, and to change participants' behavior, by assigning study participants — even those of

different races — to wear the same color t-shirt). Taken together, these findings suggest that

policy makers may attenuate the negative effects of implicit bias by supplanting race based

categories with categories based on characteristics that police and community members may be

more likely to share.

While changing the social framework within which officers and community members think is

conceptually simple, however, it is logistically far more involved. In particular, the nature of the

frameworks that are most likely to be shared by police officers and community members likely

differs between cities, by neighborhoods, and even by blocks. Coming up with policy solutions

that are sufficiently flexible so as to allow for the use of different frameworks in different areas,

but which are still sufficiently systematic, so as to be evaluable empirically, will be a challenge.

The ability to flexibly implement such a solution, and in a way the results of which can be

quantified, however, represents an important step forward for this area of implicit bias research,

the promise of which is appealing, but the external validity of which remains untested.

Reconciliation

Where the first two Round Table panels — on procedural justice and implicit bias — focused on how we can influence the practice and perception of future behavior, the last panel on reconciliation considered the ways in which we conceive of, and respond to, events that happened in the past, and in which we may not have been directly involved.

Individual vs. Institutional (and Ongoing vs. Discrete) Harms

One issue that was raised repeatedly during this panel was that of who (or what) should be considered to be responsible for harm. More specifically, both panelists and audience members discussed the example of a police officer, who may not have acted in a procedurally unjust or biased manner, but who, as a member of the department, now represents an *institution* that has acted in these ways in the past. To what degree do people hold that individual officer responsible (explicitly or implicitly) for the acts committed by his or her predecessors, how do different perspectives regarding responsibility impact reconciliation efforts, and how can people be encouraged to view events from the perspective of those with whom they might disagree?

On this issue, one area of relatively low-hanging fruit is a simple inventory of the degree to which officers versus community members see police departments in their current form, as similar to, representative of, and responsible for, departments of the past? Whereas these data may just confirm what reconciliation experts already believe to be true (i.e. that community members hold current departments responsible, while officers believe themselves to be distinct), they may have utility in terms of making this point more plain to laypeople — in particular, to officers and community members — and may therefore represent a concrete basis upon which to begin discussions between these groups regarding reconciliation. (Indeed, the utility of data like this — which describe in more concrete terms problems that people may intuitively already

expect might exist — in reconciliation efforts is another issue that may be addressed empirically, and which may prove useful in the future. Survey studies of attitudes and beliefs are common, but also time consuming and expensive. To the degree that founding discussions on hard data helps to break through what otherwise might be an impasse, these efforts may be worth their expense. If such reports are assumed to be biased, invalid, or are otherwise dismissed or ignored, however, the research community and funding agencies may find that their resources are better channeled elsewhere.)

Another issue, and one that must also be addressed in order to understand how people assign responsibility for harm, is that of potentially differential perspectives as to whether or not the harm is confined to the past, or ongoing, in the present. Past research has demonstrated that the perpetrators of harm are more likely to view past events as having been discrete, or closed (i.e. not continuing into the present), whereas the victims are more likely to view those events as ongoing (Zechmeister & Romero, 2002). This has not been demonstrated, however, in the context of police community interactions. Even a relatively simple survey study assessing the degree to which people perceive specific harms as having been confined to the past versus continuing into the present, and the characteristics that are most closely related to holding one view versus the other (including, but not limited to, membership in or affiliation with the police versus traditionally marginalized social groups), could therefore represent a real advance, insofar as it may provide guidance as to the magnitude of the problem, and with respect to the ways in which the problem must be phrased, when attempting to gain the trust of either officers or community members. Additional, more basic, research could also be conducted to further flesh out the reasons behind these divergent beliefs, and thus the issues that must be addressed if one is to reconcile them. Perpetrators of harm (or those affiliated with them) may be more likely to

view past events as having been discrete because they are not *currently* enacting the same, harmful behavior, for example, whereas victims may be more likely to view those events as ongoing because it is the negative *consequences* of the transgression (which may be ongoing) that are more salient to them, relative to the transgressions themselves.

Structuring Interactions and Incentives

In addition to providing a factual basis for efforts at reconciliation, and conducting more basic research into the ways in which people are likely to construe those facts going into any discussion, it is important to think about how those reconciliation-relevant discussions are structured, and the ways in which this structure may be improved, so as to fulfill the needs of all parties. Below we list three attributes of these discussions that may be examined as potential entry points for improvement.

Voice

One of the pillars of procedural justice, as described during the panel, is voice: the degree to which people feel like they have had an opportunity to share their perspective, and have this perspective recognized by others. A large literature in this area has empirically demonstrated that allowing people the opportunity to voice their experience is predictive of more positive outcomes, both in terms of rapport between the parties to the interaction and in terms of more concrete outcomes, like criminality and complaints against police officers.

These observations can inform efforts to better structure interactions between police departments and the communities they serve regarding reconciliation. Specifically, organizers can implement formats for discussion in which all parties are assured time to express their viewpoints. These observations also highlight new areas for research. For example, it is possible that one is allowed the opportunity to describe one's viewpoint, but that one still does

not experience the benefits of having done so, because one believes that the other side has not

paid attention, or has not taken one's viewpoint seriously. Future research can be conducted to

try to identify behaviors that communicate a lack of attention or seriousness, but which are not

intended to do so (and as such might be something that the listeners, e.g. police officers, are

willing and able to change). Basic correlational research can also strive to elucidate *structural*

variables that are associated with the perception of greater seriousness and motivation on behalf

of all parties, and which are under the control of those who organize the efforts at reconciliation.

Narrative type

Similarly, it may prove useful to consider the ways in which officers or community members

structure their narratives when given the opportunity to voice their perspectives, and how these

narrative choices impact the other party's attention to those narratives and acceptance of them as

both valid and important. Narratives involving the possibility for redemption, or a light at the

end of the tunnel, for example, may be more likely to capture others' attention than those which

are more pessimistic (as self-protective instincts may cause listeners whose behavior these

narratives implicate to tune out, or otherwise dismiss the arguments being made).

On this topic, very little empirical research exists. Future efforts may be aimed first at

developing a typology of narrative structure, and understanding the frequency with which

different types are invoked, as well as conducting truly experimental research in which narrative

types are deliberately manipulated, and their impacts quantitatively compared. Building upon

this, researchers should work together with practitioners with experience in reconciliation to

develop and test the efficacy of different approaches to encouraging the use of desirable narrative

types by both officers and community members.

Incentive structure

Finally, the point made in the context of the procedural justice panel regarding the influence of incentive structures is relevant here as well. Explicit or not, incentive structures exist within every environment. These structures dictate, furthermore, the degree to which people are willing to participate in the reconciliation process, as well as the ways in which they behave as part of that process. If the goals of the reconciliation process are not clear, for example, or are not attractive to the participants, they will not invest their time and energy. If there are specific disincentives — for example, implicit social costs to being seen as someone willing to communicate with another group perceived as the enemy — these might also decrease the likelihood that the reconciliation process is successful. Understanding what structures exist in the context of current approaches to reconciliation, as well as the degree to which these structures can be deliberately manipulated by reconciliation organizers will be an important goal for future research.

Domain-General

For each of the three panel topics described above, we make specific suggestions, both as to research questions that must be addressed empirically in order to round out the literature, and as to the way in which standard methodologies must be adapted, if we are to do this in a way that is truly informatively, and ecologically valid. There are additional insights, however, that were highlighted over the course of the Round Table, and that represent overarching issues, equally applicable to each of the panel topics. Here below we summarize four, and discuss their implications for the way in which the research topics suggested above should be approached.

Studying Three Pillars Together

First and foremost, it is important to acknowledge that none of the panel topics exist in isolation. The degree to which an officer acts in procedurally just manner influences the likelihood that he or she will be perceived as harboring implicit biases, which itself influences the nature of the relationship between the police and the community they serve, and the need for subsequent reconciliation. In contrast, the empirical literatures on these topics exist almost exclusively in isolation. We have little foundation, therefore, upon which to predict *to what degree* addressing procedural justice will impact perceptions of implicit bias, for example. This is important from a conceptual point of view, and from the point of view of policy makers, who may want to identify the interventions most likely to have the widest impact (or the greatest cost-benefit ratio). And it is *crucial* from an empirical standpoint, in terms of researchers' ability to properly quantify the impact of any intervention, such as those that will be implemented within the six National Initiative sites over the course of this project. Researchers seeking to characterize the influence of any one of these interventions must remain aware of the multivariate nature of this project, and of the real potential for interactions between these interventions, and must explicitly and statistically model these characteristics, as part of any empirical analysis.

Translating Basic Research Into Policies and Practices

It is also important to establish basic guidelines for the ways in which fundamental research can and should be translated into policies and practices. Most of the suggestions made in the sections above relate to basic research, designed to address limitations in our extant models of the way in which we think and behave. The ultimate goal of this research, however, is to provide insights that may allow for us to develop policies and practices that can be implemented in the

real world, and which can be used to prevent or attenuate undesirable outcomes, such as a souring of relations between the police and the community they serve. Whereas the impact of a hypothesis is routinely tested in the course of basic research, however, the impact of the policies that this research suggests is often not as rigorously examined. This is a crucial limitation of current practice, and one that must be addressed moving forward.

Addressing that limitation will require cooperation from the parties conducting the original research, and those adapting that research into procedures that may be carried out in the real world. Specifically, researchers reporting basic science must strive to make explicit the assumptions involved in their design of their studies, as well as the exact context within which it was conducted. Proper study design requires significant effort, to simply real world scenarios in a way that makes them conceptually and computationally tractable within a laboratory setting, without sacrificing all semblance of external validity. Human subjects are incredibly sensitive not only to the nature of the manipulations they experience, but also to contextual factors, such as the physical and social environment within which they experience them, and their beliefs about the goals of the experiment and of the experimenter. A change in any one of these may mean that interventions that appeared promising in the course of basic research may have an impact that is quantitatively or qualitatively different when implemented outside the laboratory. An inventory of each of these factors by the parties who conducted the original research will make more salient the general potential to those attempting to adapt the research for a differential impact between the lab and the real world. It will also serve as a ready-made agenda for additional research, should such a differential impact be discovered. (Similarly, researchers conducting field studies, and policy makers attempting to implement new measures based on insights from basic science, must also make explicit the assumptions that they make in the course

of adapting research from the lab to an external environment, as assumptions made at this stage

may also the degree to which results generalize.)

Finally, it is crucial for anyone attempting to adapt basic research into tangible, real world

policies, to design these policies in such as way so that their impact can be quantified and their

efficacy assessed. The need for empirically-proven practices and policies is increasingly widely

recognized — insofar as it serves as a point in favor of any policy that has data to back it up —

but it is not yet routinely considered during the policy design phase. In other words, the

recognition is often retrospective ("let's try to collect data to show that this policy that we have

previously designed does what we expect it to do"), rather than prospective ("let's design this

policy such that its impact may be relatively more easily quantified, and it's impact more

persuasively measured"). Thinking prospectively about the need for empirical data that may be

used to compare and contrast competing approaches to solving any one of the problems

discussed in this report will be critical to the design of better policy, and to the success of the

Initiative.

Framing Change so as to Overcome Resistance

All of the issues addressed in this report represent areas in which we may desire to change

policies and practices in the future, based on the outcome of our research.   It is important to

remember, however, that change itself is psychologically potent. Humans have a well-known,

domain general, preference for the status quo (Samuelson & Zeckhauser, 1988), and require

significant motivation to enact *any* change. This must be understood if we are to develop

reasonable expectations as to the likely impact of any practice or policy we implement.

It is also important to understand *why* people are biased against change. Basic research has

demonstrated that one of the primary drivers of the preference for the status quo is risk aversion.

We understand our current environment - we know what the risks are, and where the rewards can be found, and that knowledge is valuable. Changing any part of this necessarily raises the possibility of introducing new risks, or doing away with old, known, routes to reward, and this makes our survival and success less certain. As a result, the potential upside of any change must be significantly larger than the potential risk (or opportunity cost) of staying with the status quo, in order to provoke action. This knowledge can be adapted and expanded so as to be useful in the context of improving police community relationships. In particular, it suggests that we must expend *real* effort to characterize and communicate the benefits of any chance to all parties, and to do so explicitly and deliberately (rather than assuming that they will be obvious, or that people will be motivated to examine and evaluate them on their own). In a complimentary fashion, we must also strive to better understand the risks (or perceived risks) associated with any change, and to address these directly with both officers and community members.

References

Ballenger, J. F., Best, S. R., Metzler, T. J., Wasserman, D. A., Mohr, D. C., Liberman, A., ... & Marmar, C. R. (2011). Patterns and predictors of alcohol use in male and female urban police officers. *The American Journal on Addictions*, *20*(1), 21-29.

Barrett, L. F., Mesquita, B., Ochsner, K. N., & Gross, J. J. (2007). The experience of emotion. *Annual review of psychology*, *58*, 373.

Dias-Ferreira, E., Sousa, J. C., Melo, I., Morgado, P., Mesquita, A. R., Cerqueira, J. J., ... & Sousa, N. (2009). Chronic stress causes frontostriatal reorganization and affects decision-making. *Science*, *325*(5940), 621-625.

Gilovich, T., Savitsky, K., & Medvec, V. H. (1998). The illusion of transparency: biased assessments of others' ability to read one's emotional states. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *75*(2), 332.

Granot, Y., Balcetis, E., Schneider, K. E., & Tyler, T. R. (2014). Justice is not blind: Visual attention exaggerates effects of group identification on legal punishment. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 143, 2196-2208.

Janis, I. L., & Mann, L. (1976). Coping with decisional conflict: An analysis of how stress affects decision-making suggests interventions to improve the process. *American Scientist*, 657-667.

Jones, E. E.; Harris, V. A. (1967). "The attribution of attitudes". *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* **3** (1): 1–24.

Kashy, D. A., & Kenny, D. A. (2000). The analysis of data from dyads and groups. *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology*, 451-477.

Keinan, G. (1987). Decision making under stress: scanning of alternatives under controllable and uncontrollable threats. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *52*(3), 639.

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. Guilford Press.

Kring, A. M. (2008). Emotion disturbances as transdiagnostic processes in psychopathology. *Handbook of emotion*, *3*, 691-705.

Lerner, J. S., Li, Y., Valdesolo, P., & Kassam, K. S. (2015). Emotion and decision making. *Psychology*, *66*.

Liberman, A. M., Best, S. R., Metzler, T. J., Fagan, J. A., Weiss, D. S., & Marmar, C. R. (2002). Routine occupational stress and psychological distress in police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*,*25*(2), 421-441.

Markey, P. M., Funder, D. C., & Ozer, D. J. (2003). Complementarity of interpersonal behaviors in dyadic interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*(9), 1082-1090.

Marmar, C. R., McCaslin, S. E., Metzler, T. J., Best, S., Weiss, D. S., Fagan, J., ... & Mohr, D. (2006). Predictors of posttraumatic stress in police and other first responders. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1071*(1), 1-18.

Naqvi, N., Shiv, B., & Bechara, A. (2006). The role of emotion in decision making a cognitive neuroscience perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *15*(5), 260-264.

Neylan, T. C., Metzler, T. J., Best, S. R., Weiss, D. S., Fagan, J. A., Liberman, A., ... & Marmar, C. R. (2002). Critical incident exposure and sleep quality in police officers. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, *64*(2), 345-352.

Plous, S. (1993). *The psychology of judgment and decision making*. Mcgraw-Hill Book Company.

Pronin, E., Gilovich, T., & Ross, L. (2004). Objectivity in the eye of the beholder: divergent perceptions of bias in self versus others. *Psychological review*,*111*(3), 781.

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, *277*(5328), 918-924.

Samuelson, W., & Zeckhauser, R. (1988). Status quo bias in decision making.*Journal of risk and uncertainty*, *1*(1), 7-59.

Schwarz, N. (2000). Emotion, cognition, and decision making. *Cognition & Emotion*, *14*(4), 433-440.

Starcke, K., Wolf, O. T., Markowitsch, H. J., & Brand, M. (2008). Anticipatory stress influences decision making under explicit risk conditions. *Behavioral neuroscience*, *122*(6), 1352.

Svenson, O., & Maule, A. J. (Eds.). (1993). *Time pressure and stress in human judgment and decision making* (pp. 133-144). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Toda, M. (1980). Emotion and decision making. *Acta Psychologica*, *45*(1), 133-155.

Ward, A., & Ross, L. (1997). Naive realism in everyday life: Implications for social conflict and misunderstanding. *Values and knowledge*, 103-135.

Zechmeister, J. S., & Romero, C. (2002). Victim and offender accounts of interpersonal conflict: autobiographical narratives of forgiveness and unforgiveness. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *82*(4), 675.