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“When any part of the American family does not feel like it is being treated fairly, that's a problem for all of us. It's not just a problem for some.”

-- President Obama
A paradox:

- **Objective** quality of American policing has improved.
  (Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing, 2004, National Academy of Science).
- Greater ability to fight crime
- Decline in unlawful shootings of civilian
Introduction

Overall Confidence in Police Rebounds in 2016, 2017
Percentage of all American adults who have "a great deal" or "quite a lot" of confidence in the police

GALLUP
Percent expressing “a great deal/quite a lot” of confidence in police officers
Introduction

Average Confidence Rating for All Institutions, 1993-2016

Average percentage of Americans who have "a great deal" or "quite a lot" of confidence across 14 institutions

Average is based on 14 institutions asked about annually since 1993
### Introduction

Many Institutions Lost Ground in Last Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church or organized religion</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical system</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidency</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Supreme Court</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized labor</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal justice system</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television news</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big business</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GALLUP POLLS, JUNE 1-4, 2006, AND JUNE 1-5, 2016
Many Institutions Lost Ground in Last Decade
Percentage with "a great deal" or "quite a lot" of confidence in the institution
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GALLUP POLLS, JUNE 1-4, 2006, AND JUNE 1-5, 2016
### Confidence in Police Rebounds for Some Groups, Drops for Others

Percentage who have a great deal or quite a lot of confidence in the police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-2014</th>
<th>2015-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. adults</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberals</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderates</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatives</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and older</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party ID</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats and leaners</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans and leaners</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gallup*
Introduction

Why do we care what people think of police & other institutions?
President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing
Pillar One “Building Trust & Legitimacy”

Recommendation 1.1
Law enforcement culture should embrace a guardian mindset to build public trust and legitimacy. Toward that end, police and sheriffs’ departments should adopt procedural justice as the guiding principle for internal and external policies and practices to guide their interactions with the citizens they serve.
Introduction

Public: • Defers to authority • Obeys the law • Cooperates with authorities • Participates

Legitimacy: Public accepts the authority of the agent

Procedural Justice: Public believes that legal authority is exercised fairly
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Legitimacy & Procedural Justice

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=76fkEan5Nj4
Legitimacy & Procedural Justice

Legitimacy is shaped by *how* authority is exercised: procedural justice
"Quality" of individual interactions determines sense of legitimacy.
The belief that the law enforcer has the right to do so.
Impacts compliance.
The extent to which the public views “government agents” as entitled to exercise authority.
During police-citizen interactions, perceived legitimacy:

- Increases deference.
- Leads to voluntary decision acceptance of police directives (maintained over time)
- Lowers resistance and hostility
- Increases safety
- Increases satisfaction
Legitimacy & Procedural Justice

- Voluntary compliance
- Cooperation
- Decreases violence
- Other positive benefits
What shapes legitimacy?
– Dominant models:
  
  Lawful – agents obey the law
  Effective – agents succeeding (means justify the ends)

– *Neither* central to public trust and confidence
Lawfulness is . . .
Lawfulness is . . .
Legitimacy & Procedural Justice

Constraints:
- Laws and Ordinances
- Rules, Regulations and SOPs
- Court Rulings and Decisions
Lawfulness is . . .

Legitimacy is . . .
Lawfulness is . . .

Legitimacy is . . .

Legitimacy & Procedural Justice

Lawfulness

Where you want to be

Don’t want to be here

Legitimacy

Where you want to be

Don’t want to be here

Lawfulness
Legitimacy & Procedural Justice

Exercising their authority in fair ways - *procedural justice*
Legitimacy & Procedural Justice

Quality of decision making
1. Voice
2. Neutrality, Transparency, Factuality

Quality of treatment
3. Respect for people and their rights
4. Trustworthiness
An opportunity to “tell their side of the story”

“The judge/police officer/attorney did not listen to me.”

An opportunity to participate / provide input

“Who made that rule? That doesn’t make any sense.”
Voice in Practice

Allow people to state their case *before* making decisions.

Create “forums” in which they can *voice* their side of the story.
Neutrality, Transparency

Decisions based on facts and rules, not personal opinions, rules applied consistently across people and over cases.

“My neighbor did the same thing but they didn’t get a ticket.”

Transparency (Evidence)

Being neutral is not the same as being seen as neutral.
Explain:

what is happening
why it is happening
basis upon which decisions are being made
what will happen next
what they can / should do
Respect in Treatment

Demonstrate respect
-- for people
-- for their concerns

“The officer didn’t even get out of the car, just yelled at me to come to them.”

“The judge didn’t know my name.”
Respect in Practice

Courtesy, politeness
- Offer greeting
- Make eye contact
- Address people by name.

Respect rights
- Provide information about rights
- Emphasize that they have the right to fair treatment
In stressful situations, non-verbal communication takes over:

- **Body language**: 55%
- **Tone/volume**: 38%
- **Verbal**: 7%

Percent of information communicated

Mehrabian, Albert & Wiener, Morton (1967).
Trust in Treatment

Trust based on perceptions that officials are:

- Listening / considering expressed views
- Serious consideration
- Trying to do right
- Acting in interest of individual
• Trying to do what is right.
• Communicating that you are concerned about the people involved (benevolence).
• **Acknowledge** the importance of the issues to the people involved. Consider people’s arguments.
• **Account for decisions** showing responsiveness to concerns. Concerns have been listened to and taken into account.
Trust in Practice

Demonstrate listening & serious consideration
  Eye contact, not distracted OR multitasking

Acknowledgement, even when you cannot act as they would want

Express awareness of / empathy for the situation
  Treat the matter seriously
  Explain your decision.
  Demonstrate that you considered people’s arguments by
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Implicit Bias

– Human brains shortcuts
– Necessary to function in a complex world
– Without them difficult to respond quickly
Implicit Bias

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lsV8kiDtN78&t=26s
Implicit Bias

– Overt hostility in decline
– Equality remains elusive
– Not all biases are explicit.
– Everyone have implicit biases to some extent
### Implicit Bias

#### Percent of web respondents with each score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong automatic preference for European American compared to African American</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate automatic preference for European American compared to African American</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight automatic preference for European American compared to African American</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little to no automatic preference between African American and European American</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight automatic preference for African American compared to European American</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate automatic preference for African American compared to European American</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong automatic preference for African American compared to European American</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This distribution summarizes 3,314,277 IAT scores for the Race task completed between December 2002 and December 2015.
**MYTH:** Implicit bias is nothing more than beliefs people choose not to tell others. They know how they feel; they just know they cannot or should not say those beliefs aloud, so they hide them.

**BUSTED** Implicit bias differs from suppressed thoughts that individuals may conceal for social desirability purposes. **Implicit biases are activated involuntarily and beyond our awareness or intentional control.** Implicit bias is concerned with unconscious cognition that influences understanding, actions, and decisions, whereas individuals who may choose not to share their beliefs due to social desirability inclinations are consciously making this determination.

**MYTH:** Having implicit biases makes me a bad person.

**BUSTED** Bias is a natural phenomenon in that our brains are constantly forming automatic associations as a way to better and more efficiently understand the world around us. **No one is a “bad” person for harboring implicit biases; these are normal human processes that occur on an unconscious level.** Some implicit biases are even positive in nature. In terms of the existence of unwanted, negative implicit biases, fortunately our brains are malleable, thus giving us the capacity to mitigate their effect through research-based debiasing strategies.
**MYTH:** It’s a waste of time to try to mitigate my implicit biases. They do not impact anyone anyways.

**BUSTED** Extensive research has documented the real-world effects of implicit biases in the realms of health care, criminal justice, education, employment, and housing, among others. For example, implicit biases can affect the quality of care a patient receives, the level of encouragement students receive from their teachers, whether or not an individual receives an interview or promotion, and more. Implicit biases have huge implications; thus, it is important to identify your own biases and then actively engage in debiasing techniques to address them.

**MYTH:** I am not biased; I have diverse friends and I believe in equal treatment.

**BUSTED** Actually, we all have implicit biases. Research shows that all individuals are susceptible to harnessing implicit associations about others based on characteristics like race, skin tone, income, sex, and even attributes like weight, and accents. Unfortunately, these associations can even go as far as to affect our behavior towards others, even if we want to treat all people equally or genuinely believe we are egalitarian.
Implicit Bias

- Impact heavily dependent upon contexts
- When basis for judgment is vague, implicit bias more likely to creep
- Explicit, concrete decision criteria protects
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Training

• Department of Justice COPS Office
• Office of Justice Programs Diagnostic Center
• National Initiative for Building Community Trust & Justice
• Center for Court Innovation
Training

—Can build legitimacy and trust
  Can be helpful and reassuring

—Goal of PJ training
  To foster positive
  Increase compliance with law
  Increase officer safety
Training

– Before training, prepare the organization
  Pre-training messaging
– Community involvement in design, delivery
– Trainer quality
– Ongoing evaluation
  Future iterations
Exercise

• Words that others (non-police) use to describe police.

• Words that the police use to describe others (non-police).
– Good models exist at no cost
– Training programs with strong fidelity to the underlying theory demonstrated success
– Models should be created with input from social scientists, theorists
  Theory is foundation; if theory unsound, whole house will be unstable
– Leadership training (e.g. Blue Courage) not a substitute for PJ or IB training
Training

– To be taught by police officers
– Train-the-trainer
– Internal police department buy-in
– Departments should adapt to fit their history, specific issues
Completed Procedural Justice Training - Police:

- Chicago, IL
- Oakland, CA
- Salinas, CA
- Stockton, CA
- Birmingham, AL
- Fort Worth, TX
- Gary, IN
- Minneapolis, MN
- Pittsburgh, PA
- New York, NY
Credibility is key.
Chicago, IL - 95% percent rated “Excellent,” “Very Good,” or “Good”

Stockton, CA - 95% rated “Excellent” or “Very Good”

“...helped open the floor for peer support and better communication.”
“I was pleasantly surprised;” “encouraged by it;” and “this is the right direction we need to be going.”

Oakland, CA - 98% “Excellent,” “Very Good,” or “Good”

“...reminded us why we’re here.”
“...reminded me of how my attitude affects my interactions.”
Training

- Increased officer support for all of the procedural justice dimensions
- All effects were strong
- Longer-term, officers continued to be more supportive of three of four PJ principles
  Effect of training on trust *not* statistically significant.

Skogan et al, 2014
Training

– Changes in attitudes difficult, only moderately predictive

– Goal of IB training not to reduce but to interrupt

– Can / will hold implicit biases without acting on them
Developed by Center for Policing Equity staff in collaboration with Chicago Police Department and New York Police Department

one-day (eight-hour) training consisting

4 Modules that cover how and when racial disparities arise even in the absence of bigotry

Scenarios, interactive exercises, and repetition

Train the Trainers
“Identity traps”
Situations that allow psychological factors to allow behavior inconsistent with values.

Behaviors unrelated to character or conscious intentions

Issues of racial disparities not to “hearts and minds” of officers
Training

- Commitment beyond training
- Policies and practices
- Internal procedural justice
- Efforts to incorporate PJ throughout CJS
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Special Issue: Procedural Justice and Legitimacy Across the Criminal Justice System
Research

- Prevents crime and recidivism
- Prevent arrest, use of force
- Prevent abuses in jailing
- Promote fairness in prosecution

- Prevent wrongful convictions
- Reduce corrections populations
- Build stronger communities
Objective / Author(s)
Prevent crime & recidivism

Tyler 1990, 2006
Jackson et al., 2013;
Papachristos et al., 2013

Findings
- Perceived police legitimacy decreases approval for the use of violence among private citizens
- Legitimacy-based programs reduce previously incarcerated individuals likelihood of recidivism and increase the length of time they spend out of jail.
- Perceptions of fairness can increase citizens’ cooperation with legal authorities and reduce their likelihood of supporting or engaging in criminal activities themselves.
Objective / Author(s)
Prevent arrest, Use of Force

Owens et al, 2016
Trinkner, Tyler, & Goff, 2016

Findings
- Officers with regular procedural justice training were 26% less likely to end encounters with arrest (short-term), 50% less likely to be involved in a use-of-force case (long-term).
- Internal procedural justice, leads officers to be more likely to endorse the value of fair policing in their own encounters with citizens (Trinkner, Tyler, & Goff, 2016).
**Objective / Author(s)**
Prevent abuses in jailing

- Lambert et al., 2007
- Kop et al., 1999
- Taxman & Gordon, 2009

**Findings**
- Corrections officers’ perceptions of organization as procedurally just predict greater commitment to work and reduced stress; both factors reduce proclivity for violence on duty.
- Corrections officers who perceive workplace operating with less procedural justice lead them to feel more afraid of their inmates, which may promote what they mistakenly consider pre-emptive force.
Objective / Author(s)
Promotes fairness in prosecution

Casper et al., 1988

Findings
– The amount of time spent with one’s lawyer predicts stronger feelings of procedurally fair treatment.
– Procedurally fair treatment by prosecutors—feeling listened to and treated in an unbiased way—leads people to feel more satisfied with the outcome of their case, independent of sentence severity.
Objective / Author(s)
Prevent wrongful conviction

Barret-Howard & Tyler, 1986
Ask et al., 2008
Tyler & Huo, 2002

Findings
- Using the same criteria consistently is a hallmark of procedural justice. Bias is the definition of inconsistently applying criteria, yet bias can affect all aspects of the conviction process. For example, police rate exonerating evidence as less reliable than guilt-confirming evidence.
- Procedural fairness improves the court experience for all, regardless of race, economic background, or felony severity.
Research

Objective / Author(s)
Reduce corrections populations

Franke et al., 2010
Reisig & Mesko, 2009
Vidmar, 1992

Findings
- Long-term incarceration delegitimizes legal authority in the eyes of the incarcerated.
- Corrections officers’ use of legitimate and just authority reduced the likelihood of prisoners’ engaging in misconduct or violating institutional rules.
- Principles of procedural justice are often used to bolster alternative dispute resolution practices.
Procedural Justice Training

Skogan, Van Craen & Hennessy (2014)

Two Studies:
  - Short-term effects
  - Longer-term effects

Training:
  - 1 day, 5 modules
Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>- whether <em>citizens</em> could be trusted to do the right thing, have good intentions, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>“Officers need to show an honest interest in what people have to say, even if it is not going to change anything,” “Listening and talking to people is a good way to take charge of situations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>“People should be treated with respect regardless of their respect for the police,” “People who break the law do not deserve to be treated with respect.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrality</td>
<td>“It is necessary to give everyone a good reason why they are being stopped, even if it is not required,” “If people ask why they are being treated like they are, it is necessary to stop and explain.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Short-term Effects: Substantial differences on all four dimensions of procedural justice.

Fig. 1 Four dimensions of procedural justice, before and after training.
“Relatively enduring impact” on three of four dimensions.

Excluded “Trust” in public

We’ve been taught to trust nobody, to show less emotion. . . . We come to see everything as bullshit – going to another domestic, going to a beat meeting, going to training. We come to see people as assholes. But in reality, there’s a big population we never come in contact with. It’s the rest of the world.
Summary
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– Public perceptions of gov’t actors’ behaviors shapes their own behaviors.

– Procedural justice:
  – creates and maintains legitimacy.
  – Across group membership (race, offending)

– Fair treatment supports, promotes agency goals
Thank You

• Questions / Discussion
**Implicit Association Test**

Next, you will use the 'E' and 'I' computer keys to categorize items into groups as fast as you can. These are the four groups and the items that belong to each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Pleasure, Glad, Fantastic, Laughing, Appealing, Delight, Excellent, Spectacular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Evil, Nasty, Despise, Detest, Abuse, Disgust, Sickening, Horrific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donald Trump</strong></td>
<td>![Images of Donald Trump]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>George W. Bush</strong></td>
<td>![Images of George W. Bush]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are seven parts. The instructions change for each part. Pay attention!

[Continue]
Percent of web respondents with each score

- Strong automatic preference for Trump compared to other presidents: 3%
- Moderate automatic preference for Trump compared to other presidents: 8%
- Slight automatic preference for Trump compared to other presidents: 9%
- Little to no automatic preference between other presidents and Trump: 20%
- Slight automatic preference for other presidents compared to Trump: 17%
- Moderate automatic preference for other presidents compared to Trump: 24%
- Strong automatic preference for other presidents compared to Trump: 19%

This distribution summarizes 64,422 IAT scores for the President IAT completed between March 2017 and December 2017.
Research

Respect Model Coefficients

Log Odds Ratio by Race

Disrespectful Respectful

- Apologizing
- For You
- Gratitude
- Reassurance
- Last Names
- Formal Titles
- For Me
- Safety
- Give Agency
- Filled Pauses (Um/Uh)
- Adverbial Just
- Positive Words
- Hedges
- Introductions
- Questions
- Linguistic Negation
- Negative Words
- Ask for Agency
- Disfluency
- Informal Titles
- First Names
- Hands on the Wheel

- Black Stops
- White Stops

Perceived as more...

First Name Ask For Agency Questions
[name], can I see that driver's license again? It-it's showing suspended. Is that- that's you?
Disfluency Negative Word Disfluency

Informal Title Ask For Agency Adversal "Just"
All right, my man. Do me a favor. Just keep your hands on the steering wheel real quick.
"Hands On The Wheel."

Apology Introduction Last Name
Sorry to stop you. My name's Officer [name] with the Police Department.

Last Name Formal Title Safety Please
There you go, ma'am. Drive safe, please.

Adversal "Just" Filled Pause Reassurance
It just says that, uh, you've fixed it. No problem. Thank you very much, sir.

Gratitude Formal Title