



**CONSORTIUM FOR POLICE LEADERSHIP IN EQUITY**  
[www.policingequity.org](http://www.policingequity.org)

# The Contract for Policing Justice

**A Report Issued by:**

*The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity, Board of Directors*

## Table of Contents

Law Enforcement Partners .....	2
Executive Summary: Legitimacy in Policing .....	3
Diagnosing the Problem: How to Address Unwarranted Disparate Treatment .....	4
Who is Protected? How to Address Immigration Policy Enforcement .....	7
Fairness Breeds Fairness: How to Address Organizational Equity in Policing .....	10
References .....	13
Appendix .....	17
Endnotes .....	23

## Law Enforcement Partners

The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity is intended as a tool for law enforcement executives to improve their profession. Our motto, "leadership in equity through excellence in research" requires not only that the social science affiliates of CPLE be rigorous and objective, but also that law enforcement executives take leadership on the difficult issues of equity and justice. Consequently, we wish to acknowledge the following individuals and the departments they represent, without whom the following document would not have been possible:

Atlanta Police Department	Deputy Chief Shawn L. Jones
Austin Police Department	Chief Art Acevedo
Baltimore County Police Department	Chief James W. Johnson Captain Karen Johnson
Calgary Police Department	Chief Richard H. Hanson
Denver Police Department	Chief Gerald Whitman Division Chief Tracie L. Keesee
Fort Worth Police Department	Chief Jeffery W. Halstead
Houston Police Department	Chief Charles A. McClelland, Jr. Deputy Director Craig E. Ferrell, Jr.
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department	Division Chief Roberta A. Abner
Los Angeles Police Department	Deputy Chief Kirk J. Albanese
Las Vegas Metro Police Department	Assistant Sheriff Raymond J. Flynn Lieutenant John Farrell
Montgomery Co. Police Department	Chief J. Thomas Manger
Newark Police Department	Director Garry McCarthy
Oklahoma City Police Department	Chief William Citty
Philadelphia Police Department	Deputy Commissioner Stephen T. Johnson
Phoenix Police Department	Chief Jack F. Harris
St. Louis Metro Police Department	Chief Daniel Isom
Salt Lake City Police Department	Chief Chris Burbank Deputy Chief Lee Dobrowolski
San Diego Police Department	Chief William Lansdowne
San Jose Police Department	Chief Robert Davis
Toronto Police Service	Deputy Chief Michael Federico
City of Tucson	Deputy City Manager Richard Miranda
Tucson Police Department	Chief Roberto Villaseñor
Vancouver Police Department	Deputy Chief Constable Warren Lemcke
Virginia Beach Police Department	Captain Patrick Gallagher

## Executive Summary: *Legitimacy in Policing*

Effective law enforcement requires legitimacy.<sup>1</sup> This is not simply an adage, but a social fact. Departments are better able to protect those who trust law enforcement. Agencies receive more information from communities that believe law enforcement is invested in their wellbeing. And officers elicit more compliance when suspects feel they are treated with respect.<sup>2</sup> In recognition of these facts, the National Academy of Sciences issued a report entitled *Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing* in 2004 in which leading scholars identified police legitimacy as an area in dire need of new research and policy innovation.

Both law enforcement executives and scholars agree on this point, and researcher-practitioner collaborations have become increasingly common as a result. These burgeoning relationships have begun to identify ways to achieve fair police practices and demonstrate their fairness to the public. These collaborations, however, have mostly been discrete projects designed to address the needs of individual departments or researchers. Consequently, in August of 2010, the Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity (CPLE) assembled executives from 23 of the largest law enforcement agencies in the US and Canada, 37 leading social science scholars, representatives from federal agencies, and leaders from national community advocacy groups to set a national agenda for research and practice in policing equity. The discussions benefited from tremendous trust, courage, and candor. And despite differences of opinion, consensus on important topics emerged.

This report is the result. The **Contract for Policing Justice** is an agenda for research on legitimacy and effective policing, the goal of which is to provide a roadmap to ensure effective and unbiased law enforcement. It is divided into three sections, which reflect the three areas that conference participants identified as most pressing: unwarranted disparate police treatment of minorities; immigration and immigrant community issues; and internal legitimacy within police agencies. Each is a critical area urgently in need of rigorous research.

Across each area we suggest the importance of gathering empirical data regarding both the reality of police practices and the perceived legitimacy of the police in their communities. With proper support, data can be aggregated from large, medium, and small municipalities, filling in the knowledge gap with regard to less populated areas—where the majority of law enforcement works. When considering the reality of policing, our primary concern is with the impact of police practices and behaviors on the effectiveness of the police in maintaining social order, controlling crime, and ensuring the safety of both officers and members of the public.

Our overall theme is that legitimate policing creates effective policing. Professional conduct builds legitimacy both within a department and among the members of the community. This, in turn, facilitates police effectiveness by encouraging officer integrity internally and public support for and cooperation with the police externally. Using survey, longitudinal, and experimental methods, the proposed research constitutes an opportunity to increase our knowledge about legitimacy in law enforcement and, in so doing, ensure greater policing justice.

## Diagnosing the Problem: *How to Address Unwarranted Disparate Treatment*

Biased policing is not legitimate policing and leads to mistrust in the communities that most need effective law enforcement services.<sup>3</sup> Even in departments that enjoy overwhelming public support, there remain community members who assume that racial profiling and police harassment of racial minorities is common. This perception is driven in part by historical realities and in part because the percentage of stops that result in valid arrests tend to be relatively low and the number of innocent racial/ethnic minorities subjected to police stops, frisks, and searches tends to be relatively high.<sup>4</sup> This combination of negative perceptions and disparate treatment (where it occurs) is a sure recipe for community mistrust and ineffective policing. That is, the perception and reality of racial bias in policing creates communities that facilitate criminality and obstruct law enforcement. Research needs to decipher when/if disparate treatment exists; when/if it is unwarranted and linked to bias; and how the perception of profiling shapes public reactions to the police.

Law enforcement agencies are well aware of the critical issues related to the disparate treatment of racial groups and expressed their desire for four specific research interventions. First, they were eager to find tools that could *identify officers that were likely to engage in biased policing*. Second, they expressed a need to *develop trainings that are effective in reducing biased policing*. Third, they asked for researchers to *identify results-oriented practices* with regard to departmental policies (e.g. staffing levels, discipline, etc.) that ensure equitable policing. And, fourth, they called on researchers to *develop a systematic way of gauging community perceptions of racial bias*. However, identifying problem officers, developing effective training, specifying effective departmental policies, and discerning when bias is real or merely perceived each require that researchers be able to identify when racial profiling occurs—a task that has proven exceedingly difficult. That is because, despite the importance of biased policing, researchers and practitioners have yet to reach a consensus on the best way to measure it.

As the law enforcement community conveyed, a more complete understanding of racially disparate treatment is a critical first step in ensuring equitable delivery of law enforcement services and improving community trust in the law. The ultimate goal of the proposed research on unwarranted disparate treatment is to design a tool that can be used by law enforcement and researchers alike to assess the racial equity of police departments' practices, and to chart a path toward improving that standing. This research has the potential to establish nationwide best practices for the measurement—and more importantly the reduction—of unwarranted racially disparate treatment in policing.

### METHODS FOR MEASURING RACIAL PROFILING

Researchers have yet to reach a consensus on the best way to assess racial profiling, typically relying on one of several imperfect measures. The most common approaches include: 1) benchmarking; 2) hit rates; and 3) surveying community opinion regarding law enforcement. These represent the most promising methods currently available for measuring racial profiling and its impact, but each has its own limitations.

*Benchmarking.* Perhaps the most common approach to assessing whether bias accounts for racial and ethnic disparities in law enforcement behavior is the method of benchmarking.<sup>5</sup> This method compares the racial distribution of stop rates, citations, use of force, searches, arrests, etc. to the racial demographics of a relevant comparison population. In its most crude form, benchmarking would use population statistics (i.e., from the U.S. Census) for the geographical area under consideration. Using this method, one might conclude that racial profiling was occurring if 50% of vehicle stops involved African Americans but only 24% of the area population was composed of African Americans. Studies relying on population benchmarking should account for demographics of neighboring areas from which individuals may come to a targeted area; racial differences in the amount of time spent in an area, offending rates, or types of crimes perpetrated; the amount of police attention directed at an area; or whether encounters are initiated by officers or citizens. Ideally, benchmarking is accomplished using actual surveys, with representative samples, of behavior of individuals in the targeted area so that the benchmark captures the offending rates for behavior that triggers stops (e.g., speeding). However, this approach can be expensive and labor-intensive. Thus, population benchmarking in its crudest form provides only a weak index of racial bias and in its robust form may be impractical.

*Hit Rates.* Researchers have begun to focus on the racial distribution of hit rates—the percentage of individuals who are stopped and searched who are actually caught engaging in illegal activity.<sup>6</sup> The logic behind this method is that if officers are equally successful in, for example, securing contraband from African American, Hispanic/Latino, and White suspects, then it is unlikely that officer bias contributes to racial disparities in stop and search statistics. In contrast, if officers are less successful in securing contraband from searches of African American and/or Hispanic/Latino suspects than from White suspects, then non-Whites have probably had to meet a lower threshold of suspicion to get stopped and searched. Although this method is a significant improvement on benchmarking in that researchers do not have to control for offending rates, it is still limited in that many police encounters are excluded from such analyses and analyses are unable to distinguish between individual biases (e.g., proclivity to conduct searches) or policies (e.g., directed patrol) that might produce differential stop, search, and hit rates.

*Community Surveys.* Research has revealed that perceptions of racial bias severely erode community confidence and trust in law enforcement.<sup>7</sup> Thus, it is important to consider not only whether racial profiling actually occurs but also whether the community believes that it occurs. Community surveys demonstrate consistent racial and ethnic differences in perceptions of biased law enforcement -- specifically, Blacks and Hispanics are more likely than Whites to believe that racial profiling is widespread and that they have been profiled.<sup>8</sup> In addition, when involved in traffic stops, compared to Whites, Blacks are more likely to believe that the stops are not legitimate and that the police acted improperly.<sup>9</sup> Results such as these highlight how important such surveys of the public are for understanding the problem of racial profiling. Yet, just because community members think that the police engage in racial profiling does not mean that they do. Likewise, just because police do not believe they engage in racial profiling does not mean that they do not, and ample research on how non-conscious stereotypes influence discriminatory behaviors indicates that it is likely that the police do sometimes discriminate as a result of non-

conscious stereotypes—just as civilians do.<sup>10</sup> Although researchers and practitioners often assume that community attitudes towards policing are driven by police policies, it is difficult to gauge accurately this causal link due to methodological and logistical limitations. Further, such surveys have not accounted for the possibility that some of the racial differences in attitudes toward the police may be the result of differences in more general attitudes towards public and civil services, variations in trust in government, or differences or in the tendency to perceive bias more generally.<sup>11</sup>

## SOLUTION STATEMENT

Much like a physician must identify symptoms to diagnose and cure a disease, we must understand how to identify and quantify a social malady before designing an intervention for it. In an effort to provide a kind of biased policing symptomology, participating researchers will first explore five variables of interest, and the relationships among them. The first three are the most common existing methods: 1) benchmarking statistics (including demographics, such as racial and economic statistics within each area of study), 2) hit rate data, 3) and community opinion regarding law enforcement. The final two offset some of the shortcomings of these more popular measures and are: 4) officer attitude-behavior matching data, and 5) diversity and officer deployment policies.

Officer attitude-behavior matching is a technique that simply correlates officer attitudes (e.g. “I like/dislike a particular group”) with their behaviors on the job (e.g. number or ratio of Latino and White civilians stopped). By analyzing how officer racial attitudes affect their behaviors, it is possible to test whether or not there is a clear link between racial bias and racially disparate outcomes (controlling for relevant other factors). In contrast, analyzing departmental diversity and officer deployment policies *across departments*, makes it possible to determine not only when individual officers within a given agency engage in racially biased policing, but to identify policies that contribute to disparate racial outcomes across an entire department. Using all five of these indicators in concert will allow researchers to develop a racial bias symptomology for police departments. By collecting these data across multiple departments and testing relationships between variables, it will be possible to create a rubric for identifying which departments are succeeding at delivering equitable policing and which are falling behind; which departments are “healthy” and which are “unhealthy” with regard to racially equitable treatment of their communities. Regardless of how well or poorly an area is being policed, the first step in any solution will have to be a diagnosis—something both law enforcement executives and community members both desire fervently.

## Who is Protected?: *How to Address Immigration Policy Enforcement*

Local law enforcement's role in immigration policy enforcement has recently become a national flashpoint. The difficulty of continuing to police effectively in the face of this controversy was the second concern addressed at the CPLE summer conference. Law enforcement executives called on researchers to reveal both objective *realities* of immigration and policing and *perceptions* of the police and the communities they serve related to immigration and policing.

Immigration policy has been a mounting concern due to the burgeoning immigrant population in the United States. The growing popularity of laws that add immigration enforcement to the duties of law enforcement personnel on the local level, known as “cross-deputization,” “deputizes” officers to enforce immigration policy—a job that had until recently been reserved for federal agents. Because the political debate is both new and heated, the consequences of cross-deputization are unclear. Thus, the focus of the proposed research is to explore the consequences of the trend toward including immigration enforcement among the duties of local law enforcement, elucidating the consequences for both the police and the communities they serve. The proposed research investigates the impact of immigration policy on law enforcement personnel, immigrant and non-immigrant communities, and the relationship between law enforcement and the communities they protect.

Much of what serves as the rationale for cross-deputization is inconsistent with publicly available data. It is often argued, for example, that immigrants are violent and contribute disproportionately to crime rates. There is research, however, that provides evidence to the contrary.<sup>12</sup> For instance, converging evidence suggests that immigration tends to decrease crime over time.<sup>13</sup> Another popular claim is that immigration damages the economy because immigrants are allegedly taking jobs from native-born citizens. A study of Border States in the United States, however, showed no influence of immigration rates on the number of hours worked by U.S. native-born residents.<sup>14</sup> In fact, increased numbers of immigrants actually served to increase total productivity in these states. Thus, both positive and negative correlates of immigration need to be considered in any systematic data analysis. Though there have been studies of the relationship between immigrants and law enforcement in general,<sup>15</sup> there is still a need for research on the impact of cross-deputization in particular.

Consistent with these findings, preliminary evidence suggests that there is little basis for concern about elevated levels of criminality in new immigrants. A recent CPLE report indicates that in Salt Lake City, despite a rapidly increasing Latino immigrant population, Latinos continue to commit both drug and violent crimes at a rate slightly less than their proportion (28%) of Salt Lake City's total population.<sup>16</sup> There was, however, basis for concern regarding the impact cross-deputization policies will have on public safety. Cross-deputization efforts damage community perceptions of police legitimacy.<sup>17</sup> This was true not only for undocumented immigrants, but also for documented immigrants, Latino citizens, and White citizens—again, undermining the legitimacy of law enforcement in the communities they serve.<sup>18</sup>

Any decrease in perceptions of police legitimacy may have dangerous consequences for public safety. For example, in the CPLE study cited above, both White and Latino residents of



Salt Lake City were asked how likely they would be to report a variety of crimes if a statewide cross-deputization bill, were to be enacted.<sup>19</sup> Both Whites and Latinos said that they would be significantly less likely to report both drug and violent crimes, for example, if such policies were in place. The decreases in predicted willingness to report crime were particularly pronounced for Latinos, with the drop equally severe among citizens and undocumented immigrants.

Finally, not only will the community be impacted by cross-deputization policies, but so too will the law enforcement personnel charged with enforcing the policy. First, a majority of police officers do not think that local law enforcement should be responsible for immigration, and only a small minority believed that cross-deputization policies will help fight crime.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, a recent CPLE study found that, regardless of their personal beliefs about immigration policy, officers are concerned that enforcing immigration laws will cost them both public respect and personal safety.<sup>21</sup> While these data should not be interpreted too broadly beyond the particular situation of Salt Lake City, Utah, it would be distressing should further research uncover similar patterns nationwide.

Maintaining the respect of people in the community is critical to an officer maintaining control in any civilian contact, maintaining the civility of any given interaction, having their directives accepted, and most importantly, minimizing the chances that force becomes necessary.<sup>22</sup> Similarly, previous research indicates that individuals who are concerned with being seen as biased—as many officers facing cross-deputization fear they will be<sup>23</sup>—are likely to respond negatively to individuals who produce that fear.<sup>24</sup> Together with previous research on community responses to cross-deputization, these data suggest that there are serious public safety concerns associated with the implementation of cross-deputization policies.

## METHODS FOR STUDYING IMMIGRATION

Law enforcement executives were eager to see new research in several immigration related areas: the objective realities of immigration, the consequences of cross-deputization on law enforcement resources, the consequences of cross-deputization on police-community relations, and the impact of the policies they have to enforce on the attitudes of police officers.

To understand the relationship of immigration to crime levels and economic indices, data should be collected systematically over time, not just at a single point. It will be important to track a variety of both negative and positive indices over time in order to fully understand the impact of immigration—to explore not only rates of criminality and financial burden, but also contributions to economic and civic life. This extended data set will provide a more informed basis for considering immigration policies and for evaluating the effectiveness of the laws that are operating in a community. With the availability of this longitudinal time-series data, we will be able to track these indices of crime and economic activity relative to changes in immigration rates, changes in federal immigration policy (such as 287(g)), and changes in local immigration legislation (such as Arizona's SB 1070). Accordingly, these enriched data will facilitate stronger causal arguments for the impetuses and impacts of cross-deputization policy. Finally, collecting these data will allow us to more accurately assess potential costs (such as decreased legitimacy

of the police) and benefits (such as decreased rates of undocumented immigration) of these policies and laws.

In parallel with objective measures of crime and economic activity, it will also be important to develop sensitive measures of community climate that can allow law enforcement organizations to know how their activity is being perceived within all segments of their community (the established White community as well as various ethnic communities that have longer or shorter histories in the specific city or state). These measures will include perceptions of procedural justice, police legitimacy, and feelings of safety within the community. In cities that adopt or change their enforcement policies, or in states where laws such as SB 1070 are enacted during the course of study, it will be very useful to collect data both prior to and after the enactment of the new laws or policies. Such a pre-post design will allow us to draw some cause and effect conclusions, adding value to the cross-sectional assessments among cities.

A third focus of the proposed research looks to the impact of immigration on the attitudes and job satisfaction of police personnel themselves. We believe it is vital to include and assess the changing reality and perceptions of the law enforcement personnel who are being tasked with cross-deputization. Preliminary work by CPLE, described earlier, suggests that officers believe that the new practices being imposed on them will have costs both in terms of public respect and personal safety. As a result, general job satisfaction is also likely to suffer. We intend to extend our preliminary studies, moving toward a more representative national sample and, where appropriate, using the kind of pre-post design described above to assess the causal impact of policies. Some aspects of the surveys of organizational equity, described elsewhere in this proposal, will also be useful in assessing the immigration issues.

To summarize, the development of a broad program of research that addresses both objective and subjective facets of the impact of immigration and immigration policy on the immigrant, non-immigrant, and law enforcement communities will prove invaluable to an informed assessment of the utility and valence of immigration policy and legislation.

## Fairness Breeds Fairness: *How to Address Organizational Equity in Policing*

Organizational equity in policing refers to the fair representation *and* treatment of members of racial and ethnic groups, religious groups, and women and men at all levels of responsibility within the police force.<sup>25</sup> Equity, both in representation and treatment, impacts police behavior and effectiveness. Inequity within police organizations adversely affects the morale and functioning of the force and undermines the confidence and support of diverse communities for policing. Equity is first important because it shapes legitimacy within the community. However, legitimacy is not only something that the public feels about the police. Police officers themselves vary in their perceptions of the legitimacy of their departments, and such variations influence job satisfaction and job performance. Equity is also important because it impacts upon officer views about legitimacy. Thus, organizational equity is not just a question of morality, it is also critical for operational effectiveness. People, both inside and outside an organization, use organizational diversity as an indicator of the fairness of the organization.<sup>26</sup>

Perceived discrimination undermines the morale of both majority and minority group members because it erodes beliefs in the fairness and integrity of the organization. When procedural justice is perceived to be violated within a group, members of that group—not only those victimized by the injustice but also others who witness the injustice—experience feelings of anger, reduced identification with and commitment to the group, and less trust for others within the group.<sup>27</sup> These processes apply directly to organizational commitment within police departments.<sup>28</sup>

With respect to gender, for example, women are typically underrepresented in traditional male roles,<sup>29</sup> and are less likely than men to be hired and evaluated favorably.<sup>30</sup> Consequently, women are less likely than men to be hired for such positions, are evaluated less favorably, and are less likely to be promoted.<sup>31</sup>

Perceptions of bias do not have to be based directly on observation of blatant injustice; people often infer bias from the composition of the group, in terms of overall representations of members of different groups and their representation in central positions within the group. Members of traditionally disadvantaged groups (racial, ethnic, religious, gender, and/or sexual orientation) perceive an under-representation of members of their group as a signal that they do not belong and a cue that the organization harbors systematic biases toward their group.<sup>32</sup> Consequently, it is more difficult to recruit members of these groups to join the organization and more difficult to retain those who are already members. Members who question their belonging and their opportunities for advancement demonstrate less ambition to achieve within the organization, are less likely to exhibit behaviors beyond required responsibilities that support the organization and individuals within it,<sup>33</sup> experience more stress,<sup>34</sup> and, even when they are motivated otherwise, behave in ways that reinforce negative stereotypes of their group.<sup>35</sup>

Members of underrepresented groups show high levels of cultural distrust toward organizations perceived to historically support primarily the majority population (such as the police and the medical community).<sup>36</sup> With respect to policing, in particular, recent research reveals that perceptions of illegitimacy within police organizations and policing reduces community respect, increases anger and resistance, and leads to lower levels of compliance with

the law and cooperation with the police in fighting crime.<sup>37</sup> Greater racial/ethnic diversity and diversity in sexual orientations in police forces, though, increases credibility in the police among minority group members.<sup>38</sup>

Organizational equity, in both fact and perception, is critical for creating the climate of respect, trust, and cooperation within the police force and cultivating the support of the community, which are fundamental for effective policing. Nevertheless, women and minorities remain substantially underrepresented in police forces, generally, and in senior leadership positions, more specifically. In 2001, women accounted for only 12.7% of all law enforcement officers in large agencies (with 100 or more sworn personnel), significantly less than the participation of women in the labor force overall, 46.5%. Moreover, the National Center for Women and Policing (2002) reported that “more than half (55.9%) of the large police agencies surveyed reported no women in top command positions, and the vast majority (87.9%) reported no women of color in their highest ranks” (p. 4). The majority of chiefs and sheriffs want to create departments that are representative of the communities they serve but historical and contemporary barriers have frustrated that desire—leaving several questions.

#### METHODS FOR ASSESSING ORGANIZATIONAL EQUITY

We propose to use surveys conducted within police departments to study the connection of organizational culture to the ability of departments to recruit and retain diverse groups of officers. Such a survey will serve multiple purposes. First, a climate survey will help law enforcement agencies assess their standing relative to other agencies (but note that agencies will be able to identify only their own data and where they rank relative to other—unnamed—departments; other forces will not be identified). Second, the survey will provide a benchmark for later assessing the impact of interventions to improve organizational equity that different forces pursue over time. Third, by systematically coding for different precincts or different levels of unit or individual performance, the results of this survey can illuminate how organizational equity relates to difference aspects of policing effectiveness. And fourth, using data from these surveys, we will be able to see how historical factors—such as earlier representations of members of diverse groups in the police force and disparate hiring and promotion rates—relate to current perceptions of organizational equity.

The survey will address a set of three questions. First, how does the procedural fairness of the climate within the department shape recruitment and retention? Are minorities and women more likely to stay in and excel within departments that have fair procedures for decision-making and that emphasize respectful treatment?

Second, does the diversity climate matter? Do the actions or lack of actions taken by departments that indicate the department’s orientation toward diversity make any difference? Does the provision of sensitivity training, mentoring, or other programs designed to signal support for diversity facilitate building a diverse department?

And third, do the factors noted above influence the ability of diverse departments to be effective? In other words, does organizational legitimacy promote equitable policing? To make

this assessment we will link officers' survey responses to indices of police performance either at the individual or the unit level. We want to examine which aspects of organizational culture, policies and practices, and officers' attitudes shape the objective quality of police performance.

Beyond internal dynamics of police departments we also propose examining the influence of diversity on the relationship between police forces and their communities. Are diverse agencies effective or do officers act similarly regardless of ethnicity or gender?

This research could be accomplished via community surveys linking police force composition to indicators of effectiveness, such as the crime rate. Performance may also be assessed in terms of complaints and community surveys of police legitimacy.

## SOLUTION STATEMENT

Although increased diversity creates new social challenges as people learn to communicate with and understand others who are different from them,<sup>39</sup> greater diversity in organizations is associated with increases in a group's ability to solve complex problems.<sup>40</sup> In addition, diversity in educational settings leads to positive learning outcomes (e.g., critical thinking skills, problem solving) and future commitment to community services, civic affairs, and racial/ethnic engagement.<sup>41</sup> The benefits of diversity are particularly relevant to settings like policing in which specialized background or local knowledge is relevant to work outcomes.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, within a diverse community, subgroups have their own cultures and those officers familiar with these subcultures bring valuable knowledge to the police department.<sup>43</sup>

Although the literature is not entirely uniform in its findings, Sklansky reported that Black officers get more cooperation than do White officers from Black citizens, are less prejudiced against Blacks, and know more about Black communities.<sup>44</sup> Women also bring valuable communication effectiveness, community involvement, and sensitivity in relation to domestic abuse to their jobs as officers.<sup>45</sup>

The problem that police forces most commonly confront does not concern the question of whether diversity is desirable; most departments are already committed to supporting and expanding diversity within the force. The main challenge is to find ways to achieve diversity in their work places.<sup>46</sup> Researchers can assist police departments in achieving organizational equity by (a) assessing the current organizational climate in policing, (b) studying what is being done to promote diversity and analyzing its effectiveness, and (c) offering suggestions for change and evaluating those changes.<sup>47</sup>

It is also important for researchers to build upon the existing literature to identify those circumstances under which diversity has valuable benefits for policing and those in which diversity poses problems that need to be addressed within police departments. Researchers can identify strategies ranging from appropriate "tone from the top" to effective training and field management approaches to minimize the potential harms and maximize the possible gains of diversity.

## References

- Amendola, K. L., Williams, K. N., Hamilton, E. E., & Puryear, V. (2008). Law Enforcement Executive Views: Results from the Conference Survey. In M. Malina (Ed.), *The Role of Local Police: Striking a Balance Between Immigration Enforcement and Civil Liberties*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Antonio, L. A., Chang, M. J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D. A., Levin, S., & Milem, J. F. (2004). Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students, *Psychological Science, 15*, 507-510.
- Banks, R. R. (2003). Beyond profiling: Race, policing, and the drug war. *Stanford Law Review, 56*, 571-603.
- Blank, R. M., Dabady, M., & Citro, C. F. (Eds.). (2004). *Measuring Racial Discrimination. Panel on Methods for Assessing Discrimination and the Committee on National Statistics, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Becker, S. (2004). Assessing the use of profiling in searches by law enforcement personnel. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 32*, 183-193.
- Brown, B., & Benedict, W. R. (2002). Perceptions of the police: Past findings, methodological issues, conceptual issues and police implications. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 25*, 543-580.
- Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Broadnax, S., & Blaine, B. E. (1999). Belief in U.S. Government conspiracies against blacks among black and white college students: Powerlessness or system blame? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 941-953.
- Davison, H. K., & Burke, M. J. (2000). Sex discrimination in simulated employment contexts: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*, 225-248.
- Decker, S. H., Lewis, P. G., & Varsanyi, M. W. (2009). On the Frontier of Local Law Enforcement: Local Police and Federal Immigration Law. In W. McDonald (Ed.), *Immigration, Crime, and Justice, 13* (pp. 261-277). NY: Emerald Publishing.
- Decker, S. H., & Smith, R. L. (1980). Police minority recruitment: A note on its effectiveness in improving Black evaluations of the police. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 8*, 387-393.
- Dharmapala, D., & Ross, S. L. (2004). Racial bias in motor vehicle searches: Additional theory and evidence. *Contributions to Economic Analysis & Policy, 3*, 1-21.
- Dipboye, R., & Colella, A. (2005), "The dilemmas of workplace discrimination", in R. L. Dipboye and A. Colella (Eds.), *Discrimination at Work: The Psychological and Organizational Bases* (pp. 425-462). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. E., Kawakami, K., & Gordon, H. (2002). Why can't we just get along? Interpersonal biases and interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 8*, 88-102.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 62-28.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*, 573-598.
- Engel, R. S. (2005). Citizens' perceptions of distributive and procedural injustice during traffic stops with police. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 42*, 445-481.
- Engel, R. S., Calnon, J. M., & Bernard, T. J. (2002). Theory and racial profiling: Shortcomings

- and future directions in research. *Justice Quarterly*, 19, 249-273.
- Fagan, J., & Davies, G. (2000). Street stops and broken windows: Terry, race, and disorder in New York City. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 28, 457-504.
- Gabbidon, S. L., & Higgins, G. E. (2009). The role of race/ethnicity and race relations on public opinion related to the treatment of Blacks by the police. *Police Quarterly*, 12, 102-115.
- Gelman, A., Fagan, J., & Kiss, A. (2007). An analysis of the New York City Police Department's "Stop-and-Frisk" policy in the context of claims of racial bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102, 813-823.
- Glaser, J. & Banaji, M.R. (1999). When fair is foul and foul is fair: Reverse priming in automatic evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 669-687.
- Glaser, J., & Knowles, E. D. (2008). Implicit motivation to control prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 164-172.
- Goff, P. A., Epstein, L. M., Burbank, C. & Keesee, T. L. (2010). *Deputizing Discrimination?: Causes & Effects of Cross-Deputization Policy in Salt Lake City, Utah*. The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity.
- Goff, P. A., Epstein, L. M., Jackson, M. C., Kliengklom, T. J., Gamson-Smiedt, M. & Keesee, T. L. (2010). "Safe Because We Are Fair": How Cross-Deputization Undermines Police Officer and Community Safety. The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity.
- Goff, P. A., Steele, C.M., & Davies, P. G. (2008). The space between us: Stereotype threat and distance in interracial contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 91-107.
- Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 17-41.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity in higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes, *Harvard Educational Review*, 72, 330-366.
- Gurin, P.Y., Dey, E. L., Gurin, G. & Hurtado, S. (2003). How does racial/ethnic diversity promote education? *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 27, 20-29.
- Harris, D. A. (2002). *Profiles in injustice: Why racial profiling cannot work*. New York: New Press.
- Hassell, K. D., & Brandi, S. (2009). An examination of the workplace experiences of police patrol officers: The role of race, sex, and sexual orientation. *Police Quarterly*, 12, 408-430.
- Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 5, 269-298.
- Heilman, M. E. (1995). Sex stereotypes and their effects in the workplace: What we know and what we don't know. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 10, 3-26.
- Higgins, G. E., Gabbidon, S. L., & Jordan, K. L. (2008). Examining the generality of citizens' views on racial profiling in diverse situational contexts. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 1527-1541.
- Immigration Policy Center (2008a). *Immigrants and Crime: Are They Connected? A Century of Research Finds that Crime Rates for Immigrants are Lower than for the Native-Born*. Retrieved from <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/immigrants-and-crime-are-they-connected-century-research-finds-crime-rates-immigrants-are>

- Immigration Policy Center (2008b). *From Anecdotes to Evidence: Setting the Record Straight on Immigrants and Crime*. Retrieved from <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/anecdotes-evidence-setting-record-straight-immigrants-and-crime>.
- Jordan, W. T., Fridell, L., Faggiani, D., & Kubu, B. (2009). Attracting females and racial/ethnic minorities to law enforcement. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *37*, 333-341.
- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses: Assessing the effectiveness of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, *71*, 589-617.
- Knowles, J., Persico, N., & Todd, P. (2001). Racial bias in motor vehicle searches: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Political Economy*, *109*, 203-229.
- Lamberth, J. (1994). *Revised statistical analysis of the incidence of police stops and arrests of Black drivers/travelers on the New Jersey Turnpike between exits or interchanges 1 and 3 from the years 1988 through 1991*. Unpublished report, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Leung, A. K-Y., Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Chiu, C-Y. (2008). Multicultural experience enhances creativity: The when and how. *American Psychologist*, *63*, 169-181.
- Lyness, K. S. (2002). Finding the key to the executive suite: Challenges for women and people of color. In R. Silzer (Ed.), *The 21st century executive: Innovative practices for building leadership at the top* (pp. 229-273). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morris, A., Shinn, M., & DuMont, K. (1999). Contextual factors affecting the organizational commitment of diverse police officers: A level of analysis perspective. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *27*, 75-105.
- National Center for Women and Policing. (2002). *Equality denied: The status of women in policing*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Center for Women and Policing (2000). *Recruiting & retaining women: A self-assessment guide for law enforcement*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Olian, J. D., Schwab, D. P., & Haberfeld, Y. (1988). The impact of applicant gender compared to qualifications on hiring recommendations: A meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *41*, 180-195.
- Ousey, G. C., & Kubrin, C. E. (2009). Exploring the Connection between Immigration and Violent Crime Rates in U.S. Cities, 1980-2000. *Social Problems*, *56*, 447-473.
- Paluck, E. L., & Greene, D. P. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 339-337.
- Peri, G. (2009). *The Effect of Immigration on Productivity: Evidence from US States*. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Petrocelli, M., Piquero, A. R., & Smith, M. R. (2003). Conflict theory and racial profiling: An empirical analysis of police traffic stop data. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *31*, 1-11.
- Powell, G. N. (1999). Reflections on the glass ceiling: recent trends and future prospects. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 325-345). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Dittmann, R., & Randall-Crosby, J. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African-Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*, 615-630.
- Putnam, R. (2007) 'E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century: The Johan Skytte Prize Lecture', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, *30*, 134-67.



- Ramirez, D., McDevitt, J., & Farrell, A. (2000). *A Resource Guide on Racial Profiling Data Collection Systems: Promising Practices and Lessons Learned*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Reitzel, J. D., Rice, S. K., & Piquero, A. R. (2004). Lines and shadows: Perceptions of racial profiling and the Hispanic experience. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 607-616.
- Ridgeway, G. (2007). *Analysis of Racial Disparities in the New York Police Department's Stop, Question, and Frisk Practices*. RAND Corporation.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sklansky, D. A. (2006). Not your father's police department: Making sense of the new demographics of law enforcement. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 96, 1209-1243.
- Skogan, W., & Frydl, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Smith, M., & Petrocelli, M. (2001). Racial profiling?: A multivariate analysis of police traffic stop data. *Police Quarterly*, 4, 4-27.
- Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, 5, 613-629.
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37, 513-548.
- Tyler, T. R. (2004). Enhancing Police Legitimacy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 593, 84-99.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). Psychological Perspectives on Legitimacy and Legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 375-400.
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. (2000). *Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Why do people cooperate with the police? *Ohio Journal of Criminal Law*, 6, 231-275.
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law: encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Verniero, P., & Zoubek, P.H. (1999, April). *Interim report of the state police review team regarding allegations of racial profiling*. N.J. Attorney General's Office.
- Waddington, D. P. (1992). *Contemporary issues in public disorder: A comparative and historical approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Waddington, D. P. (2007). *Policing public disorder: Theory and practice*. Portland, OR: Willan.
- Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 82-96.
- Jordan, W. T., Fridell, L., Hurt, S., & Kubu, B. (2009). Attracting Females and Racial/Ethnic Minorities to Law Enforcement." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37, 333-341.
- Zingraff, M. T., Mason, H. M., Smith, W. R., Tomaskovic-Devey, D., Warren, P., McMurray, H. L., et al. (2000). *Evaluating North Carolina State Highway Patrol data: Citations, warnings, and searches in 1998*. Retrieved January 24, 2002, from <http://www.nccrimecontrol.org/shp/ncshpreport.htm>.

## Appendix: Authorship Lists

The Contract for Policing Justice was authored by CPLE researchers and other engaged scholars in the weeks following the CPLE’s 2010 summer conference, “Towards Equal Justice for All: A National Agenda for Research on Equity in Law Enforcement.” The conference (hosted by the Russell Sage Foundation, New York University, and John Jay College of Criminal Justice) allowed a diverse collection of stakeholders to articulate our shared priorities for ensuring equity in law enforcement. In addition to the law enforcement partners listed above, representatives from federal agencies, civil rights advocacy leaders, and researchers all contributed to the dialogue that served as the foundation for this document. Though researchers were primarily responsible for writing the document, input from all participants was vital to the final product. We are pleased to acknowledge both the authors and the conference participants in this appendix.

## The Contract for Policing Justice

Phillip Atiba Goff, Ph.D.	
Tom R. Tyler, Ph.D.	James Sidanius, Ph.D.
John F. Dovidio, Ph.D.	Kay Deaux, Ph.D.
Samuel R. Sommers, Ph.D.	Division Chief Tracie L. Keesee, Ph.D.

Matthew Baldwin, B.A.	Monica Biernat, Ph.D.	Leo Beletsky, Ph.D.
Jennifer Brooke, M.A.	Jennifer L. Eberhardt, Ph.D.	Liana Maris Epstein, M.A.
Meredith Gamson-Smiedt, M.S.W.	Jack Glaser, Ph.D.	Edwin LeRoi Goff, Ph.D.
John Hagan, Ph.D.	David Harris, Ph.D.	Matthew Christian Jackson, M.A.
Delores Jones-Brown, JD, Ph.D.	Kimberly Barsamian Kahn, Ph.D.	Tattiya July Kliengklom, M.A.
Kenneth Land, Ph.D.	Sue Hyun Moon, M.A.	Michael Motto, M.A.
Cynthia Najdowski, M.A.	Victoria Plaut, Ph.D.	Amanda Sesko, M.A.
Pamela Smith, Ph.D.	Susan Sturm, Ph.D.	Erin Thomas, B.A.
	Marjorie Zatz, Ph.D.	

## Diagnosing the Problem: *How to Address Unwarranted Disparate Treatment*

Authors are listed alphabetically, first among Ph.D.s and then among graduate student “Emerging Scholars”:

Leo Beletsky, Ph.D.	Phillip Atiba Goff, Ph.D.	Jack Glaser, Ph.D.
Delores Jones-Brown, JD, Ph.D.		James Sidanius, Ph.D.
Matthew Baldwin, B.A.		Kimberly Barsamian Kahn, Ph.D.

## Who is Protected?: *How to Address Immigration Policy Enforcement*

Authors are listed alphabetically, first among Ph.D.s and then among graduate student “Emerging Scholars”:

Kay Deaux, Ph.D.		Liana Maris Epstein, M.A.
Phillip Atiba Goff, Ph.D.		Tom R. Tyler, Ph.D.
Matthew Christian Jackson, M.A.	Cynthia Najdowski, M.A.	Erin Thomas, B.A.

## Fairness Breeds Fairness: *How to Address Organizational Equity in Policing*

Authors are listed alphabetically, first among Ph.D.s and then among graduate student “Emerging Scholars”:

Monica Biernat, Ph.D.	Kay Deaux, Ph.D.	John Dovidio, Ph.D.
John Hagan, Ph.D.	Pamela Smith, Ph.D.	Samuel R. Sommers, Ph.D.
	Tom R. Tyler, Ph.D.	
Jennifer Brooke, M.A.	Sue Hyun Moon, M.A.	Amanda Sesko, M.A.

## Researcher Participants

Arizona State University	Marjorie Zatz, Ph.D.
The City University of New York	Michelle Fine, Ph.D.
Columbia University	Michael Motto, M.A.
Columbia University	Susan Sturm, Ph.D.
The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity	Meredith Gamson-Smiedt, M.S.W.
The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity	Tattiya July Kliengklom, M.A.
Deakin University	Kristina Murphy, Ph.D.
Denver Police Department	Division Chief Tracie L. Keesee, Ph.D.
Duke University	Kenneth Land, Ph.D.
Harvard University	Larisa Heiphetz, M.A.
Harvard University	James Sidanius, Ph.D.
John Jay College of Criminal Justice	Jeremy Travis, JD, MPA
John Jay College of Criminal Justice	Delores Jones-Brown, JD, Ph.D.
John Jay College of Criminal Justice	Susan Opotow, Ph.D.
John Jay College of Criminal Justice	Brett Stoudt, Ph.D.
Lisbon University Institute	Kimberly Barsamian Kahn, Ph.D.
New York University	Jennifer Brooke, M.A.
New York University	Kay Deaux, Ph.D.
New York University	Tom R. Tyler, Ph.D.
Northwestern University	John Hagan, Ph.D.
Stanford University	Jennifer L. Eberhardt, Ph.D.
Tufts University	Samuel R. Sommers, Ph.D.
University of California, Berkeley	Jack Glaser, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles	Liana Maris Epstein, M.A.
University of California, Los Angeles	Phillip Atiba Goff, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles	Matthew Christian Jackson, M.A.
University of California, San Diego	Pamela Smith, Ph.D.
University of Georgia	Victoria Plaut, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago	Cynthia Najdowski, M.A.
University of Kansas	Matthew Baldwin, B.A.
University of Kansas	Monica Biernat, Ph.D.
University of Kansas	Amanda Sesko, M.A.
University of Pittsburgh	David Harris, Ph.D.
The University of Toronto	Sue Hyun Moon, M.A.
Villanova University	Edwin LeRoi Goff, Ph.D.
Yale University	Leo Beletsky, Ph.D.
Yale University	John F. Dovidio, Ph.D.
Yale University	Erin Thomas, B.A.

## Federal Agency Participants

United States Department of Justice: Civil Rights Division	Dept. Asst. Attorney General, Roy L. Austin, Jr., JD
United States Department of Justice: Community Oriented Policing Services	Director Bernard K. Melekian, MPA Albert Pearsall III
National Institutes of Justice	Deputy Director Ellen Scriver, Ph.D.

## Advocacy Participants

American Civil Liberties Union	Deputy Legal Director, Vanita Gupta, JD
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People	Niaz Kasravi, Ph.D.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—Legal Defense and Educational Fund	Jin Hee Lee, JD
Rights Working Group	Jumana Musa, JD Aadika Singh
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund	Thomas Saenz, JD
Laboratory to Combat Human Trafficking	A.J. Alejano-Steele, Ph.D. Amanda Finger C. Anders Minter Mary Robertson
APCO International	George Rice, Jr.

## The CPLE Board of Directions

The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity is governed by a Board of Directors consisting of:

Phillip Atiba Goff Ph.D., Executive Director of Research  
 Division Chief Tracie L. Keesee, Ph.D., Executive Director of Operations  
 Samuel R. Sommers, Ph.D., Director of Development  
 John F. Dovidio, Ph.D., Director of Training  
 James Sidanius, Ph.D., Director of Research: Toronto  
 Kay Deaux, Ph.D.  
 Jennifer Eberhardt, Ph.D.  
 Delores Jones-Brown, JD, Ph.D.  
 Tom R. Tyler, Ph.D.

## Acknowledgements

The CPLE does not accept research funding from its municipal law enforcement partners. Consequently our work is not possible without the generous support of the Russell Sage Foundation whose financial contribution underwrote both the CPLE summer conference and the writing of this document. Our program officer, Aixa Cintrón-Vélez, has been particularly remarkable in her dedication to the goals of this project.

In addition to the support the CPLE enjoys from the Russell Sage Foundation, the summer conference was facilitated by institutional support from New York University and John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Thanks are also due to Paulo Campos and Nicole Hanson for their assistance with conference logistics. It should also be noted that authors Tattiya July Kliengklom and Meredith Gamson-Smiedt were heroic in their organization of the conference and subsequent drafting of this Contract.

Finally, we want to thank the law enforcement leaders—and their assistants—who were instrumental in setting up the meeting in New York where the issues contained in this document were discussed and the drafting of this statement began. Those individuals include Chief Gerald R. Whitman, Denver Police Department; Chief Robert Davis, San Jose Police Department; Chief Charles A. McClelland, Jr., Houston Police Department; Deputy Director Craig E. Ferrell, Jr., Houston Police Department; Chief Chris Burbank, Salt Lake City Police Department; and Director R. Gil Kerlikowske, Office of National Drug Control Policy whose support for these initiatives dates back to his time as chief of police in Seattle, WA. We are also deeply indebted to the tireless efforts of Division Chief Tracie L. Keese, Ph.D., Denver Police Department, for providing advice on negotiating the cultures of law enforcement and the academy.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law: encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. NY: Russell Sage Foundation.; Skogan, W., & Frydl, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- <sup>2</sup> Tyler & Huo (2002); Skogan & Frydl (2004).
- <sup>3</sup> Banks, R. R. (2003). Beyond profiling: Race, policing, and the drug war. *Stanford Law Review*, 56, 571-603.; Blank, R. M., Dabady, M., & Citro, C. F. (Eds.). (2004). *Measuring Racial Discrimination. Panel on Methods for Assessing Discrimination and the Committee on National Statistics, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.; Harris, D. A. (2002). *Profiles in injustice: Why racial profiling cannot work*. New York: New Press.; Ramirez, D., McDevitt, J., & Farrell, A. (2000). *A Resource Guide on Racial Profiling Data Collection Systems: Promising Practices and Lessons Learned*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.; Tyler & Huo (2002); Verniero, P., & Zoubek, P.H. (1999, April). *Interim report of the state police review team regarding allegations of racial profiling*. N.J. Attorney General's Office.
- <sup>4</sup> E.g., Ridgeway, G. (2007). *Analysis of Racial Disparities in the New York Police Department's Stop, Question, and Frisk Practices*. RAND Corporation.
- <sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Fagan, J., & Davies, G. (2000). Street stops and broken windows: Terry, race, and disorder in New York City. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 28, 457-504.; Gelman, A., Fagan, J., & Kiss, A. (2007). An analysis of the New York City Police Department's "Stop-and-Frisk" policy in the context of claims of racial bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102, 813-823.; Lamberth, J. (1994). *Revised statistical analysis of the incidence of police stops and arrests of Black drivers/travelers on the New Jersey Turnpike between exits or interchanges 1 and 3 from the years 1988 through 1991*. Unpublished report, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA; Petrocelli, M., Piquero, A. R., & Smith, M. R. (2003). Conflict theory and racial profiling: An empirical analysis of police traffic stop data. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31, 1-11.; Ridgeway (2007); Smith, M., & Petrocelli, M. (2001). Racial profiling?: A multivariate analysis of police traffic stop data. *Police Quarterly*, 4, 4-27.
- <sup>6</sup> E.g., Becker, S. (2004). Assessing the use of profiling in searches by law enforcement personnel. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 183-193.; Dharmapala, D. & Ross, S. L. (2004). Racial bias in motor vehicle searches: Additional theory and evidence. *Contributions to Economic Analysis & Policy*, 3, 1-21.; Engel, R. S., Calnon, J. M., & Bernard, T. J. (2002). Theory and racial profiling: Shortcomings and future directions in research. *Justice Quarterly*, 19, 249-273.; Knowles, J., Persico, N., & Todd, P. (2001). Racial bias in motor vehicle searches: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Political Economy*, 109, 203-229.; Zingraff, M. T., Mason, H. M., Smith, W. R., Tomaskovic-Devey, D., Warren, P., McMurray, H. L., et al. (2000). *Evaluating North Carolina State Highway Patrol data: Citations, warnings, and searches in 1998*. Retrieved January 24, 2002, from <http://www.nccrimecontrol.org/shp/ncshpreport.htm>.
- <sup>7</sup> Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.; Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37, 513-548.; Tyler & Huo (2002).
- <sup>8</sup> Higgins, G. E., Gabbidon, S. L., & Jordan, K. L. (2008). Examining the generality of citizens' views on racial profiling in diverse situational contexts. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 1527-1541.; Reitzel, J. D., Rice, S. K., & Piquero, A. R. (2004). Lines and shadows: Perceptions of racial profiling and the Hispanic experience. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 607-616.
- <sup>9</sup> Engel, R. S. (2005). Citizens' perceptions of distributive and procedural injustice during traffic stops with police. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42, 445-481.
- <sup>10</sup> E.g., Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 62-28.; Glaser, J., & Knowles, E. D. (2008). Implicit motivation to control prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 164-172.; Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 17-41.



- <sup>11</sup> Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Broadnax, S., & Blaine, B. E. (1999). Belief in U.S. Government conspiracies against blacks among black and white college students: Powerlessness or system blame? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 941-953.; Sidanius & Pratto (1999).
- <sup>12</sup> For a discussion, see Immigration Policy Center (2008a). *Immigrants and Crime: Are They Connected? A Century of Research Finds that Crime Rates for Immigrants are Lower than for the Native-Born*. Retrieved from <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/immigrants-and-crime-are-they-connected-century-research-finds-crime-rates-immigrants-are>. See also, Immigration Policy Center (2008b). *From Anecdotes to Evidence: Setting the Record Straight on Immigrants and Crime*. Retrieved from <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/anecdotes-evidence-setting-record-straight-immigrants-and-crime>.
- <sup>13</sup> Ousey, G. C., & Kubrin, C. E. (2009). Exploring the Connection between Immigration and Violent Crime Rates in U.S. Cities, 1980-2000. *Social Problems*, 56, 447-473.
- <sup>14</sup> Peri, G. (2009). The Effect of Immigration on Productivity: Evidence from US States. *National Bureau of Economic Research*.
- <sup>15</sup> See, e.g., Decker, S. H., Lewis, P. G., & Varsanyi, M. W. (2009). On the Frontier of Local Law Enforcement: Local Police and Federal Immigration Law. In W. McDonald (Ed.), *Immigration, Crime, and Justice*, 13, (pp. 261-277). New York, NY: Emerald Publishing.
- <sup>16</sup> Goff, P. A., Epstein, L. M., Burbank, C. & Keesee, T. L. (2010). *Deputizing Discrimination?: Causes & Effects of Cross-Deputization Policy in Salt Lake City, Utah*. The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity.
- <sup>17</sup> (Goff, Epstein, Burbank, & Keesee, 2010)
- <sup>18</sup> Tyler, T. R. (2006). Psychological Perspectives on Legitimacy and Legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 375-400. See also, Tyler & Huo (2002).
- <sup>19</sup> (Goff, Epstein, Burbank, & Keesee, 2010)
- <sup>20</sup> Amendola, K. L., Williams, K. N., Hamilton, E. E., & Puryear, V. (2008). Law Enforcement Executive Views: Results from the Conference Survey. In M. Malina (Ed.), *The Role of Local Police: Striking a Balance Between Immigration Enforcement and Civil Liberties*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- <sup>21</sup> Goff, P. A., Epstein, L. M., Jackson, M. C., Kliengklom, T. J., Gamson-Smiedt, M. & Keesee, T. L. (2010). *Safe Because We Are Fair”: How Cross-Deputization Undermines Police Officer and Community Safety*. The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity.
- <sup>22</sup> Tyler & Huo (2002); Waddington, D. P. (1992). *Contemporary issues in public disorder: A comparative and historical approach*. New York: Routledge.; Waddington, D. P. (2007). *Policing public disorder: Theory and practice*. Portland, OR: Willan.
- <sup>23</sup> (Goff, et al., 2010)
- <sup>24</sup> Goff, P. A., Steele, C.M., & Davies, P. G. (2008). The space between us: Stereotype threat and distance in interracial contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 91-107.
- <sup>25</sup> As was the case with racial profiling the issue in the case of equity is that the ethnic and gender composition of police forces is and is perceived to be unrelated to stereotypes and biases. There are many reasons that a department's composition might vary in the proportion and level of minority and female officers. Some of those reasons are linked to valid job related issues, some to the existence and operation of biases. As in the case of racial profiling a key issue is to disentangle these varying reasons for existing levels of diversity. And, as with racial profiling the perception of bias is a separate issue from the perception of bias. Irrespective of whether a police department actually practices discrimination, the perception of a lack of appropriate levels of diversity undermines the legitimacy of the police in the community.
- <sup>26</sup> Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Dittmann, R., & Randall-Crosby, J. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African-Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 615-630.
- <sup>27</sup> Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. (2000). *Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- <sup>28</sup> Morris, A., Shinn, M. & DuMont, K. (1999). Contextual factors affecting the organizational commitment of diverse police officers: A level of analysis perspective. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 27, 75-105.
- <sup>29</sup> E.g., Lyness, K. S. (2002). Finding the key to the executive suite: Challenges for women and people of color. In R. Silzer (Ed.), *The 21st century executive: Innovative practices for building leadership at the top* (pp. 229-273).

- San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.; Powell, G. N. (1999). Reflections on the glass ceiling: recent trends and future prospects. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 325–345). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- <sup>30</sup> See Davison, H. K., & Burke, M. J. (2000). Sex discrimination in simulated employment contexts: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *56*, 225–248. and Olian, J. D., Schwab, D. P., & Haberfeld, Y. (1988). The impact of applicant gender compared to qualifications on hiring recommendations: A meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *41*, 180–195. for reviews; Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *5*, 269–298; Heilman, M. E. (1995). Sex stereotypes and their effects in the workplace: What we know and what we don't know. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *10*, 3–26.
- <sup>31</sup> Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 573–598.
- <sup>32</sup> Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*, 82–96.
- <sup>33</sup> Dipboye, R., & Colella, A. (2005), “The dilemmas of workplace discrimination”, in R. L. Dipboye and A. Colella (Eds.), *Discrimination at Work: The Psychological and Organizational Bases* (pp. 425–462). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- <sup>34</sup> Hassell, K. D., & Brandi, S. (2009). An examination of the workplace experiences of police patrol officers: The role of race, sex, and sexual orientation. *Police Quarterly*, *12*, 408–430.
- <sup>35</sup> Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, *5*, 613–629.
- <sup>36</sup> Brown, B. & Benedict, W. R. (2002). Perceptions of the police: Past findings, methodological issues, conceptual issues and police implications. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *25*, 543–580.; Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. E., Kawakami, K. & Gordon, H. (2002). Why can't we just get along? Interpersonal biases and interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *8*, 88–102.; Gabbidon, S. L., & Higgins, G. E. (2009). The role of race/ethnicity and race relations on public opinion related to the treatment of Blacks by the police. *Police Quarterly*, *12*, 102–115.
- <sup>37</sup> Sunshine & Tyler (2003); Tyler, T. R. (2004). Enhancing Police Legitimacy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *593*, 84–99.; Tyler (2006); Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Why do people cooperate with the police? *Ohio Journal of Criminal Law*, *6*, 231–275.
- <sup>38</sup> For a review, see Sklansky, D.A. (2006). Not your father's police department: Making sense of the new demographics of law enforcement. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *96*, 1209–1243.
- <sup>39</sup> Putnam, R. (2007) ‘E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century: The Johan Skytte Prize Lecture’, *Scandinavian Political Studies*, *30*, 134–67.
- <sup>40</sup> Antonio, L. A., Chang, M. J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D. A., Levin, S., & Milem, J. F. (2004). Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students. *Psychological Science*, *15*, 507–510.; Leung, A. K-Y., Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Chiu, C-Y. (2008). Multicultural experience enhances creativity: The when and how. *American Psychologist*, *63*, 169–181.
- <sup>41</sup> Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity in higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes, *Harvard Educational Review*, *72*, 330–366.; Gurin, P.Y., Dey, E. L., Gurin, G. & Hurtado, S. (2003). How does racial/ethnic diversity promote education? *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, *27*, 20–29.
- <sup>42</sup> Glaser, J. & Banaji, M.R. (1999). When fair is foul and foul is fair: Reverse priming in automatic evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 669–687.
- <sup>43</sup> Decker, S. H. & Smith, R. L. (1980). Police minority recruitment: A note on its effectiveness in improving Black evaluations of the police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *8*, 387–393.
- <sup>44</sup> Sklansky (2006)
- <sup>45</sup> National Center for Women and Policing (2000). *Recruiting & retaining women: A self-assessment guide for law enforcement*. Washington, DC: Author.
- <sup>46</sup> Jordan, W. T., Fridell, L., Faggiani, D., & Kubu, B. (2009). Attracting females and racial/ethnic minorities to law enforcement. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *37*, 333–341.
- <sup>47</sup> Kalev, A., Dobbin, F. & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses: Assessing the effectiveness of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, *71*, 589–617.; Paluck, E.L. & Greene, D.P. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 339–337.