

# ***Facilitator Guide***

## **Tactical Perception for Community: The Science of Justice (PJ3)**



# Credits

*Tactical Perception Community Training: The Science of Justice*  
**Facilitator Guide**

*Prepared by the*

**Center for Policing Equity**

524 West 59th St, Room 6.63.14  
John Jay College of Criminal Justice  
New York, New York 10019

*Written by*

*Phillip Atiba Goff, Ph.D., Kimberly C. Burke, P.O. A. Ferreira, Sgt. Heather Perkins, Tanya Johnson*

*Contributions by the*

*CPE Staff, NYPD Training Team, Chicago PD Education and Training Division*



# Table of Contents

<b>Overview: Course Details .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Module 1: Introduction .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Module 2: Fast Traps .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Module 3: Slow Traps .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Module 4: Defusing Traps .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>42</b>
Glossary	
Suggested Handouts	
Recommended Readings and Abstracts	
Facilitation Tips and Guidelines	



# Overview

## Course Details

### Duration of Instruction

Total time: 2 or 4 hours

### Materials and Equipment

- Multi-media projector and media presenter
- Handouts with instructions for each small group activity
  - Suggested handouts included as appendices
- Media slide presentation, lesson plan
- Suggested room set-up:
  - Tables should be set up in pods with 4-6 participants at each table to allow for classroom discussion and facilitate small group exercises
  - Table tents with participants' names

### Required Learners' Materials

There are no required learners' materials for this course.

### Instructional Goal

The goal of this course is to engage police officers and the communities they serve in critical thought and discussion about contemporary mechanisms of bias regarding race, gender, sexuality, and other identities within the context of law enforcement, centering on identity traps and drawing on the scholarship of implicit bias and self-threats. Identity traps are situations that trigger mental reactions which influence behaviors. Identity traps allow us to foreground the importance of the situation in predicting outcomes, and to move away from the framing of the problem of race in policing as one of prejudice. We will also pay attention to the underlying historical elements of identity traps and the implications they have for everyone's lives.

### Learning Objectives

- Participants should be able to define identity traps, fast traps, and slow traps
- Participants should be able to generate their own examples of fast and slow traps
- Participants should review historically significant events that have impacted fast and slow traps
- Participants should be able to define stereotype, prejudice, discrimination, and racism
- Participants should be able to explain how identity traps can interfere with procedural justice

### How to Facilitate This Course Successfully

#### *Provide a Safe Learning Environment*

- Set a positive tone and create an atmosphere where it's safe to share ideas.
- Guide group discussions in order to avoid inappropriate personal comments, unproductive criticism, or hurtful remarks.
- Don't let a few people monopolize discussions.

- Make sure everyone is involved in the exercises and discussions.
- Don't ask a question and then call on an individual to answer it. Ask your question and then ask if anyone has a suggestion or an answer. If your group is quiet, they may prefer opportunities to address questions at their individual table groups and share highlights with the large group.

### *Timing and Pace*

- Provide breaks every hour to maintain participants' energy and interest.
- Keep the pace of the program energetic and interesting.

### *Modeling and Personalizing*

- Model procedural justice to increase the power of your teaching. What you are will be as powerful in the eyes of your participants as what you say.
- Share your own experiences and viewpoint to increase the impact of your teaching. Use powerful, personal stories to illustrate the concepts from your own experience.
- Attempt to draw on the experience of the officers for examples. Engage the class to provide personal stories as examples of the concepts. If the class is non-responsive, then provide your own example. (PJ1, Principle 1, Voice)
- Make the learning as interactive as possible and avoid lecturing too much.
- Vary the activities. Let participants work as individuals, in pairs, in table groups, or with randomly selected teams, as room size and the number of participants allow.
- Remember to set up and debrief videos appropriately and do not just show them. To debrief a video, seek insights from participants on what they observed.

# Module 1

## Slide 1

Procedural Justice III Community: The Science of Justice

**Purpose:** To orient participants to the session.

**Delivery of Content:** Co-facilitator's should introduce themselves and the goal of today's session. Specify if it's the 2 or 4 hour session and clearly state the purpose of the session: To use behavior science to help engage community members and law enforcement in dialogue about issues of bias, in police community interactions and more broadly. This program was designed to educate, enhance personal growth, build community, and politically empower the participants.

Then, the instructors should read:

This session is adapted from a police training. What officers get is an 8 hour version of this. It is the third installment in the Procedural Justice Training series. The training incorporates the mind sciences, like implicit bias.

## Slide 2

Housekeeping

**Purpose:** To create a learning environment for the training that promotes respect, trust, and honesty for all participants.

**Delivery of Content:** In order to maintain a learning environment conducive to these goals, review the following "housekeeping" rules with the class:

- Remind everyone to silence their phones: "Please silence cell phones. There will be plenty of time to check your messages!"
- Remind participants of the restroom locations.
- Inform the participants of break times, length of breaks (10 minutes), and time and length for lunch (one hour).
- Remind participants to: "Have an open mind!"
- Remind participants that everyone has something to offer - so be respectful of the opinions of others.
- Remind everyone that conversations during the training should not leave the room.

Plan to take a break at each hour marker. If you are doing a 4 hour session, let participants know whether lunch will be provided. It is critical that ground rules for discussion be covered right away.

Clear ground rules for discussion allow for a deeper understanding of expectations. It will enable facilitators and participants to hold each other accountable in a respectful way.

**It is strongly suggested that you print the ground rules on a laminated board so that they can be posted in front of the classroom and easily referenced throughout the training.**

**Suggested ground rules** (Adapted from the L.A. LGBT Center Social Networking Groups 2012 Facilitators Training Manual)

- Respect everyone's confidentiality. What is said in this room stays in this room.
- Take care of yourself.

- Share only to the degree that is comfortable for you.
- Use “I” statements and speak from your own experiences. Avoid “I think” and “I believe” because they lead to opinions and beliefs and are not reflective of personal experiences.\*
- Do not give advice.
- No cross talking or side-conversations while others are speaking.
- Raise your hand every time you wish to speak (optional depending on group size and/or if the facilitators deem it necessary)
- Do not criticize another individual, their experience, their statements, or decisions.
- This is a substance-free environment.

\*Through personal experiences, rather than speculation, you will be able to have a more meaningful dialogue. The goal of the group is to have participants speak from their feelings, share personal stories and experiences. Our tendency as human beings is to comment on the expression of others. These comments are usually based on whether we agree with the thought or not. This conflict will work against the free expression of thoughts and ideas. Facilitators should discourage “voting” on the validity of the experiences and thought of another individual. When an individual feels they will be judged upon the thoughts and feelings they express, they are likely to edit what they will say. This program should foster a safe environment where people can express themselves without being judged by other participants.

### Slide 3

Why Are You Here Today?

**Purpose:** This is meant to set intention and give participants an opportunity to be thoughtful/proactive about how they will show up during the session (e.g. listen to understand.)

**Delivery of Content:** Ask the participants to pair with someone they have not met. This should function as a bit of an icebreaker. Lead them through the “Think-Timed-Pair-Share” exercise.

**Process:** Optimize engagement by creating (timed) space for up to 50% of (all) participants to be actively engaged in discussing a topic at one time (simultaneously) using a partner structure.

#### Steps for the Strategy:

1. Participants are paired and work in pairs.
2. Present the question to the participants
3. Provide participants with a 30 seconds of think time, then give them 2 minutes total to share their responses with their partner. Each person will get 1 minute of talk time.
4. Participants discuss their answers with either their face or shoulder partners.
5. Call on participants to share with the class the answer they have developed with their partners.
5. Ask 2-3 participants to share with the class the answer they have developed with their partners.

**Source:** [http://www.usd416.org/pages/uploaded\\_files/Timed\\_Pair\\_Share.pdf](http://www.usd416.org/pages/uploaded_files/Timed_Pair_Share.pdf) \*Based on various materials available from Kagan Publishing.

## Slide 4

### Objectives

**Purpose:** Review the course objectives with the class.

**Delivery of Content:** Read the following objectives:

- Understand the psychological science of bias and its influence on behaviors in a universal context and in a policing context
- Create a shared language to bridge divide between law enforcement and the communities they serve
- Engage in dialogues that build empathy and increase self-reflection
- Empower you with tools to improve the way you respond to and make sense of situations vulnerable to bias

This training is about everyone's personal responsibility to reduce the impact of bias in our world. Officers are trained to understand these concepts in their interactions with the communities they serve and in this session we will use that framework to create a shared language for addressing the divide between different social groups. That framework will help us engage in difficult conversations that aim to elicit personal experiences with bias and stereotypes and culminate in an action plan to reduce unjust disparities.

## Slide 5

### Module 1: Introduction

**Purpose:** The intention of this slide is to differentiate this training from traditional diversity trainings and to get participants to acknowledge that there are things that happen in the brain that we don't understand.

**Delivery of Content:** You should first point out that the text on the slide looks indecipherable. Then t ask for a volunteer to read the content of the brainteaser. Read the first line, if needed, to get the volunteer started, then have the volunteer read the remainder of the text out loud.

This passage, popularly known as the Cambridge Reading Test, illustrates that our brains process information in ways that we often do not understand and may not be aware of. The volunteer was able to read the passage out loud and make sense of this jumbled mess of letters.

Our brains are able to make sense out of confusing or ambiguous situations and lead us to the right answer; like a logical reading of this passage. Could it also be conceivable, then, that our brains might lead us to the wrong conclusion? Could it do that in ways that we may not even be aware of?

The point of this exercise is not to discuss this specific cognitive processes rather to provide evidence that our brains take shortcuts that are outside of our awareness.

## Slide 6

### This Session Is About...

**Purpose:** Provides the main training objective: to encourage officers to be aware of the factors that go into human decision-making, so that they can make better choices by being more conscious of biases and stereotypes that exist in the world.

**Delivery of Content:** Inform participants that this session is about understanding the sort of shortcuts your brain takes, as was demonstrated in the Cambridge Reading Test.

We will focus on the shortcuts it takes as it applies to the decision-making process. We are also going to learn how the biases and stereotypes that exist in the world can influence these shortcuts.

In doing so, we will make more neutral choices.

## Slide 7

This Session Is Not About Your Character

**Purpose:** To dismiss the notion that this training is in anyway targeting the character of officers.

**Delivery of Content:** Inform participants that we all have biases that affect our perception. Some are outside of our conscious awareness. We call those implicit biases and we will talk about that in depth today. These biases do not make us bad people, and some may even be contrary to our value system. In fact, we are all sitting in this room with a desire to understand and reduce the number of errors our brains make when interacting with people so that we are all treating each other in fair and unbiased ways. So, understanding the situations that lead to those mistakes, can help us reduce them.

- We all have biases that affect our perception
- Many are subconscious
- Some may be contrary to our values

- Brains make mistakes
- Understanding how these mistakes are made is the first step in reducing those errors

## Slide 8

In Group / Out Group Behavior Exercise

**Purpose:** The goal is to get the class to give their group positive attributions and the opposite group negative attributions. This will illustrate the universality of biases in a trivial way and highlight human inclination to favor members of their own group, whatever that group identification may be.

**Delivery of Content:** The last slide stated that we all have biases that affect our perception. This next exercise is going to demonstrate that biases are universal.

Find a category that evenly divides the class into two groups, or as close to evenly as possible. Some examples could be: students with Androids vs. students with iPhones; chocolate vs. vanilla; Ford vs. Chevy; Adele vs. Beyonce; or whatever your local rival athletic teams are.

Ask participants to identify by show of hands and go with the category that most evenly divides the room and relatively trivial i.e. don't use categories like divorced vs. not-divorced.

Ask the class to stand on opposite sides of the room with their in group members.

It is important to prime each group with a question that makes them feel an affinity for their group first, such as: why did your group choose iPhone over Android and vice versa.

Have the group spend a few minutes brainstorming why their choice was the best. Ask each side to share their reasoning with everyone. Get 3-5 examples from each group.

Then ask them to brainstorm about why the opposite group made the choice they did, such as, why did the other group choose Android over iPhone or vice versa.

After a few minutes ask each group to list off the reasons they came up with. Both groups will likely list reasons that were negative such as "the Android users are cheap people" or "the iPhone users are sheep who just follow trends."

The answers may start out fairly neutral but will likely digress into negative reasons, especially if the two groups can hear each other.

## Slide 9

### In/Out Group Behavior Diagram

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to debrief the In group/out group exercise and to highlight that it is part of normal human cognition to give internal attributions for the negative behaviors of out-group members.

**Delivery of Content:** The debrief to the exercise is simply that as humans, we form biases based on group identification. In this exercise it was a harmless category. But what happens when there are more serious differences, like black vs. white; employed vs. unemployed; Liberal vs. Conservative; criminal vs. non-criminal?

The diagram illustrates an additional concept about in group/out group behavior. Social scientists have found that humans are wired to blame out group members' bad behavior on their character or values, and blame their in group members' bad behavior on external or situational factors. In other words, if I see your group do something I perceive as negative, I am very likely to reduce it down to your character: you are a bad person doing bad things. However, if someone from my

group does something negative, I'm more likely to list outside factors that contributed to this particular bad behavior. In other words, I'm a good person, I was just having a bad day.

Example: let's say you are part of a football team, and the opposing player commits an illegal tackle. Your team views that player as malicious- the whole team plays dirty and rough. Now imagine the same game, but it's your teammate who commits an illegal tackle. You and everyone on your team excuse it as a heat of the moment accidental mistake. They are a good noble player, as is everyone on your team.

After presenting the concept, pose the question, "How might this relate to police/ community relationships?" to the room and get both community and police perspectives. If it doesn't come up in dialogue, be sure to flag the example of police misconduct caught on film. The general public tends to attribute it to policing as a whole (i.e. proof of bad cops), whereas other police officers tend to look at the tactical/situational errors that contributed to the bad outcome.

As a note, the scientific concept we're discussing is called the ultimate attribution error. That is not important to introduce that phrase to the class, rather as an FYI if anyone asks about the science.

## Slides 10-18

### Observation Game

**Purpose:** The purpose of these slides is to highlight how media, conditioning, exposure, and reinforcement of stereotypes about groups of people, in this case gender, can lead to incorrect assumptions. Even though people know logically that a woman can become a pilot- the time pressure and constraints of this exercise will likely lead the participants to the wrong conclusion. This will set the stage for discussion of Fast Traps later on.

**Delivery of Content:** In addition to in group/out group influences, there are ideas about groups generally that can impact our decision-making. This next exercise is an illustration of that concept. Read the list of professions out loud. Tell participants that this is a test of observational skills. Explain that they are to look at the following slides and assign the correct profession to the image that appears as fast as they can. They should say it out loud as quickly as possible as a group. First, read aloud the list of professions. Click through the next 8 slides fairly quickly so the class does not take too long to respond.

### Slide 19

#### Evaluation

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to debrief from the Observation game and to explain how the time pressure and restrictions of the exercise led participants to the wrong conclusions.

**Delivery of Content:** Read the actual professions of each image. Explain that people will typically make assessment errors based on gender e.g. the white male as CEO rather than the black female.

Highlight that even though people understand logically that a woman can become a CEO, the time pressure and constraints of this exercise can lead participants to the wrong conclusions based on common stereotypes.

We might find ourselves making this type of error in daily interactions for example, if our friend says, "I saw my doctor today." We might reply, "What did he say?"

We don't invent these stereotypes ourselves, we are confronted with them in our everyday lives through media, news, marketing, stories and other means.

### Slide 20

#### Permeation of Stereotypes

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to show how widespread and pervasive stereotypes are. When these ideas saturate the world around us, they can impact our decision-making beyond our awareness. Again, this slide will support the concepts in Fast Traps.

**Delivery of Content:** Fade in each screenshot pulled from a Google search for these professions. They reflect the gendered stereotypes about each job listed. Note that the top ten images on Google are the ones that are most frequently searched.

Reiterate that we do not have to personally think women cannot be pilots or doctors to be impacted by societal influences and environmental cues that illustrate that bias.

Highlight some relevant content about Google searches using the following articles as points of reference: <https://mic.com/articles/146905/a-google-image-search-result-for-two-black-men-further-proves-racial-bias-in-algorithms#.dsmDlfxeV>

"Google has been accused of racial bias in its search algorithm in the past. Searches for "black teenagers" yielded [photos of mugshots](#), "beautiful dreadlocks" displayed [mostly white people](#) and "unprofessional hairstyles for work" showed mostly [black women with natural hair](#). And now, Google's best guess for a photo of two black men is "gang." People's effect on algorithms was evident in reports from [Gizmodo](#) that [Facebook's](#) trending news algorithm is influenced by human input and the way algorithms reflect people's online behavior was evident when Microsoft's chatbot Tay [got its plug pulled](#) after it evolved into a racist Nazi.

A recent investigation by ProPublica also revealed that algorithms used by the criminal justice system are [easier on white defendants](#) — further proving that data can be influenced or amplified based on human prejudices.

"From a machine learning perspective, if you don't think about gender inclusiveness, then oftentimes the inferences that get made are biased towards the majority group—in this case, affluent white males," professor at Oregon State University's School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Margaret Burnett told [Bloomberg](#).

"If un-diverse stuff goes in, then closed-minded, inside-the-box, not-very-good results come out."

## Slide 21

#WhatADoctorLooksLike

**Purpose:** The point of this slide is to give a real world example of the "Observation Game" at work.

**Delivery of Content:** The story of Dr. Tamika Cross is a real life example of the "Observation Game" at play. In January 2016, Dr. Cross was on a flight when there was a page announcing a medical emergency. She responded and let the flight attendant know that she was a doctor but didn't have her credentials readily available. According to Cross, the flight attendant responded: 'Oh no sweetie, put your hand down, we are looking for actual physicians or nurses or some type of medical personnel.' Then an older white man approached, claimed to be a physician and the flight attendant took him at his word. Cross posted about this experience on social media and it almost instantly went viral, sparking the hashtag "This is what a doctor looks like" with countless non-white women sharing similar experiences.

This story is a prime example of how stereotypes can influence people's decision-making when they are put in time pressured and/or stressful situations. We can imagine that if the flight attendant involved was interviewed prior to this incident about whether or not black women can attain medical degrees, she would concede that yes, of course, black women can go to medical school and become doctors. But

when put in an actual emergency situation, she made an error based on a stereotype, much like what we illustrated in the Observation Game.

### Suggested reading:

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/black-women-are-speaking-out-to-show-the-world-whatadoctorlookslike\\_us\\_5801004ae4b06e047594630e](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/black-women-are-speaking-out-to-show-the-world-whatadoctorlookslike_us_5801004ae4b06e047594630e)

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/tamika-cross-is-not-the-only-black-doctor-ignored-in-an-airplane-emergency/2016/10/20/3f59ac08-9544-11e6-bc79-af1cd3d2984b\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.14dc283575cc](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/tamika-cross-is-not-the-only-black-doctor-ignored-in-an-airplane-emergency/2016/10/20/3f59ac08-9544-11e6-bc79-af1cd3d2984b_story.html?utm_term=.14dc283575cc)

## Slide 22

Unpacking Stereotypes

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to continue the conversation about stereotypes and get in front of the common pushback that "stereotypes are just true."

**Delivery of Content:** Acknowledge that one of the biggest push backs on this training is that some stereotypes are true. Stereotypes are shortcuts to understandings that don't take into account the reality of a specific individual. When stereotypes guide behavior, that is discrimination, which we will discuss in more depth later in the training. In order to understand how stereotypes are misleading, we can deconstruct a common stereotype. We have been discussing stereotypes but let us define it here. The definition of stereotypes that we will use in this training is the overgeneralizations that connect group membership to specific characteristics.

The stereotype we will unpack here is the idea that in the U.S., Asian people are smarter.

Walk through the historical context behind that stereotype. First, U.S. immigration policy has given priority to attracting the elites of all nations around the world, either through immigration quotas or elite employment preference quotas. Selective immigration has contributed to a large population of Asian immigrants, particularly from 1990-1999, with wealth and access to educational opportunities.

Second, Asian Americans were not always considered a model minority. It wasn't until the height of the Civil Rights Movement in 1966 that the term "model minority" was coined and it was used to reinforce the idea that African Americans were trouble makers and any inequalities they faced were from a lack of hard work strategically juxtaposing Black and Asian-Americans.

Last, there are a significant numbers of Asian American and Pacific Islander students who struggle with poverty, who are English-language learners increasingly likely to leave school with rudimentary language skills, who are at risk of dropping out. These populations, typically Cambodian, Malyasian, and Filipino, get erased by the stereotype of Asian American as smarter.

Pose a question to the room: Based on this information, can anyone think about why this seemingly positive stereotype could have a negative impact?

Possible responses include: other populations of students will not view themselves as intelligent, Asian students needing extra academic help may be less likely to seek it out, it may discourage Asian students from pursuing more creative or non-academic career paths.

### Slide 23

"The problem with stereotypes is not that they are untrue, but that they are incomplete." - Chimamanda Ngozie Adiche

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to continue the conversation about why it is problematic to hold stereotypes as truths.

**Delivery of Content:** Inform the class that the next short clip is a continuation of the discussion about the problems with stereotypes. Read the listed quote aloud: "The problem with stereotypes is not that they are untrue, but that they are incomplete." Chimamanda Ngozie Adiche is a Nigerian writer and well-known feminist advocate. In this clip she shares her own confrontation with stereotypes.

Play the clip.

After the clip is over, ask the class if they have ever experienced either having a single story created about them or having created a single story about someone else. Have a person example ready to share. It does not necessarily have to be related to group identity.

For example, "my nephew is 8 years old and a complete Tasmanian devil. My niece is 15 and a well-behaved angel. So, if my nephew complains to me that my niece has mistreated him, my initial response is to dismiss him and assume that she was just trying to do something her mother directed her to do like get him to brush his teeth or eat his vegetables. That is based on my experiences of my hurricane of a nephew. I have created an ending for the story before I even hear his full side or even bother about questioning my niece. I have a single story for him that disallows for me to understand or hear any possible alternative. What is the danger there? What could I miss? Isn't it entirely possible that my niece, a teenager, has treated him unfairly? How did the single story prevent me from getting to the truth of his experience and getting a complete story? How might this apply to different social groups in the way that Chimamanda described?"

### Slide 24

Suspicious Person Scenario

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to begin to tie in discussions of stereotyping into policing and to highlight the complicated nature of police interactions.

**Delivery of Content:** Explain to participants that you are going to play a clip that highlights the dangers of a single story in a policing context. Instruct the class to be on the look out for the potential influence of stereotypes. After the clip, you will facilitate a group discussion.

Play the clip.

The video shows the following: An officer receives a 911 call for service detailing that a suspicious person is peering into car windows on the street. The video then shows a black male peering into car windows. The black male is then startled by the presence of a police officer. The video stops.

Instruct the class to assume the role of the officer responding. Ask the class, "What is the single story the officer could assume about the reportedly 'suspicious person?' What are some alternative stories?"

The obvious single story is that the black male is trying to break into cars. Some alternative explanations are that the man is looking to buy a similar car and is checking it out or that he lost his keys.

Be sure to emphasize that in this scenario, the responding officer is put in a situation where they might be faced with a stereotype that a community member had when they called about a suspicious person. That officer must investigate the call for service but is then tasked with overcoming their own reliance on a single story.

*Video Script in full:*

Emergency Services: "2612?"

Beat 2612: "2612."

Emergency Services: "12. I have a call of a suspicious person at West Jackson checking vehicles."

Beat 2612: "99-12"

## Slide 25

### Stereotyping

**Purpose:** This quote highlights that this type of human cognition is universal but police have a unique responsibility to reduce the influence of stereotyping on their decision-making and behavior.

**Delivery of Content:** We just had conversations about the dangers of stereotyping in everyday life and in the context of policing. We saw that policing interactions are particularly vulnerable to the influence of stereotypes and officers have an added responsibility in reducing that influence. In the police version, we highlight that responsibility for officers using the following quote from Jack Glaser, PhD Associate Dean of Public Policy at the University of California- Berkeley and author of the book, *Suspect Race*.

Read the quote aloud:

"Stereotyping is normal human cognition. Police are normal humans. So police stereotype. Policing is not a normal job — it's a particularly taxing position so they cannot make the same errors the rest of us can."

## Slide 26

### Identity Traps Defined

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to provide definitions of fast and slow traps.

**Delivery of Content:** All of the concepts and conversations up to this point establish the foundation for the training on identity traps. What are identity traps? Identity traps are situations that trigger mental reactions which influence behaviors. These behaviors are unrelated to the nature of one's character or conscious intentions. For example, the flight attendant fell into a trap when she assumed Tamika Cross was not a medical doctor. We will get into the definition of fast traps in the next Module.

# Module 2

## Fast Traps

### Slide 27

### Module 2 - Fast Traps: Shortcuts in the Brain

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to introduce and define the concept of fast traps.

**Delivery of Content:** Direct participants to their glossaries at this point.

Fast traps are energy-saving shortcuts that develop in our brain. The definition of a fast trap is an over-reliance on implicit biases. In this module, we will walk through the components of a fast trap including implicit associations, implicit bias, and the situations that make us vulnerable to a trap.

### Slide 28

### Implicit Association

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to define implicit associations and provide an example.

**Delivery of content:** Read the definition of an implicit association: a cognitive link between two concepts that is automatic. When one concept is primed or made obvious, the other becomes more easily accessible without conscious deliberation.

For example, if I say peanut butter (get the class to respond with “jelly.”

## Slide 29

### Brain Game

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to provide a fun and non-threatening way to that priming and time pressure can cause our brain to take shortcuts. This is a primer for understanding how implicit bias can influence behavior.

**Delivery of Content:** There are several ways to prime our brains. The next exercise is going to illustrate that concept and show how our brains can rely on shortcuts when there are primers, particularly in a time pressured situation.

Inform participants that you are going to ask 6 questions. Instruct them to respond loudly and as quickly as possible. Don't think, just respond. Provide the answer to the first question. Get them to repeat it with you and then move quickly through the next five:

Q: What kind of music do Peter, Paul and Mary sing? A: folk (provide this answer to get them started!)

Q: Comedians tell \_\_\_\_\_. A: joke

Q: If you have no money, you are \_\_\_\_\_. A: broke

Q: The wire in a wheel is a \_\_\_\_\_. A: spoke

Q: What comes out of a lit cigarette? A: smoke

Q: The white part of the egg is the \_\_\_\_\_. A: yolk

Typically, you can get people to say yolk several times before they realize what's happening. This is not because they believe in their hearts that the white part of an egg is called a yolk. (If anyone asks, the white part of an egg is actually called an albumen.) It is because you put them in a time pressured situation, primed them with pictures and rhyming words thereby activating shortcuts in their brains that led them to wrong conclusion.

Our brains make these shortcuts, known as implicit associations, because it is often energy saving. But sometimes, these implicit associations can interfere with rational thinking or decision-making, and may have unintended or negative consequences.

Another scenario that drives this home:

Your significant other asks you to stop by the store for some milk on your way home from work. You leave work with every intention to stop by the store to get the milk, but somehow find yourself at home, no milk in hand. What happened? Most likely your brain relied on automatic associations, or mental shortcuts, shaped by the context of the situation. If anyone uses a GPS system on their phone everyday, it makes the same kind of shortcut based on time of day. If I turn on my Waze app around 5pm, a message pops up asking me if I'd like to navigate home.

It would be too taxing if your brain had to think of every single turn you had to make to get home every single day so it becomes automated. That's why when someone is first learning to drive it is very difficult, but it becomes easier and easier over time with more practice. Your brain automates some of the driving process, like frequently used routes, and goes into autopilot triggered by situational cues (i.e. leaving work means driving home via xyz route. However, in the scenario provided, that shortcut was wrong. You should have navigated to the grocery store to pick up milk. The unintended negative outcome? A disappointed person greeting you at home.

Again, these examples illustrate that fast traps can lead to unwanted behavior (saying yolk instead of white part of an egg), incorrect decision-making (driving home instead of stopping for milk), and negative outcomes (disappointed/frustrated significant other in need of milk.)

### Slide 30

#### Subconscious Conclusions

**Purpose:** The purpose of the slide is to show how the brain can make connections without conscious effort and based on very little information.

#### Delivery of Content:

As defined, implicit associations are cognitive links between two concepts that are automatic. These associations can form outside of conscious awareness or intention. For example, in marketing. Marketers design logos that associate brands with symbols.

Fade in each picture and ask participants what they're seeing.

Participants probably did not have to think about these symbols at all. Their brains instantly produced an answer. It made the connection before you asked it to. What's more, you probably don't remember when you "learned" what these symbols represented. The point of this is to show that the brain made instant connections without conscious thought. Equally important is that most people will not remember the exact moment when they learned what these symbols represent. The repeated exposure to these brands, through experience and environment, created associations in the brain in unconscious ways.

This way of learning and understanding the world is universal. Everyone does it. Advertising companies understand this aspect of human cognition very well. It's why they bombard us with images of their product, and use discrete product placement in movies and music videos - because even if we're not aware of the placement, our brain is paying attention to it and becomes imprinted with this information. We see an image, and our brains take a shortcut to the answer. In the exercise everyone knew the golden arches represented McDonald's.

That's why it's easy to remember fast traps as shortcuts in the brain.

**Note:** It's fine to substitute different logos especially if there is one that is regionally significant. Alternatively, this exercise works if you begin to hum/sing a jingle and ask the class to finish the jingle.

### Slide 31

#### Implicit Association Test

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to teach participants that implicit biases are common and harbored by the majority of human beings no matter their racial group membership. The video clip discusses the implicit association test.

**Delivery of Content:** There is an entire segment of psychology that studies implicit associations, especially as they relate to particular identities like race, gender, age, weight, etc. Show this clip that discusses the IAT test and Project Implicit. This clip shows one way scientists have demonstrated the phenomena of implicit associations.

Remind participants that everyone develops implicit associations about others based on characteristics like race, skin tone, income, sex and other physical attributes. Biases are learned, beginning from the time we are born. All of the things we see

and hear contribute to these biases. We probably aren't aware of most of what we are absorbing.

**Suggested reading:**

Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). There are also useful definitions and FAQs at Project Implicit: <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/faqs.html>

## Slide 32

### Implicit Bias

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to make the link between implicit associations and implicit bias and provide a definition of implicit bias.

**Delivery of Content:** As shown in the last clip, our brains make implicit associations in relation to race, gender, sexuality, and other identities; We call those implicit biases. Implicit biases are attitudes and stereotypes that are not consciously accessible through introspection. If we find out that we have them, we may indeed reject them as inappropriate.

In other words, the shortcuts that our brains made in folk/yolk and the in branding exercise can also happen with groups of people.

Provide a policing example, such as: Officers who have been assigned to a high crime area over a long period of time may start to associate the **criminals** they interact with in that area-with the area as a whole. That unconscious association would be an implicit bias. The opposite association may develop for people living in low-crime areas—**that is**, that they are not criminals.

Pose this thought question (for introspection, not for discussion): Ask yourself what you pictured when we said high crime area? Did you associate a race with that area? If so, what race? Now ask yourself the same question for a low-crime area.

These types of associations can form implicit biases.

**Suggested reading:** Kang, J., Bennett, M. W., Carbado, D. W., Casey, P., Dasgupta, N., Faigman, D. L., & Mnookin, J. (2012). Implicit bias in the courtroom. *UCLA Law Review*, 59(5).

## Slide 33

### Situations Matter

**Purpose:** The purpose is to illustrate that situations are better predictors of behavior than attitude and set the foundation for discussing the types of situations that lead to traps.

**Delivery of Content:** The good news is that implicit biases don't always guide behavior. In fact, psychological science reveals that attitudes predict about 10% of our behaviors at best.

Situations are actually better predictors of behavior than attitude. What do we mean by that? Consider the following scenario:

*You're late for work. Why?*

*Reality:* Your alarm went off and you hit snooze 5 times, you went through the Starbucks and the line was long, you forgot your gym bag and had to go back home to grab it.

*What you tell your supervisor:* Car trouble.

WHY? The reality is people lie when...

- They have motivation
- The consequences will be slight
- They believe they'll get away with it

Who does this? EVERYONE.

Lying, like all behavior, is less about character and more about the situational vulnerabilities. Regardless of your personal values, the situations in which we find ourselves are powerful, and will affect our behavior, even if it is inconsistent with our self-image.

### Slide 34

#### Situations That Create Fast Traps

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to identify the specific situations that lead to fast traps.

**Delivery of Content:** When it comes to fast traps, there are particular situations that make us MORE vulnerable to relying on implicit biases. These situations may include: being mentally taxed, being in a bad mood, feeling threatened, being a novice or a rookie, needing to make a quick decision, or multitasking (Blair, 2002; Devine, 1989; Ghumman & Barnes, 2013; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998; Fiske & Taylor, 2013; Sim, Correll, & Sadler, 2013).

Refer back into the folk/yolk exercise: if you hadn't put participants in a time-pressured situation, would their response to 'what is the white part of an egg?' have been different?

Pose the question to the room: Does anyone here face these conditions? How often? The point of this discussion question is to get people from different professions and walks of life to realize that they are faced with situations that can lead to fast traps.

### Slide 35

#### Definitions

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to define stereotype, prejudice, and discrimination as parts of a fast trap.

**Delivery of Content:** Understanding the difference between stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination is integral to understanding fast traps.

Go through each definition and provide examples. Read the definitions and accompanying examples below. Feel free to come up with some of your own examples for these definitions.

- Stereotypes are ideas or associations that connect group membership with traits about that group (ex: women are bad drivers)
- Prejudice is the belief that a stereotype or overgeneralization is true (ex: I believe that women are bad drivers)
- Discrimination is the behavior influenced by a stereotype or prejudice. This includes objectionable differential treatment based on group membership. (ex: I'm the hiring manager at Uber and I will not hire women because I believe that all women are bad drivers.)

**Note:** Bias (not listed) is the catch-all; an idea can be biased; a belief/feeling can be biased; a behavior can be biased Ex: All of the above examples are examples of bias.

These are easy words to mix up. You can use these in an interactive way to keep people engaged by asking them to try to catch you using a phrase inaccurately. It helps participants better understand the definitions and helps to keep you on your toes as a facilitator.

### Slide 36

Stereotypes ► Behavior

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to illustrate how fast traps occur. The point is that our explicit attitudes/values/beliefs do not play a role in a fast trap. Our behavior is influenced strictly by the idea regardless of our endorsement of that idea.

**Delivery of Content:** Play the animation on this slide to showcase how a fast trap works. Narrate each part of the trap as the animation plays using the working definitions from the previous slide.

You should also draw on the same examples from the previous slide to further illustrate how someone can go from the stereotype/idea (e.g. women are bad drivers) to the discriminatory behavior (e.g. not hiring women as drivers.)

Be sure to highlight the situational components necessary for the trap to be set e.g. time pressure, stress, etc. from Slide 34: Situations that create fast traps.

Acknowledge that it is difficult to talk about bias without feeling personally attacked. Most people would like to think that they are in complete control of their behavior and are impervious to any kind of bias.

But as we have illustrated, everyone is vulnerable to traps because of how the brain works. This diagram illustrates how fast traps cause the brain to skip right from idea to behavior.

### Slide 37

Watch These Judges Fall into a Trap

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to give an example of a fast trap in action.

**Delivery of Content:** Set up the first clip by telling people to focus on the judges' and audience members' reactions. The purpose of the clip is to watch as everyone judges Susan on her outward appearance and decides that she must have a horrible voice because she is not young and conventionally attractive.

Play the first clip.

Play the 2<sup>nd</sup> clip and move into group dialogue.

Facilitate a group discussion: What stereotypes or associations were at play here? Why were the judges so surprised that Susan Boyle had a beautiful voice? Why is it funny when Simon Cowell says, "I knew it all along?"

After discussion, be sure to highlight that if someone asked each of the judges and audience members if they actually believed unattractive people could not sing or that older people are not talented, they would likely say no. If they do not hold these prejudices, how do we explain their visceral reactions when she appears on stage? What might be going on here? We know LOGICALLY that looks and age are not good predictors of vocal ability yet the judges and audience fall into that trap. Why? We only see pop singers that are young and attractive, right?

Pose the question: What situational factors may have contributed to their assumptions?

One of the situations present here that could have contributed to everyone's negative reactions are the format of the talent show i.e. people are forced to make quick decisions with little information; contestants walk out on the stage and are instantly judged by their physical appearance.

Reiterate, physical appearance is not a great predictor of vocal ability so this is an example of a fast trap. The judges and audience members were in a situation that led to an over-reliance on implicit associations. The information they used to judge—Susan’s appearance—was the easiest information available to them but not the best.

### Slide 38

#### Black/Crime Association

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to help participants understand that stereotypical associations may be more common than one might think, especially the stereotype that purports that Blacks are more prone to commit crimes than other groups.

**Delivery of Content: This is the tie in to policing.** The Observation Game reveals biases about gender. These same types of biases exist for race.

For example, people are likely to show patterns of anti-Black and/or pro-White bias when they implicitly associate Black with negative evaluations, feelings, or beliefs, and/or White with positive evaluations, feelings, or beliefs, as discussed in the IAT video.

The stereotype of Black Americans as violent and criminal has been documented by social psychologists for almost 60 years. Not only is the association between Blacks and crime strong it also appears to be automatic. This was illustrated this in a 2004 study of police officers and college students.

In the first study, Drs. Jennifer Eberhardt, Phillip Atiba Goff, Valerie Purdies, and Paul Davies showed that people who were subliminally exposed to black faces were then

more quickly able to identify a blurry image as a gun than those who were exposed to white faces or no faces. The figure above is pulled from that work.

In other research, Dr. Eberhardt showed that among defendants convicted of murdering a white victim, defendants whose appearance was more stereotypically black (e.g. darker skinned, with a broader nose and thicker lips) were sentenced more harshly and, in particular, were more likely to be sentenced to death than if their features were less stereotypically black. This finding held even after the researchers controlled for the many non-racial factors (e.g. the severity of the crime, aggregators, mitigators, the defendant's attractiveness, etc.) that might account for the results.

Biases influence how our brains process objects, body movements and other behaviors beyond our awareness. The effects are real and sometimes a matter of life or death.

#### Suggested reading:

Suggested reading: Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V. J., & Davies, P. G. (2004).

### Slide 39

#### How Can Fast Traps Impact Police Officers?

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to elucidate the role of fast traps in policing. This clip provides a real life example from an officer who reflected on a fast trap that nearly cost him his life.

**Delivery of Content:** Now that we have a foundation for understanding fast traps, let’s explore a policing specific example. Set up the clip for so that participants know what to expect: This is an audio interview with a Las Vegas Metro Police officer

reflecting on an experience that they have identified as an example of implicit bias influencing their behavior.

Play the audio clip.

Debrief the clip: highlight that fast traps can create blind spots that prevent officers from seeing important elements. Police learn that implicit biases can impact officer safety and reduce public safety. Just as we saw in the black/crime association study, ideas about race can hinder officers' ability to accurately detect weapons.

The officer validates the idea that in that Cici's pizzeria, it was likely that the suspect would be black or Latino based on the neighborhood demographics. He goes on to describe how the situation changed and his assumption about the shooter changed with it. Through retrospection and introspection, the officer reflects that his moment's hesitation, when he fell into the fast trap, almost cost him his life. If he hadn't gone in with the assumption that the shooter was male, he may have immediately read the situation accurately and taken down the female shooter faster. This is a situation where going in without assumptions would have been a benefit. The officer illustrates how pre-conceived ideas can actually cloud clarity of the present situation and present a safety risk.

You can note that police officers rely on their "gut" instinct to make split-second, life-saving decisions. It is important in the officer training that emphasize that this training is not about making them doubt their gut instinct. The reality of a gut instinct or hunch is that it's not some other-worldly spidey sense, it's a result of our brains learning to read clues around us. Studying situations and human behavior long enough can hone your gut instinct, which is why cops seem to have exceptional "intuition": they've trained their gut to be hyper aware of situations and of people.

Unfortunately, good police training and instincts can get muddied up with the noise from society—the idea that black men are violent, experiences with transwomen as sex workers, women as victims, and as we heard in this clip, white males as active shooters. Somewhere in between conscious thoughts and values, implicit biases can sneak in and mess with your gut, leading to fast traps.

As a reminder, this is the same training we use for police officers, and this training is meant to create awareness of the situations that can lead to a trap and the existence of biases, including in policing, that could make you vulnerable to a negative outcome. This training can be thought of as a way to "enhance your instincts" so that you are not solely reliant on implicit biases when you're in a fast trap.

## Slide 40

### Small Group Exercise: Examples of Fast Traps

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to get participants to identify a fast trap by unpacking the elements of a trap and generating their own examples.

**Delivery of Content:** Pass out the handouts for this exercise.

In their small groups, ask participants to consider the following questions:

- Reflect on or imagine an experience where your behavior may have been guided by implicit bias.
- Identify any underlying stereotypes
- How did it or could it have changed your behavior?
- Identify situational influences (e.g. being in a rush, multitasking, etc.)
- How did it impact you? The other person?

It will be helpful to walk through an example of a fast trap that we've already used to demonstrate appropriate responses to each question.

Here's an example using the clip of the podcast on the last slide:

- Reflect on or imagine an experience where your behavior may have been guided by implicit bias: **officer responding to active shooter**
- Identify any underlying stereotypes: active shooters are white males, women are typically victims
- How did it or could it have changed your behavior: **it delayed the officer's ability to detect the woman as a threat rather than a victim**
- Identify situational influences (e.g. being in a rush, multitasking, etc.): **he had to make a quick decision under the most stressful situation possible**
- How did it impact you? The other person?: **it nearly cost the officer his life**

Give participants 5-7 minutes in their groups to discuss. Ask each table to share at least one example.

## Module 3

### Slow Traps

#### Slide 41

Module 3 - Slow Traps: When Identities Matter

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to define slow traps.

**Delivery of Content:** Definition of slow traps: a negative response to identity threats (e.g. stereotype threat, authority threat)

#### Slide 42

Slow Traps

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to walk through each element of a slow trap and provide an example.

**Delivery of Content:** Go over three factors that lead to slow traps and provide an example for each:

- Our Identity is important in a particular situation. Example: A young woman is about to participate in a math competition.

- Our abilities to manage other people's perceptions of ourselves are low. Example: She is aware that all of the judges are men and most of the opposing teams are predominantly boys. She is also aware of the stereotype that boys are better at math and feels everyone might be judging her based on that.
- Failure to validate our identity could lead to negative consequences. Example: If she doesn't perform well she feels she will be used as an example to reinforce the stereotype that all girls are not as good at math as boys. Her concern, combined with the pressures of the competition, lead her to perform poorly.

**Suggested reading:** Bergsieker, H. B., Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2010).

### Slide 43

#### Stereotype Threat Definition

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to discuss the impact of stereotype threats on behavior.

**Delivery of Content:** When confronted with the idea that girls are bad at math, this individual may feel that her identity as a smart girl who is good at math is threatened. This is a well-documented phenomena known as stereotype threat. Stereotype threat is the sense of threat that can arise when one knows that he or she can be possibly judged or treated negatively on the basis of a negative stereotype about one's group. Research finds that even when stereotypes are not uttered aloud, the phenomenon of stereotype threat, or the fear of confirming a negative stereotype, can be a stigma that affects attitudes and behaviors.

Though there are stereotypes that could lead to being treated or judged positively, stereotype threat only addresses scenarios in which you would be judged or treated negatively because of a stereotype about your group.

### Slide 44

#### Stereotype Threat + Vulnerable Condition = Slow Trap

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to walk through the components of a slow trap involving stereotype threat and facilitate group discussion around this concept.

**Delivery of content:** Go over what is required for stereotype threat to happen:

- An individual feels strongly identified with a group
- The individual believes they are being evaluated
- Self-concept is connected to that evaluation

**Debrief:** Has anyone experienced stereotype threat in the way that is described here? How did that impact your behavior?

Instructors should be prepared with specific examples of stereotype threat.

For example, a macho man might be more likely to try to affirm their masculinity after it has been threatened e.g. someone calls him an effeminate name. That man might behave in an overly aggressive ways to try to reassert his masculinity.

### Slide 45

#### Situations That Create Slow Traps

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to illustrate the conditions needed to lead to a slow trap.

**Delivery of content:** The same situations that make us vulnerable to fast traps, also make us vulnerable to slow traps. Highlight the situational components of the last few examples provided e.g. the time pressure and stress of a math competition.

### Slide 46

#### Slow Traps on the Job

**Purpose:** To provide a real-life policing example of a slow trap.

**Delivery of content:** Describe the example from the female police recruit who experiences stereotyping during her physical test in her class, containing mostly men. She was aware of the negative stereotype about women as weak and she felt her male counterparts would judge her based on that. In order to prove that she was strong, she overcompensated and pushed herself too hard and injured herself. Ultimately, it delayed her hiring process. Point out each element of the trap (e.g. she strongly identified with a group, she believed she was being evaluated, her self-concept was connected to that evaluation).

### Slide 47

#### Small Group Exercise: Examples of Slow Traps

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to have the class generate their examples of slow traps in small groups.

**Delivery of Content:** Read the slide, explain the activity, and pass out the hand-out.

Begin by providing an example such as the following: a female officer is responding to a noise complaint call at a loud frat party. A young man opens the door. What does he say to her? Answer: Who ordered the stripper?? Now imagine that's the 5th time that officer has heard that joke that day. Now imagine she's lost count of how many times she's heard that joke since joining the force. Now imagine that she's been working for 12 hours, she's hungry, and tired. How do you think she'll react? What kind of threats are at play here? Highlight the stereotypes about gender and authority threat.

Debrief: Can you see how this female officer might react poorly?

Be sure to highlight the situational vulnerabilities that would increase the likelihood that she would react poorly e.g. being tired, stressed, being cognitively depleted.

Give everyone 7-10 minutes to discuss amongst their groups, then ask the groups to share out loud one or two compelling examples of a slow trap.

This is another moment to tailor your example to the population represented in this session population (e.g. Latino, LGBTQ, Youth (17 and under), Members of "high crime" neighborhoods, Victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, Faith-based groups.)

### Slide 48

#### Authority Threat

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to provide a definition of authority threat.

**Delivery of Content:** In addition to stereotype threat, slow traps can arise from authority threat. Authority threat is the perception that one's identity as an authority figure is not respected or is negatively perceived. This sense of threat could lead to an unwanted change in behavior, similar to what we saw with stereotype threat.

## Slide 49

### Authority Threat + Vulnerable Condition = Slow Trap

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to highlight a common slow trap in policing and show how a lack of legitimacy may lead to increased use of coercive force.

**Delivery of Content:** Explain that a cops' sense of authority is important in their interactions with citizens in order to gain compliance and secure the situation. However, if police lack the legitimacy needed to have their authority respected, it could lead to a slow trap. Consider the following, social scientists have identified 5 **types of power or authority:**

- **Legitimate:** a person has been given formal authority to make demands and expects obedience from others. The CEO of your company, for example, has legitimate power.
- **Reward:** a person is able to compensate another – financially or otherwise – for complying with his/her demands. A parent has reward power over his children.
- **Expert:** a person has the knowledge and skills to outperform others; their good judgment is respected and relied upon. A specialist physician has expert power.
- **Referent:** a person is strongly liked and admired by others and often exerts a charming influence. A celebrity has referent power. Senior officer, well liked officer.
- **Coercive:** a person achieves compliance from others through the threat of punishment. A military dictator has coercive power.

In communities where there is little trust of police legitimate authority goes out the window; if there's no respect then referent authority is out too.

What other types of authority could an officer rely on? Reward is not an option because police can't pay people to comply. Expert authority might work if an officer is transparent in their intentions and reveals their expertise in managing a particular situation.

What if that doesn't work? Coercive authority is the only remaining option. Coercive power can look a lot like excessive or unnecessary force from an outside perspective, even though, from a cop's point of view, it may be needed to ensure everyone's safety.

*Suggested reading: French, J. R., Raven, B., & Cartwright, D. (1959). The bases of social power. Classics of organization theory, 311-320.*

<http://quickbase.intuit.com/blog/the-5-types-of-power-revisited>

## Slide 50

### Authority Threat Example

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to walk through a real-life example of authority threat in action.

**Delivery of Content:** Play the video and have the types of authority posted in the front of the room. Ask people to call out when they think certain types of authority are being used. End with a discussion of why/how this represents an authority threat.

Note at the end, the sergeant is being very transparent about the ambiguity around drones and the lack of legislation which has led to confusion about police enforcement in such situations. This transparency, which could also increase both referent and legitimate authority, is one of the principles of procedural justice which officers get 2 8-hour trainings on. We'll go over procedural justice in more depth in

the next module but just wanted to flag this as one of the trainings officers receive that will help reduce slow traps.

How could this situation have escalated into a case of excessive force? Has anyone experienced authority threat in their own lives?

## Module 4

### Defusing Traps

#### Slide 51

##### Module 4: Defusing Traps

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to serve as a call for action. Now that participants understand identity traps, it is time to think about how they can defuse them in their own lives.

**Delivery of content:** Now that participants have an understanding of identity traps, it is time to figure out how to defuse those traps in their everyday lives.

Read the quote from Dr. Phillip Atiba Goff, whose science forms the framework of this training: “Before anybody’s had contact with law enforcement, they’ve had contact with schools, with jobs, either getting them or not, with the health care system and the housing systems, all of which suffer from many of the same and sometimes even worse forms of bias than does law enforcement.”

This module is designed to empower participants with tools to improve the way they respond to and make sense of situations vulnerable to bias.

## Slide 52

### Defusing Traps

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to begin the conversation about how to avoid falling into traps.

**Delivery of Content:** How do we begin to make sense of those situations? We start by stopping and engaging in self-reflection. Some concrete questions to guide this reflection are:

1. What are the factors that lead me to think of someone in a negative way?
2. What stereotypes could inform that decision?

## Slide 53

### Practice Procedural Justice

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to introduce the tenets of procedural justice and highlight how they can be used to reduce the influence of identity traps. This is also a good opportunity for police officers to describe PJ1 and PJ2 trainings.

**Delivery of Content:** Inform participants that this training is adapted from the third in a series of procedural justice trainings. Officers participate in 16 hours of coursework on the tenets of procedural justice before they take this course on identity traps. Procedural justice “describes the idea that how individuals regard the justice system is tied more to the perceived fairness of the process and how they were treated rather than to the perceived fairness of the outcome.”

Remind participants about the authority threat example of the officer interacting with the drone guy. How could that officer have avoided the slow trap by practicing procedural justice? Note that the sergeant who comes out at the end uses PJ to deescalate the situation.

Review principles of procedural justice and provide examples for each:

- Voice (Listen)
- Neutrality (Fairness and Consistency)
- Respectful Treatment (The Golden Rule)
- Trustworthiness (Fair and Transparent Process)

[https://cops.usdoj.gov/html/dispatch/09-2013/fairness\\_as\\_a\\_crime\\_prevention\\_tool.asp](https://cops.usdoj.gov/html/dispatch/09-2013/fairness_as_a_crime_prevention_tool.asp)

## Slide 54

### Interventions

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to introduce additional intervention strategies to combat traps.

**Delivery of Content:** Facilitate group discussion for each intervention listed. Ask for examples of how each tactic could have defused one of the identity traps discussed in today’s session.

- Expand awareness: has been shown to actually reduce the impact of implicit bias on behavior
- See the individual rather than their group identification and stereotypes about that group

- Increase opportunities for interactions with other races, cultures, ethnicities, etc. : What groups of people are you the least exposed to? How can you find ways to meaningfully interact with those groups that is mutually beneficial?
- Slow things down— allow yourself time to reflect on the situation. And you might practice this after an interactions
- Hold accountability for yourself and for each other accountable
- Stereotype Replacement: actively locate counter stereotypes

### Slide 55

Aziz Ansari Clip

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to provide a humorous example of stereotype replacement.

**Delivery of content:** This clip of comedian Aziz Ansari provides a humorous example of stereotype replacement. He highlights that when people’s only exposure to certain groups of people are through negative media accounts, negative prejudices can develop. This also calls back to the dangers of a single story.

Play clip.

### Slide 56

Scenario Group Exercise

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to introduce the next group exercise. This exercise is intended to bring together everything participants have learned in today’s session and brainstorm to tactics to defuse traps in various scenarios vulnerable to bias.

**Delivery of Content:** Assign a micro population to each small group. Everyone in that group will have the same handout with the same population listed. It might be helpful to choose the population most relevant to the class as a whole and to walk through that scenario together as a class.

The goal is to explore what identity traps look like in everyday life, to examine particular contexts where people might be more susceptible to traps, and ultimately to foster empathy for multiple perspectives (i.e. the officers, civilians, and bystanders).

Keep in mind, the bystander perspective could be anyone who is observing the police interact with the civilian involved. Participants can be creative about who bystanders might be, as long as they are exploring how different people might view the interaction differently.

### Slide 57

Benefits of Parallel Trainings for Police and Communities on Identity Traps

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to summarize the goals of the training.

**Delivery of content:** Remind participants of the objectives of the training: common Language, understanding that no one is immune to identity traps, strategies for defusing.

## Slide 58

Closing Circle

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to give participants an opportunity to share how their ideas have shifted throughout the course of this training.

**Delivery of content:** Depending on the size of the group, this can either be done in their small groups, as a pair and share, or each individual can share. Ask each participant to complete the following phrases: “At first I thought...”

“But, now I think...”

## Slide 59

Thank You

**Purpose:** The purpose of this slide is to mark the close of the training and to acknowledge any group that has contributed to the carrying out of today’s training i.e. if space, snacks, etc were donated acknowledge those donors.

## Micropopulation Slides: 60-77

*Trainers can show the appropriate slides while conducting the group scenario exercise.*

### Slide 60

Micropopulations

**Purpose:** Instructors should note that for the sake of this training we focus on populations that are particularly vulnerable. Other populations would include indigenous peoples, other immigrant, homeless, people with physical and mental disabilities.

### Slide 61

Non-White Youth

**Stereotype - loud, dangerous, aggressive, culpable**

Black children are perceived as older and more culpable than their actual age and more culpable than their white and Latino/a counterparts. Black children are 18 times more likely than white children to be sentenced as adults and represent 58% of children sentenced to adult facilities.

Age and culpability perceptions of teenagers are likely to impact police intervention in regular teenage activities. This may result in policing of adolescent behaviors that are not criminal but affiliated with negative stereotypes.

Slide 62

Non-White Youth Scenario

Slide 63

White Youth

White youth stereotype: innocent, good, seen as individuals

White and Latinx children are seen as more innocent than Black children of the same age. White children are 18 times less likely than Black children to be sentenced as adults.

Perceptions of age and culpability of teenagers are likely to impact police intervention in regular teenage activities. One study found that probation officers were more likely to attribute black youths' delinquency to negative attitudes and personality traits and white youths' delinquency to social environments.

Slide 64

White Youth Scenario

Slide 65

Latinx

**Delivery of Content:** Stereotypes of U.S. Immigrants from Four Global Regions (Timberlake/Williams, 2012) *The Sociological Quarterly* – respondents rated Latin American immigrants most negatively among four types of immigrant populations. Findings indicate that national dialogue has a heavy impact on interpersonal perceptions working with these groups, especially related to national debates regarding unauthorized immigration.

Who "THEY" are matters: Immigrant Stereotypes and Assessments of the Impact of Immigration (2015) *The Sociological Quarterly* research found that associations between impact assessments and stereotypes regarding most immigrant populations are weak and attenuated by covariates but strong and robust with Latino immigrants. Essentially, public opinion is shaped by stereotypes about Latin Americans, especially in areas of school, unemployment and education.

Slide 66

Latinx Scenario

Slide 67

LGB

**Suggested reading:** *Queer (In)justice* (Mogul, Ritchie & Whitlock, 2012)

The Ghosts of Stonewall: Policing Gender, Policing Sex (Truthout - <http://www.truthout.org/progressivepicks/item/31764-the-ghosts-of-stonewall-policing-gender-policing-sex>)

### Slide 68

LGB Scenario

### Slide 69

Transgender & Gender Non-Conforming

**Suggested reading:** Cultural and Personally Endorsed stereotypes of transgender men and transgender women: notable correspondence or disjunction?//Stephanie Beryl Gazzola & Melanie Ann Morrison, 2014 International Journal of Transgenderism

Stonewalled: Police Abuse and Misconduct Against Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People in the US (Amnesty International, 2005)

Trouble in accessing appropriate resources in housing situations, areas that are gendered and force them to be in areas not like their own

### Slide 70

Transgender & Gender Non-Conforming Scenario

### Slide 71

Domestic Violence/Sexual Assault Survivors

**Delivery of Content:** Perceptions of Domestic Violence in Lesbian Relationships: Stereotypes and Gender Role Expectations (Little & Terrence, 2010) – a research study looked at perceptions of plausibility of survivors' claim and blame assigned to perpetrator and survivor in lesbian relationships. Visual perception (gender stereotypes and body type) have the biggest impact on perceptions of plausibility and culpability of domestic violence.

Gender-Role Stereotypes and Perceptions of Heterosexual, Gay and Lesbian Domestic Violence (Seelau & Seelau, 2005) – Gender stereotypes influence stereotype perceptions more than sexual orientation.

### Slide 72

Domestic Violence/Sexual Assault Survivors Scenario

### Slide 73

Muslim

**Suggested reading:** <http://www.islamophobia.org/images/ConfrontingFear/Final-Report.pdf>

<http://www.cnn.com/2016/11/14/us/fbi-hate-crime-report-muslims/>

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/157082/islamophobia-understanding-anti-muslim-sentiment-west.aspx>

### Slide 74

Muslim Scenario

### Slide 75

Police

Stereotypes: violent, abusive, not trustworthy

A recent community poll found that non-white racial groups identified the most critical issues in policing to be under-policing and abusive policing.

A 2016 study found that 68% of white respondents have a favorable view of police, while 40% of black respondents and 59% of Latinx respondents have a favorable view.

The same study found that no racial group wished to reduce the number of police officers in communities; in fact, 90% entirely opposed reducing the number.

### Slide 76

Police Scenario

### Slide 77

Break

**Purpose:** This is a template of “break” slide to be used to add breaks at the appropriate intervals. The color bar is on a 10 minute timer to provide participants a visual cue to how long break is.

# References

1. Alpert, G. P., & Dunham, R. G. (2004). *Understanding police use of force: Officers, suspects, and reciprocity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
2. Alpert, G. P., & MacDonald, J. M. (2001). Police use of force: An analysis of organizational characteristics. *Justice Quarterly*, 18(2), 393-409.
3. Anderson, R. M. (1986). *Implementation of consent decrees in structural reform*. *University of Illinois Law Review*, 725 (1987).
4. Anderson, G. S., Courtney, A., Plecas, D., & Chamberlin, C. (2005). Multi-tasking behaviors of general duty police officers. *Police Practice and Research*, 6(1), 39-48.
5. Beccaria, C. (1872). *An essay on crimes and punishments: A New edition corrected*. Albany, NY: W.C. Little & Co.
6. Blair, I. (2002). The malleability of automatic stereotypes and prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 242-261.
7. Blumstein, A., & Wallman, J. (2006). *The crime drop in America*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
8. Bobo, L. (1983). Whites' opposition to busing: Symbolic racism or realistic group conflict. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(6), 1196.
9. Bobo, L. D. (2014). *The Stickiness of Race*. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 11(02), 189-193.
10. Bobo, L. D., Charles, C. Z., Krysan, M., Simmons, A. D., & Fredrickson, G. M. (2012). The real record on racial attitudes. *Social trends in American life: Findings from the general social survey since 1972*, 38-83.
11. Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2011). The effects of focused deterrence strategies on crime: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 0022427811419368.
12. Brewer, M. B. (1988). A dual process model of impression formation. In T. K. Srull & R. S. Wyer (Eds.), *Advances in social cognition* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-36). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
13. Bridges, G. S., & Steen, S. (1998). Racial disparities in official assessments of juvenile offenders: Attributional stereotypes as mediating mechanisms. *American sociological review*, 554-570.
14. Carr, P. B., Dweck, C. S., & Pauker, K. (2012). "Prejudiced" behavior without prejudice? Beliefs about the malleability of prejudice affect interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(3), 452.
15. Cheryan, S., Plaut, V. C., Davies, P., & Steele, C. M. (2009). Ambient belonging: How stereotypical environments impact gender participation in computer science. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(6), 1045-1060.
16. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
17. Collins, P. A., & Gibbs, A. C. C. (2003). Stress in police officers: a study of the origins, prevalence and severity of stress-related symptoms within a county police force. *Occupational Medicine*, 53(4), 256-264.
18. Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., Wittenbrink, B., Sadler, M. S., & Keesee, T. (2007). Across the thin blue line: police officers and racial bias in the decision to shoot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(6), 1006.
19. *The Counted*. (2015). *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/ng-interactive/2015/jun/01/the-counted-police-killings-us-database#>
20. Department of Justice. (2015). *Department of Justice report regarding the criminal investigation in to the shooting death of Michael brown by Ferguson, Missouri police officer Darren Wilson*. Retrieved from [http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/press-releases/attachments/2015/03/04/doj\\_report\\_on\\_shooting\\_of\\_michael\\_brown\\_1.pdf](http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/press-releases/attachments/2015/03/04/doj_report_on_shooting_of_michael_brown_1.pdf)
21. Devine, P. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 5-18.
22. Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. E., Kawakami, K., & Hodson, G. (2002). Why can't we just get along? Interpersonal biases and interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 8(2), 88.
23. Dweck, C., Chui, C., & Hong, Y. (1995a). Implicit theories and their role in judgments and reactions: A world from two perspectives. *Psychological Inquiry*, 6, 267-285.
24. Dweck, C., Chui, C., & Hong, Y. (1995b). Implicit theories: Elaboration and extension of the model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 6, 322-333.

25. Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V. J., & Davies, P. G. (2004). Seeing black: race, crime, and visual processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6), 876.
26. Echterhoff, G., Higgins, E. T., & Groll, S. (2005). Audience-tuning effects on memory: the role of shared reality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(3), 257.
27. Echterhoff, G., Higgins, E. T., & Levine, J. M. (2009). Shared reality experiencing commonality with others' inner states about the world. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(5), 496-521.
28. Ekins, E. E. (2016). *Policing in America: Understanding Public Attitudes Toward the Police. Results from a National Survey.*
29. Fachner, G., & Carter, S. (2014). *Collaborative Reform Model: Final Assessment Report of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.*
30. Fiske, S. T. (2004). *Social beings: A core motives approach to social psychology.* New York, NY: Wiley.
31. Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 48, 621-628.
32. Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum model of impression formation, from category-based to individuating processes: Influence of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 1-74). New York, NY: Academic Press.
33. Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (2013). *Social cognition.* London, UK: Sage.
34. Folger, R. (1977). Distributive and procedural justice: Combined impact of voice and improvement on experienced inequity. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 35(2), 108.
35. Frantz, C. M., Cuddy, A. J., Burnett, M., Ray, H., & Hart, A. (2004). A threat in the computer: The race implicit association test as a stereotype threat experience. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(12), 1611-1624.
36. Friedrich, R. (1980). Police Use of Force: Individuals, Situations, and Organizations. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 452, 82-97.
37. Fryberg, S.A., Markus, H.R., Oyserman, D., & Stone, J.M. (2008). Of warrior chiefs and Indian princesses: The psychological consequences of American Indian mascots on American Indians. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 208–218.
38. Ghuman, S., & Barnes, C. M. (2013). Sleep and prejudice: A resource recovery approach. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 166-178.
39. Goff, P. A. (2013). A measure of justice: What policing racial bias research reveals. In F.C. Harris & R.C. Lieberman (Eds.), *Beyond Discrimination: Racial inequality in a post-racist era.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Press (pp. 157-185).
40. Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human: implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 94(2), 292.
41. Goff, P. A., Epstein, L. M., Mentovich, A., & Reddy, K. S. (2013). Illegitimacy is dangerous: How authorities experience and react to illegitimacy. *Psychology*, 4(3A), 340-344. doi:10.4236/psych.2013.43A049.
42. Goff, P. A., Epstein, L. M., & Reddy, K. S. (2013). Crossing the line of legitimacy: The impact of cross-deputization policy on crime reporting. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 19(2), 250.
43. Goff, P. A. & Godsil, R. (In Press). The moral ecology of policing: A mind science approach to race and policing in the United States. In B. Bradford, B. Jauregui, I. Loader, & J. Steinberg (Eds.), *Sage handbook of global policing.* Oxford, UK: Sage Publications.
44. 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.
45. Greenberg, J., & Folger, R. (1983). Procedural justice, participation, and the fair process effect in groups and organizations (pp. 235-256). New York, NY: Springer New York.
46. Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 74, 1464–1480.
47. Hardin, C. D., & Higgins, E. T. (1996). Shared reality: How social verification makes the subjective objective. In R.M. Sorrentino & E.T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition, vol. 3: The interpersonal context.* New York, NY: Guilford Press (pp. 28-84).
48. Hawkins, D. F., & Kempf-Leonard, K. (Eds.). (2010). *Our children, their children: Confronting racial and ethnic differences in American juvenile justice.* University of Chicago Press.
49. Heller, S. B. (2014). Summer jobs reduce violence among disadvantaged youth. *Science*, 346(6214), 1219-1223.

50. Hinds, L. (2007). *Building Police—Youth Relationships: The Importance of Procedural Justice*. *Youth Justice*, 7(3), 195-209.
51. Hough, M., Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Myhill, A., & Quinton, P. (2010). *Procedural justice, trust, and institutional legitimacy*. *Policing*, paq027.
52. Jackson J, Bradford B, Hough M, et al. (2011) *Developing European indicators of trust in justice*. *European Journal of Criminology* 8(5): 267–285.
53. Justice Database. (2015). Retrieved 2015, from <http://cpe.psych.ucla.edu/justice-database>
54. Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
55. Kennedy, D. (1998). *Pulling levers: Getting deterrence right*. *National Institute of Justice Journal*, 236, 2-8.
56. Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York, NY: Springer Science & Business Media.
57. Lipsky, M. (1979). *Street level bureaucracy* (Vol. 198, No. 1). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
58. Livingston, D. (1999). *Police reform and the department of justice: An essay on accountability*. *Buffalo Criminal Law Review*, Vol. 2, 815-857.
59. Martin, M. E. (1999). *From criminal justice to transformative justice: The challenges of social control for battered women*. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 2, 415-436.
60. Marx, D. M., & Goff, P. A. (2005). *Clearing the air: The effect of experimenter race on targets' test performance and subjective experience*. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 645-657.
61. Mazerolle, L., Antrobus, E., Bennett, S., & Tyler, T. R. (2013). *Shaping citizen perceptions of police legitimacy: A randomized field trial of procedural justice*. *Criminology*, 51(1), 33-63.
62. Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Antrobus, E., & Eggins, E. (2012). *Procedural justice, routine encounters and citizen perceptions of police: Main findings from the Queensland Community Engagement Trial (QCET)*. *Journal of experimental criminology*, 8(4), 343-367.
63. McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). *Research notes. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes*. *Academy of management Journal*, 35(3), 626-637.
64. Mendes, W. B., Blascovich, J., Lickel, B., & Hunter, S. (2002). *Challenge and threat during social interactions with White and Black men*. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(7), 939-952.
65. Mentovich, A., Rhee, E., & Tyler, T. R. (2014). *My life for a voice: The influence of voice on health-care decisions*. *Social Justice Research*, 27(1), 99-117.
66. Murphy, M., Steele, C., Gross, J. (2007). *Signaling threat: How situational cues affect women in math, science, and engineering settings*. *Psychological Science*, 18, 8790885.
67. Murphy, K., Tyler, T., Curtis, A. (2009). *Nurturing regulatory compliance: Is procedural justice effective when people question the legitimacy of the law?* *Regulation & Governance* 3: 1-26.
68. Nosek, B. A., Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2002). *Harvesting implicit group attitudes and beliefs from a demonstration website*. *Group Dynamics*, 6, 101-115.
69. O'Neill, J. L., & Cushing, M. A. (1991, September). *The impact of shift work on police officers*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
70. Oyserman, D., & Fryberg, S. A. (2006). *The possible selves of diverse adolescents: Content and function across gender, race, and national origin*. In C. Dunkel & J. Kerpelman (Eds.), *Possible selves: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 17–39). Huntington, NY: Nova.
71. Pew Research Center. (2015). *Divide between blacks and whites on police runs deep*. Washington, DC: Drake, Bruce. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/04/28/blacks-whites-police/>
72. Pratt, T. C., Cullen, F. T., Blevins, K. R., Daigle, L. E., & Madensen, T. D. (2006). *The empirical status of deterrence theory: A meta-analysis*. *Taking stock: The status of criminological theory*, 15, 367-396.
73. *President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*. (2015.) *Interim Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
74. *Police Foundation*. Retrieved from <http://www.policefoundation.org/>
75. Ramsey, D. (2015, August 7). *Tracking police violence a year after Ferguson*. *FiveThirtyEightPolitics*. Retrieved from <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/ferguson-michael-brown-measuring-police-killings/>
76. Rabe-Hemp, C., Schuck, A. (2007). *Violence against police officers: Are female officers at greater risk?* *Police Quarterly*, 10, (4), 411-428.

77. Reisig, M. D., & Lloyd, C. (2009). *Procedural justice, police legitimacy, and helping the police fight crime results from a survey of Jamaican adolescents*. *Police Quarterly*, 12(1), 42-62.
78. Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). *Negotiating interracial interactions: Costs, consequences, and possibilities*. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 316-320.
79. Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). *When prejudice does not pay effects of interracial contact on executive function*. *Psychological Science*, 14(3), 287-290.
80. Richeson, J. A., & Trawalter, S. (2008). *The threat of appearing prejudiced and race-based attentional biases*. *Psychological Science*, 19(2), 98-102.
81. Richeson, J. A., Trawalter, S., & Shelton, J. N. (2005). *African Americans' implicit racial attitudes and the depletion of executive function after interracial interactions*. *Social Cognition*, 23(4), 336-352.
82. Rosenfeld, R., Fornango, R., & Baumer, E. (2005). *Did Ceasefire, COMPSTAT, and Exile reduce homicide?\**. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 4(3), 419-449.
83. Ross, D. (2015, May, 17). *5 ways to jumpstart the release of open data on policing*. Retrieved from <http://www.codeforamerica.org/blog/2015/05/17/5-ways-to-jumpstart-the-release-of-open-data-on-policing/>
84. Sanchez, R. (2015, May 6). *Freddie Gray case: Actions that led to charges against six*. CNN. Retrieved July 20, 2015, from <http://www.cnn.com/2015/05/01/us/freddie-gray-officers-actions/>
85. Schuck, A. (2004). *The masking of racial and ethnic disparity in police use of physical force: The effects of gender and custody status*. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 32, pp. 557 – 564.
86. Sharkey, P. (2013). *Stuck in place: Urban neighborhoods and the end of progress toward racial equality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
87. Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2004). *Social Dominance Theory: A New Synthesis*. Psychology Press.
88. Sim, J. J., Correll, J., & Sadler, M. S. (2013). *Understanding Police and Expert Performance When Training Attenuates (vs. Exacerbates) Stereotypic Bias in the Decision to Shoot*. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 39(3), 291-304.
89. Smith, M., & Austin, R. (2015, May 18). *Launching the Police Data Initiative*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2015/05/18/launching-police-data-initiative>
90. Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (2006). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 2006 national report*. Office of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention.
91. Steele, C. M. (1988). *The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self*. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 21(2), 261-302.
92. Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). *Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 797.
93. Stephens, N. M., Fryberg, S. A., Markus, H. R., Johnson, C., & Covarrubias, R. (2012). *Unseen disadvantage: How American universities' focus on independence undermines the academic performance of first-generation college students*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102, 1178-1197.
94. Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). *The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing*. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 513-548.
95. Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. L. Erlbaum Associates.
96. Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1978). *A theory of procedure*. *California law review*, 541-566.
97. Thomas, J. C. (1986). *Between citizen and city: Neighborhood organizations and urban politics in Cincinnati*. Kansas, KS: University Press of Kansas.
98. Trinkner, R., Tyler, T.R., Goff, P.A. (Under review.) *Justice from within: How a procedurally just organizational climate in police departments shapes those institutions, their officers, and the community*.
99. Tyler, T. R. (2004). *Enhancing police legitimacy*. *The annals of the American academy of political and social science*, 593(1), 84-99.
100. Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
101. Tyler, T. R., Goff, P. A., & MacCoun, R. J. (2015). *The Impact of Psychological Science on Policing in the United States Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and Effective Law Enforcement*. *Psychological science in the public interest*, 16(3), 75-109.
102. Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. (2002). *Trust in the law: encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts through*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
103. Tyler, T., & Jackson, J. (2013). *Future challenges in the study of legitimacy and criminal justice*. *Yale Law School, Public Law Working Paper*, (264).
104. Tyler, T. R., Sherman, L., Strang, H., Barnes, G. C., & Woods, D. (2007). *Reintegrative Shaming, Procedural Justice, and Recidivism: The Engagement of Offenders' Psychological Mechanisms in the Canberra RISE Drinking-and-Driving Experiment*. *Law & Society Review*, 41(3), 553-586.

105. Vorauer, J. D., Main, K. J., & O'Connell, G. B. (1998). How do individuals expect to be viewed by members of lower status groups? Content and implications of meta-stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(4), 917.
106. Walker, S. (2001). *Police accountability: Current Issues and Research Needs*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
107. 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.
108. Weitzer, R. (2005). Can the police be reformed?. *contexts*, 4(3), 21-26.

# Appendix

## Glossary

**Stereotypes** are ideas, associations, or over-generalizations that connect group membership and traits about that group

**Prejudice** is the belief that a stereotype or over-generalization is true and/or you have a strong feeling about a particular group

**Discrimination** is the behavior, acting in line with the stereotype or prejudice; differential treatment based on group membership

**Racism** is a system of distributing power that privileges one/some racial groupings over others

**Bias** is the catch-all: an idea can be biased; a belief/feeling can be biased; a behavior can be biased

**Priming:** activating particular associations in memory just before carrying out an action or task

### IDENTITY TRAPS

**Identity traps** are situations that make one more vulnerable to behave in a biased manner. These behaviors are unrelated to the nature of one's character or conscious intentions and have negative outcomes. Two types of identity traps: fast and slow.

**Fast traps** lead to an over-reliance on implicit associations/biases

- **Implicit association** is an automatic association between two concepts (e.g., doctors and nurses, politicians and lies, Mets and failure, etc.)

- **Implicit racial biases** are usually automatic associations between groups and traits (e.g., Southerners and friendly, artists and passionate, and Philadelphia and classy, etc.) Importantly, implicit racial biases are usually not consciously accessible. If we find out that we have them, we may indeed reject them as inappropriate.

**Slow traps** are a negative response to identity threats (e.g. stereotype threat, authority threat)

**The three factors of a slow trap are:**

- Our identity is salient or important in a particular situation
- Our abilities to manage other people's perceptions of ourselves are low
- Failure to validate our identity could lead to negative consequences.

**Situations that lead to fast & slow traps:**

- Being mentally taxed
- In a bad mood
- Feeling threatened
- Being a novice
- Making quick decisions
- Multitasking

**Defusing Traps: Intervention Strategies**

- Awareness
- Practice procedural justice
- Stereotype Replacement
- Accountability

- Be mindful of stereotypes
  - Actively locate counter-stereotypes
  - See the individual
- Increase opportunities for interactions with other races, cultures, ethnicities, etc.
  - What groups of people are you the least exposed to?
  - How can you find ways to meaningfully interact with those groups that is mutually beneficial?

### **IDENTITY THREATS**

**Stereotype threat** is the sense of threat that can arise when one knows that he or she can possibly be judged or treated negatively on the basis of a negative stereotype about one's group. **They are most likely to emerge when:**

- Aware stereotype exists
- Think others are applying/evaluating in terms of stereotype
- Care about domain in question (part of social identity)

**Authority threat** is the perception that one's identity as an authority figure is not respected or is negatively perceived

### **Types of Authority**

*French, J. R., Raven, B., & Cartwright, D. (1959). The bases of social power. Classics of organization theory, 311-320.*

<http://quickbase.intuit.com/blog/the-5-types-of-power-revisited>

**Legitimate:** a person has been given formal authority to make demands and expects obedience from others (i.e. CEO, police officer)

**Referent:** a person is strongly liked and admired by others and often exerts a charming influence. A celebrity has referent power. Senior officer, well liked officer.

**Reward:** a person is able to compensate another – financially or otherwise – for complying with his/her demands. A parent has reward power over his children.

**Expert:** a person has the knowledge and skills to outperform others; her good judgment is respected and relied upon. A specialist physician has expert power.

**Coercive:** a person achieves compliance from others through the threat of punishment. A military dictator has coercive power.

# Appendix

## Suggested Handouts

- Fast Traps: Small Group Exercise
- Slow Traps: Small Group Exercise
- Micropopulation Scenario Exercises
  - Population: Non-White Youth
  - Population: White Youth
  - Population: Latinx
  - Population: Lesbian, Gay & Bisexual
  - Population: Transgender & Gender Non-Conforming
  - Population: Domestic Violence/Sexual Assault Survivors
  - Population: Muslims
  - Population: Police

## Fast Traps: Small Group Exercise

**Fast traps** lead to an over-reliance on implicit associations/biases.

*Example:*

In a fast trap, there are situational factors that can cause you to jump from the idea (stereotype) to a behavior (discrimination) whether you believe it or not.

For example, consider the previous stereotype of women as being bad at math. Imagine it's tax season, you're stressed and late in filing, you walk into HR Block. There's a man and woman available to help, you choose the man.

- Stereotype is the *idea* (e.g. Women are bad at math.)
- Prejudice is the *belief* (e.g. I actually think women are bad at math.)
- Discrimination is when you *act* on that belief (e.g. I don't hire female accountants because I don't think they're good at math.)

**Reflect on or imagine an experience where your behavior may have been guided by implicit bias.**

1. Identify the underlying stereotypes

2. How did your behavior change?

3. What were the situational influences?

4. How did it impact you? The other person?

## Slow Traps: Small Group Exercise

**Slow traps** are threats to one's identity that can lead to changed behavior.

*Example:*

*"When I was in the police academy, there were only three female recruits in my class. When it came to weight training I often pushed myself to try to lift more than I was ready for. Being one of the women in the room, I felt like I had something to prove. One day, during training, I lifted too much and ended up seriously injuring myself. I had to postpone the test over a year."*

**Three factors of a slow trap:**

- Our Identity is salient or important in a particular situation
- Our abilities to manage other people's perceptions of ourselves are low
- Failure to validate our identity could lead to negative consequences

**1. Choose an aspect of your identity that is really important to you (e.g. mother, Muslim, masculine, etc.)**

**2. Imagine a situation where that identity is being evaluated negatively (e.g. someone implies you're a bad mom). What is that scenario?**

**3. How might that impact your thoughts or behavior?**

## Micropopulation Scenario Exercise

### Population: Non-White Youth

**Stereotypes:** Loud, dangerous, aggressive, culpable

**Things to Know:**

- Black children are perceived as older and more culpable than their actual age and more culpable than their white and Latino/ a counterparts. Black children are 18 times more likely than white children to be sentenced as adults and represent 58% of children sentenced to adult facilities.
- Age and culpability perceptions of teenagers are likely to impact police intervention in regular teenage activities.
- This may result in policing of adolescent behaviors that are not criminal but affiliated with negative stereotypes.

**The Scenario:**

Situation: Officers respond to a noise complaint reported by neighbors. When they show up, ten black teenagers are having a party.

	<b>Perspective of Law Enforcement</b>	<b>Perspective of Civilians</b>	<b>Perspective of Bystanders</b>
<b>What are the underlying stereotypes for each group?</b>			
<b>How might those stereotypes influence behavior for each?</b>			
<b>What are the situational factors that could influence this interaction negatively?</b>			
<b>What strategies for each group could help guide this engagement?</b>			

## **Micropopulation Scenario Exercise**

### **Population: White Youth**

**Stereotypes:** Innocent, good, seen as individuals

**Things to Know:**

- White and Latinx children are seen as more innocent than black children of the same age. White children are 18 times less likely than black children to be sentenced as adults.
- Perceptions of age and culpability of teenagers are likely to impact police intervention in regular teenage activities.
- One study found that probation officers were more likely to attribute black youths' delinquency to negative attitudes and personality traits and white youths' delinquency to social environments.

**The Scenario:**

Situation: Officers respond to a noise complaint reported by neighbors. When they show up, ten white teenagers are having a party.

	Perspective of Law Enforcement	Perspective of Civilians	Perspective of Bystanders
What are the underlying stereotypes for each group?			
How might those stereotypes influence behavior for each?			
What are the situational factors that could influence this interaction negatively?			
What strategies for each group could help guide this engagement?			

## Micropopulation Scenario Exercise

### Population: Latinx

**Stereotypes:** Lazy; Poorly educated; Criminal

**Things to Know:**

- Public views of immigration in America seem to be correlated with perceptions and stereotypes of Latino populations specifically
- If you are Latino, you are stereotyped as an immigrant
- Perceived cultural threats inform public opinion on immigration - major in group/out group

**The Scenario:**

Neighbors call about what sounds like a domestic dispute occurring next door. Officers respond to the scene and a couple is arguing on the front lawn. The woman present only speaks Spanish and the man speaks some English.

	<b>Perspective of Law Enforcement</b>	<b>Perspective of Civilians</b>	<b>Perspective of Bystanders</b>
<b>What are the underlying stereotypes for each group?</b>			
<b>How might those stereotypes influence behavior for each?</b>			
<b>What are the situational factors that could influence this interaction negatively?</b>			
<b>What strategies for each group could help guide this engagement?</b>			

## Micropopulation Scenario Exercise

### Population: Lesbian, Gay & Bisexual

**Stereotypes:** Breaking rules; Don't need to be protected; Abnormal

**Things to Know:**

- In some cities it is estimated that LGBT people make up to 40% of the homeless youth population
- Attention in police reports is often focused on sexual orientation and not the crime
- Stereotypes about gender and perceived gender roles influence how LGBT individuals are treated
- Often they are seen as breaking gender norms and historically have been policed for such

**The Scenario:**

Officers respond to a dispute at a homeless shelter. One young male is accused of harassing and soliciting sex from two other young males. A third party notes that the first young male is gay and has been bullied several times at the shelter.

	<b>Perspective of Law Enforcement</b>	<b>Perspective of Civilians</b>	<b>Perspective of Bystanders</b>
<b>What are the underlying stereotypes for each group?</b>			
<b>How might those stereotypes influence behavior for each?</b>			
<b>What are the situational factors that could influence this interaction negatively?</b>			
<b>What strategies for each group could help guide this engagement?</b>			

## **Micropopulation Scenario Exercise**

### **Population: Transgender & Gender Non-Conforming**

**Stereotypes:** Abnormal; Wrong; Sexualized

**Things to Know:**

- Stereotypes regarding trans people result in prejudicial and subjective reasoning to police trans people and criminalize them, often with sex worker crimes that are unfounded
- In a U.S. survey conducted by the National Center for Transgender Equality, 90% of transgender respondents reported harassment or discrimination at work, 19% reported being refused a home or apartment because of their gender identity, 53% reported harassment in public, and 19% reported being refused health care because of their gender identity.

**The Scenario:**

Officers respond to a sexual assault. The survivor self-identifies as a trans woman of color.

 Center for POLICING EQUITY	Perspective of Law Enforcement	Perspective of Civilians	Perspective of Bystanders
What are the underlying stereotypes for each group?			
How might those stereotypes influence behavior for each?			
What are the situational factors that could influence this interaction negatively?			
What strategies for each group could help guide this engagement?			

## Micropopulation Scenario Exercise

### Population: Domestic Violence/Sexual Assault Survivors

**Stereotypes:** only survivor is small female, sober, scared; only perpetrator is large, barbaric male

**Things to Know:**

- US DOJ Office on Violence Against Women says going to a room, a bar, drinking, consenting to some sexual activity, knowing the person are not assumptions of risk and rape is not the responsibility of the survivor
- In lesbian relationships, the more stereotypically feminine one looks the less likely they are to be perceived as culpable (i.e. if she is more stereotypically masculine, it means she is less likely to be perceived as a victim)

**The Scenario:**

Officers respond to a call from a young woman calls who reports that she was raped at a party the night before.

	<b>Perspective of Law Enforcement</b>	<b>Perspective of Civilians</b>	<b>Perspective of Bystanders</b>
<b>What are the underlying stereotypes for each group?</b>			
<b>How might those stereotypes influence behavior for each?</b>			
<b>What are the situational factors that could influence this interaction negatively?</b>			
<b>What strategies for each group could help guide this engagement?</b>			

## **Micropopulation Scenario Exercise**

### **Population: Muslims**

**Stereotypes:** terrorists, anti-American, foreign, anti-woman, religion based on violence

**Things to Know:**

- Hate crimes against Muslims went up 64% from 2014 to 2015, a total of 254 reported events
- In 2015, there were 78 recorded incidents in which mosques were targeted.

**The Scenario:**

Officers respond to a call of suspicious activity outside of the courthouse. When they arrive, there are three women in burkas standing near the entrance of the courthouse.

	<b>Perspective of Law Enforcement</b>	<b>Perspective of Civilians</b>	<b>Perspective of Bystanders</b>
<b>What are the underlying stereotypes for each group?</b>			
<b>How might those stereotypes influence behavior for each?</b>			
<b>What are the situational factors that could influence this interaction negatively?</b>			
<b>What strategies for each group could help guide this engagement?</b>			

## Micropopulation Scenario Exercise

### Population: Police

**Stereotypes:** violent, abusive, not trustworthy

**Things to Know:**

- A recent community poll found that non-white racial groups identified the most critical issues in policing to be under-policing and abusive policing.
- A 2016 study found that 68% of white respondents have a favorable view of police, while 40% of black respondents and 59% of Latinx respondents have a favorable view.
- The same study found that no racial group wished to reduce the number of police officers in communities; in fact, 90% entirely opposed reducing the number.

**The Scenario:**

Situation: You are driving in your neighborhood in the evening and you see three police cars with their lights on parked behind one stopped vehicle. The driver of the stopped vehicle is getting out of their car.

	<b>Perspective of Law Enforcement</b>	<b>Perspective of Civilian Involved</b>	<b>Perspective of Bystanders</b>
<b>What are the underlying stereotypes for each group?</b>			
<b>How might those stereotypes influence behavior for each?</b>			
<b>What are the situational factors that could influence this interaction negatively?</b>			
<b>What strategies for each group could help guide this engagement?</b>			

# Appendix

## Recommended Readings

### Books:

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. The New Press.

### Articles & Abstracts:

Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the implicit association test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 85(2), 197.

In reporting Implicit Association Test (IAT) results, researchers have most often used scoring conventions described in the first publication of the IAT (A. G. Greenwald, D. E. McGhee, & J. L. K. Schwartz, 1998). Demonstration IATs available on the Internet have produced large data sets that were used in the current article to evaluate alternative scoring procedures. Candidate new algorithms were examined in terms of their (a) correlations with parallel self-report measures, (b) resistance to an artifact associated with speed of responding, (c) internal consistency, (d) sensitivity to known influences on IAT measures, and (e) resistance to known procedural influences. The best-performing measure incorporates data from the IAT's practice trials, uses a metric that is calibrated by each respondent's latency variability, and includes a latency penalty for errors. This new algorithm strongly outperforms the earlier (conventional) procedure. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2012 APA, all rights reserved)

Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V. J., & Davies, P. G. (2004). Seeing black: race, crime, and visual processing. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 87(6), 876.

Using police officers and undergraduates as participants, the authors investigated the influence of stereotypic associations on visual processing in 5 studies. Study 1 demonstrates that Black faces influence participants' ability to spontaneously detect

degraded images of crime-relevant objects. Conversely, Studies 2-4 demonstrate that activating abstract concepts (i.e., crime and basketball) induces attentional biases toward Black male faces. Moreover, these processing biases may be related to the degree to which a social group member is physically representative of the social group (Studies 4-5). These studies, taken together, suggest that some associations between social groups and concepts are bidirectional and operate as visual tuning devices--producing shifts in perception and attention of a sort likely to influence decision making and behavior. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2012 APA, all rights reserved)

Bergsieker, H. B., Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). To be liked versus respected: Divergent goals in interracial interactions. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 99(2), 248.

Pervasive representations of Blacks and Latinos as unintelligent and of Whites as racist may give rise to divergent impression management goals in interracial interactions. We present studies showing that in interracial interactions racial minorities seek to be respected and seen as competent more than Whites do, whereas Whites seek to be liked and seen as moral more than racial minorities do. These divergent impression management goals are reflected in Whites' and racial minorities' self-report responses (Studies 1a, 1b, 2, and 4) and behaviors (Studies 3a and 3b). Divergent goals are observed in pre-existing relationships (Study 2), as well as in live interactions (Studies 3a, 3b, and 4), and are associated with higher levels of negative other-directed affect (Study 4). Implications of these goals for interracial communication and misunderstandings are discussed. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2012 APA, all rights reserved)

Ambady, N., Shih, M., Kim, A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2001). Stereotype susceptibility in children: Effects of identity activation on quantitative performance. *Psychological science*, 12(5), 385-390.

A growing body of research indicates that the activation of negative stereotypes can impede cognitive performance in adults, whereas positive stereotypes can facilitate cognitive performance. In two studies, we examined the effects of positive and negative stereotypes on the cognitive performance of children in three age groups: lower elementary school, upper elementary school, and middle school. Very young children in the lower elementary grades (kindergarten-grade 2) and older children in the middle school grades (grades 6-8) showed shifts in performance associated with the activation of positive and negative stereotypes; these shifts were consistent with

patterns previously reported for adults. The subtle activation of negative stereotypes significantly impeded performance, whereas the subtle activation of positive stereotypes significantly facilitated performance. Markedly different effects were found for children in the upper elementary grades (grades 3–5). These results suggest that the development of stereotype susceptibility is a critical domain for understanding the connection between stereotypes and individual behavior.

Nix, J., Wolfe, S. E., Rojek, J., & Kaminski, R. J. (2015). Trust in the police the influence of procedural justice and perceived collective efficacy. *Crime & delinquency*, 61(4), 610-640.

Tyler's process-based model of policing suggests that the police can enhance their perceived legitimacy and trustworthiness in the eyes of the public when they exercise their authority in a procedurally fair manner. To date, most process-based research has focused on the sources of legitimacy while largely overlooking trust in the police. The present study extends this line of literature by examining the sources of trust in the police. In particular, emerging research has revealed that neighborhood context influences attitudes toward the police but much less attention has been given to exploring the role individuals' perceptions of their neighborhood play in shaping such evaluations. Therefore, the present study considers whether individuals' perceptions of collective efficacy serve as a social-psychological cognitive orientation that influences levels of trust in the police. Using data from a recently conducted mail survey of a random sample of 1,681 residents from a metropolitan city, we find that procedural justice evaluations are a primary source of trust in the police. At the same time, however, level of perceived collective efficacy is positively associated with trust even after accounting for procedural justice. The findings suggest that police procedural fairness is vitally important to establishing trust from the public but peoples' cognitive orientation toward their neighborhood context partially shapes the level of trustworthiness they afford to the police.

Glick, P., Gangl, C., Gibb, S., Klumpner, S., & Weinberg, E. (2007). Defensive reactions to masculinity threat: More negative affect toward effeminate (but not masculine) gay men. *Sex Roles*, 57(1-2), 55-59.

We examined whether, due to men's desire to reject stereotypically feminine traits in themselves, a masculinity threat would elicit negative affect toward effeminate, but not masculine gay men. Fifty-three male undergraduates from the United States received bogus feedback that they had either a "masculine" or "feminine" personality before rating affect toward two "types" of gay men: effeminate and

masculine. Results were consistent with the notion that defensive reactions target groups stereotyped as having the specific traits perceivers wish to deny in themselves: masculinity threat selectively increased negative affect toward effeminate, but not masculine, gay men. Thus, gay men who exhibit feminine traits may be at particular risk from men whose masculinity is threatened.

Goff, P. A., Di Leone, B. A. L., & Kahn, K. B. (2012). Racism leads to pushups: How racial discrimination threatens subordinate men's masculinity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(5), 1111-1116.

Two studies explored the gendered nature of racial discrimination for Black men, focusing on the relationship between race, discrimination, and masculinity threat. Specifically, we hypothesized that racial discrimination may also represent a threat to Black, but not White, men's masculinity. Both studies examined the target's perspective (i.e. Black and White men's perspectives) on the experience of racism and threat. Black men who experienced discrimination reported greater endorsement of male gender norms and were more vigilant to masculinity threat cues than were those who did not experience discrimination. Additionally, Black men engaged in masculine-typed behaviors—for our purposes, completing more pushups—in proportion to their experience of masculinity threat. Conversely, White men disengaged from the pushup task after experiencing discrimination. Study 2 suggests that White men's disengagement is mediated by affirming their social status. Our data suggest the importance of considering the gendered consequences of racial discrimination toward subordinate-group men.

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(1), 91.

Four studies investigate the role that stereotype threat plays in producing racial distancing behavior in an anticipated conversation paradigm. It was hypothesized that the threat of appearing racist may have the ironic effect of causing Whites to distance themselves from Black conversation partners. In Study 1, participants distanced themselves more from Black partners under conditions of threat, and this distance correlated with the activation of a "White racist" stereotype. In Study 2, it was demonstrated that Whites' interracial distancing behavior was not predicted by explicit or implicit prejudice. Study 3 provides evidence that conceiving of interracial interactions as opportunities to learn may attenuate the negative consequences of threat for Whites. Study 4 found that Whites have conscious access to their

experience of stereotype threat and that this awareness may mediate the relationship between threat and distance. These results are discussed within a broader discourse of racial distancing and the possibility that certain identity threats may be as important as prejudice in determining the outcomes of interracial interactions. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2014 APA, all rights reserved)

Najdowski, C. J., Bottoms, B. L., & Goff, P. A. (2015). Stereotype threat and racial differences in citizens' experiences of police encounters. *Law and human behavior*, 39(5), 463.

We conducted 2 studies to investigate how cultural stereotypes that depict Blacks as criminals affect the way Blacks experience encounters with police officers, expecting that such encounters induce Blacks to feel stereotype threat (i.e., concern about being judged and treated unfairly by police because of the stereotype). In Study 1, we asked Black and White participants to report how they feel when interacting with police officers in general. As predicted, Blacks, but not Whites, reported concern that police officers stereotype them as criminals simply because of their race. In addition, this effect was found for Black men but not Black women. In Study 2, we asked Black and White men to imagine a specific police encounter and assessed potential downstream consequences of stereotype threat. Consistent with Study 1, Black but not White men anticipated feeling stereotype threat in the hypothetical police encounter. Further, racial differences in anticipated threat translated into racial differences in anticipated anxiety, self-regulatory efforts, and behavior that is commonly perceived as suspicious by police officers. By demonstrating that Blacks might expect to be judged and treated unfairly by police because of the negative stereotype of Black criminality, this research extends stereotype threat theory to the new domain of criminal justice encounters. It also has practical implications for understanding how the stereotype could ironically contribute to bias-based policing and racial disparities in the justice system. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2016 APA, all rights reserved)

Kang, J., Bennett, M., Carbado, D., & Casey, P. (2011). Implicit bias in the courtroom. *UCLA L. Rev.*, 59, 1124.

Given the substantial and growing scientific literature on implicit bias, the time has now come to confront a critical question: What, if anything, should we do about implicit bias in the courtroom? The author team comprises legal academics, scientists, researchers, and even a sitting federal judge who seek to answer this question in accordance with behavioral realism. The Article first provides a succinct

scientific introduction to implicit bias, with some important theoretical clarifications that distinguish between explicit, implicit, and structural forms of bias. Next, the Article applies the science to two trajectories of bias relevant to the courtroom. One story follows a criminal defendant path; the other story follows a civil employment discrimination path. This application involves not only a focused scientific review but also a step-by-step examination of how criminal and civil trials proceed. Finally, the Article examines various concrete intervention strategies to counter implicit biases for key players in the justice system, such as the judge and jury.

# Appendix

## Facilitation Tips and Guidelines

### Ground Rules

- Respect each other's confidentiality. What is said in this room stays in this room.
- Take care of yourself.
- Share only to the degree that is comfortable for you.
- Use "I" statements and speak from your own experiences— I think and I believe lead to opinions and beliefs are not I statements
- No cross talk or side-conversations while others are speaking
- Raise your hand every time you wish to speak (optional depending on group size and if the group facilitator feels it is helpful or necessary.)
- Do not criticize another individual, their experience, their statements or decisions.
- This is a substance-free environment.

Ground Rules should be discussed at the very beginning. If all of our expectations are upfront, it is less likely that unexpected problems will occur.

A goal of the group is to have participants speak from their own experiences rather than share their thoughts or opinions. The process is designed to promote personal stories and experiences. Our tendency as human beings is to comment on the expression of others. These comments are usually based on whether we agree with the thoughts or not. This conflict will work against the free expression of thoughts

and ideas. Facilitators should discourage "voting" on the validity of the experiences and thoughts of another individual. When an individual feels they will be judged upon the thoughts and feelings they express, they are likely to edit what they will say. These groups should foster a safe environment where people can express themselves without being judged by other participants.

### Our Role as A Facilitator

As a facilitator you will have the responsibility to conduct different types of meetings for various community members. Your role will be to use your knowledge and skills as a means to promote honest and open discussions among the participants. The goal is to facilitate dialogue and reflection among the participants to help them stay safe and build stronger community among one another.

According to the American Heritage Dictionary, facilitation is "the act of making easy or easier." Facilitation is different from public speaking, lecturing, advising, debating, teaching or other forms of communication in different ways:

A facilitator is a moderator. Your role is to keep the dialogue focuses, organized, respectful and dynamic. However, you should not dominate the conversation, give speeches, provide personal advice to force particular viewpoints on the group.

A facilitator models behavior and uses his or her experience to enrich the discussion and provide more depth to the conversation. You should not focus on meeting your own personal needs and obtaining your own therapy.

Facilitators use their skills to bring out topics and help participants disclose information about some of the most intimate aspects of their lives. You should not embarrass the participants by forcing upon them questions that they don't want to answer.

The need to have both structure and flexibility make facilitation a bit of a balancing act. On the one hand you need to promote a dialogue that is open, engaging, interesting, and useful. Yet, on the other hand, you have the power and responsibility to keep the discussion focused, structured and within certain time constraints. This is sometimes called “walking a tightrope.”

In other words, you have to maintain a careful balance between wanting to bring about rich and meaningful discussion, and watching the time. You’re going to strike a thousand compromises every time you lead a meeting, and each time you’ll gain confidence and be able to do it better. There are times when the participants could go on talking for another three hours about a particular subject. Hopefully, they will continue this dialogue after their meeting. In the meantime, you need to heed your watch and keep the meeting moving so that you can meet other objectives. In our meetings, successful facilitation will allow participants to learn from their own experiences and from the experiences of others in the room. The combination of good facilitation and the participants’ own knowledge and experience will have a powerful role in bringing about change in individuals and groups. In this section and in the training, we provide tips and general skills that will help you become a facilitator.

No one is born a facilitator. Facilitation is a learned skill that is developed through practice. So, no matter how much we tell you here, you will find that certain things work better for you than others, depending on your individual style. Use the strategies presented here, which are the result of the collective experience of many of the facilitators who have preceded you as conversation group facilitators, as guidelines to develop your own facilitation style.

### Qualities of a Good Facilitator

The qualities of a good facilitator are:

- Utilizing good listening skills

- Asking effective questions
- Utilizing feedback techniques

R-E-S-P-E-C-T! Respect the participants in your discussion group enough to know that they will make the best decision that they possibly can, for their situation, whether you think it is the best decision or not. Black, white, orange or purple. This is difficult for all of us, but it is especially important for us to remember that **these issues are not black and white**. Most things aren’t even gray! There are many ways to solve problems and what is right for one person is almost certainly not going to be right for the next person. Each person needs to be able to handle their particular situation in their own way.

### Introduction and Rapport

When a new group begins or when a new participant joins your group, it is important that these new members feel safe enough with the group to discuss what is on his or her mind. Remember, people coming to groups need to talk about very intimate subjects they probably don’t normally discuss. Building trust to invite disclosure is necessary.

How? Build trust by being trustworthy. Give the group your exclusive attention, and listen instead of talking. Encourage the group to talk by using a few words that invite many in return. Your few words are called “door openers.” Door openers can be either implicit or explicit.

### Implicit Door Openers:

“I see”

“Really”

“Oh”

“You don’t say”

“How about that”

“You did, huh”

“Interesting”

“Is that so”

“Mm Hmmmmmmmm”

“This seems like something important to you”

### **Explicit Door Openers**

“Tell me more about (it).”

“I’d like to hear more about it.”

“I’d be interested in your point of view”

“Let’s hear what you have to say”

“Go ahead, I’m listening”

Invite disclosure by self-disclosure. But use self-disclosure very judiciously. This technique makes you less of a stranger to the group because now you’ve agreed on something in common. Self-disclosure can be as basic as, “You’re 32? So am I.” It can also be a personal and intimate as, “Yes, I remember an experience of discrimination. I didn’t know how to respond, either.”

### **Necessary Facilitator Skills**

#### ***Responding***

A number of years ago researchers began an investigation in search of the “common thread” in a number of therapy systems. Over the past years they discovered that when certain conditions were present in the therapist, their clients improved. Likewise, when these conditions were absent the clients deteriorated. Further research confirmed that these “Core” conditions significantly influenced the emotional and cognitive growth of clients. These core conditions are: Empathy, Respect, Warmth, Genuineness, Self-Disclosure, Concreteness, Confrontation, and Immediacy of the Relationship.

In addition to the communication skills discussed earlier, the helper first has to establish a firm foundation to the group with empathy, respect and warmth. It is important to refrain from making judgements about the speaker.. As the base develops, the group begins to feel free to engage in self-exploration and genuineness. Directions for change emerge as the group continues to develop. Finally, the facilitators need to assist in developing plans of action. These plans not only help solve any immediate problems, but also provide a direction for attacking future problems. This then is the process of the helping relationship. This outline now examines each of the core conditions in detail.

### **Communication Empathy**

Empathy has been described as “putting oneself in the shoes of another” and “seeing through the eyes of another.” It is the most important condition in the helping process. A facilitator needs to understand participants before he/he can be helpful. This does not mean that the facilitator needs to have a personal relationship with each participant, however, it is essential that the facilitator recognize that each participant is an individual with unique goals, beliefs, coping mechanisms, backgrounds, etc.

Communicating empathy is a technique that can be displayed in the following manner:

Listen carefully to what the participants say and feel about what is happening by using the communication skills discussed earlier.

Think of words that describe the participant's feeling and current situation.

Use those words to demonstrate that their feelings and situations are understood. This can be done by using the participant's words (restraining), or elaborating on them and using one's own words (paraphrasing).

Check with the speaker to ensure that one's restating, paraphrasing and reflecting accurately describe their thoughts and feelings.

Once the problem is out in the open, condense all of what the participant has said about their problem into a summary statement. Check to see if the summary is accurate and make any corrections if necessary.

### Communicating Respect

Having respect for participants is having faith that he/she can cope with and solve his/her own problem. Respect develops as the facilitator becomes aware of each participant's uniqueness and special coping talents. The facilitator can convey respect for the participants by the following:

- Having good attending behavior (paying attention)
- Maintaining a belief that each participant is coping as effectively as possible considering his/her present situation and considering the skills he/she possesses.
- Maintaining the belief that each participant can help him/herself' facilitators demonstrate this by not making suggestions until participants have attempted it on their own.

### Communicating Warmth

Warmth is caring and concern for another person. It is closely tied to empathy and respect in that people are about others whom they know (understand) and believe in (respect). Warmth is communicated primarily through non-verbal means. These include:

- Effective attending behaviors
- A high level of alertness Focusing all of one's attention on the participant, rather than what's happening in the room
- A voice tone that is placed moderately slow and lower in pitch

### Concreteness

Responding with empathy, respect and warmth helps to make the participants relax and feel comfortable talking about their concerns. This foundation allows them to explore themselves. In order to facilitate the process of self-exploration, genuineness and self-disclosure, facilitators must display an ability to confront participants at appropriate times with his or her perceptions of the situation.

Responding with concreteness facilitates the group's ability to pinpoint and accurately label their feelings and experiences. This promotes clarification of the problem and encourages greater self-exploration. Many times a group participant will make a broad generalization like "Nobody likes me."

The helper, in asking for greater concreteness may ask, "Who doesn't like you?" requesting specific examples. Perhaps the participant was recently rejected by one or two of his or her peers. The goal of concreteness is to reduce generalizations to the actual events that led the person to make the generalization. At that point, the participant and the facilitator can re-examine what happened and see if that generalization is appropriate. Thus, the facilitator might ask, "Just because those two people rejected you, does that mean nobody likes you?"

Techniques that facilitate concreteness include:

- Being more specific. Talk in objective terms rather than abstract generalizations.
- Respond with clear, concise, detailed statements regarding the problem.

### Perceiving Feelings

Along with restating participant's words, it is important that the facilitator identifies and labels the participant's feelings for him or herself, not for the participant. Decide how the person feels and then think of words that best express those feelings. This is called **reflecting**.

- Identify the general mood category (i.e. positive or negative) Identify the specific kind of feeling (i.e. happy, fearful, elated, anxious, depressed, angry, etc.)
- Decide on the intensity level of the feeling (i.e. high, moderate, low).
- Select a word that is equivalent to the feeling words used by the participant.
- Say the word that best labels the participant's emotions.

The facilitator reflects back to the participant the feelings he/she perceives and asks if those words adequately label the participant's emotions.

### Shy Participants

Engaging participants who are shy is a difficult task. Since it is even more important that these people feel safe before they begin to disclose, it is important that facilitators and participants respect their right to remain silent until they wish to engage in discussion. Facilitators may need to defend these shy participants from other participants who may genuinely want to encourage them to joining the

discussion. It is best to allow the shy participant to participate at their own pace, while gently encouraging him or her occasionally. Never call attention to the shy participant in the hopes of embarrassing him or her into participating.

### Active Listening

Listening is very different from hearing. When we hear, the information may flow through our ears without really registering in the brain. Listening has at least four different stages: hearing, filtering, interpreting, and recalling.

When we listen, we first hear the voice of the person addressing us. We then filter the sound of their voice among other environmental sounds. We interpret the message from the words that we hear the tone and inflection of the voice, as well as the person's facial expressions and body movement. We are then able to register the message and recall it later in the conversation.

By listening carefully, we may learn a lot about the person's ideas, motivations, feelings and emotions, as well as logic and ways of reasoning. We can then respond in different ways, either with a straight answer, or by seeking clarification through questions or other techniques to facilitate clearer communication. A few of the techniques available are the following:

### **Paraphrasing and Reframing**

Sometimes feelings don't make sense to us until we state them, and even as we state them they may still be muddled. Reframing a participant's statement helps them understand what they're going through. This means basically acting as a mirror that reflects back to the person our interpretation of the message: what you heard them saying, but in your own words. For example: "I hear you say that you're pretty angry at yourself for slipping...is that right?" Phrases such as "I hear you say," "it sounds like you are," "it seems like," or "I feel you are" may help you paraphrase

someone's thoughts in order to obtain more information, explore the feelings behind the statement, or simply fully understand what the person is saying.

### Validating

Using phrases such as "It sounds like a difficult situation," or "that happens to many people" may validate the participants' experience and open up the possibility of addressing the feelings associated to specific situations. If you speak to the participants' feelings, and point them out, you can encourage a much more meaningful discussion, and help bring about more dialogue between participants. Sometimes all you need to do is use simpler phrases such as "interesting question," "thanks for taking the risk," and "good point."

*"The main thing you will be doing is balancing the needs of the individual against the needs of the group. This requires that you promote diversity as to avoid unintentionally isolating group members. It also requires that you pay attention to the individual members and their cues. You will want to validate at least some of what each group members says or seems to be experiencing, if possible."* –Brian Casey

### Maintaining Eye Contact and Observing Body Language

Note people's body language and expressions. They will help let you know when someone is disinterested, shy, anxious, domineering, bored, angry or open to the discussion. Eye contact will be useful as a way of indicating support.

### Guidelines for Active Listening

Listening is a process of helping communication. Not a lecture.

The facilitator's attitude should be one of caring and acceptance.

Listen to the participant's concerns and help them to describe all facets of it.

Let the participants know that they are important and that you take their concerns seriously.

Assist the participants in dividing their concerns into parts.

Ask the participants to restate their concerns in order to clarify them.

Let the participants know when you hear a change in voice, tone or mood.

Let the participants know when conflicting or contrasting information is detected.

Find out how the participants have handled similar or dissimilar problems in the past.

Avoid asking close-ended questions with predetermined answers.

Most importantly: KNOW THYSELF! Know your limits as well as your strengths, and be honest with yourself. You are human and can't do or know everything.

### Communication- Listening to Others

**WANT TO LISTEN-** Almost all problems in listening can be overcome by having the right attitude. Remember, there is no such things as uninteresting people- only disinterested facilitators.

**ACT LIKE A GOOD LISTENER-** Be alert, sit straight, lean forward if appropriate, let your attitude radiate interest.

**LISTEN TO UNDERSTAND-** Do not just listen for the sake of listening. Listen to gain a real understanding of what is being said.

**STOP TALKING-** You can't listen while you're talking. Communicate; do not take turns talking. Contrary to popular social belief, effective communication is talking and listening, not talking and waiting.

**EMPATHIZE WITH THE PARTICIPANTS-** Try to put yourself in the other's place so that you can see their point of view.

**ASK QUESTIONS-** When you don't understand, when you need further clarification, when you want to show you are listening; but don't ask questions that will embarrass or "put down" the other person.

**CONCENTRATE ON WHAT THE PARTICIPANTS ARE SAYING-** Actively focus your attention on the words, the ideas and the feelings **related** to the subject.

**REACT TO IDEAS, NOT TO THE PERSON-** Don't allow your reactions to the person to influence your interpretation of the words.

Here are a few more tips that, combines with active listening techniques, will foster communication in the meetings:

- If you don't understand what someone has said, don't assume that you know what they mean. Check out what you think you understood.
- Don't leave someone hanging after they talk. If there is dead silence, let the silence go on for longer than you would in polite, everyday conversation. Then you may decide to acknowledge what the speaker has said, or ask him more about it, and encourage others to participate in the discussion. "I know what you mean. Has anyone else felt this way?"
- Don't consistently point out someone who is not talking, but instead, invite them to participate once in awhile. Many people will sit through the meeting almost totally quiet, but will be getting a lot out of it all the same. Feel free to check in with them. "You look like you have some thoughts about that." Or, maybe, "You're being very quiet... are you comfortable with the discussion?"
- Ask open-ended questions. Close-ended questions evoke a yes or no response, and the discussion will stop there or turn into a poll. These include, "Do you practice safe sex?" "Did you enjoy the meeting?" Open ended questions include

"in what ways do you practice safe sex?" "Why is it hard to practice safe sex?" "What did you get out of the meeting?" Also, prompt for more detail by simply asking people to give you more information... "Tell us about that..." or "Could you elaborate some more?"

We have different styles in establishing the flow of the conversation. If you are not used to using these specific techniques, try them out so that it becomes easy, and then decide how much is appropriate for you. Be aware that you want participants to speak to each other, not just to you; if you use active listening techniques too much they might begin looking to you for all the answers. "Push back" the flow of conversation to the group itself, and encourage them to speak to each other as much as possible.

### Summing Up and Moving On

Between sections, it is **very important** to sum up what was just said. Don't move on without making some sense of what was said and leading into the next section. You should let participants know you are in another area of discussion. This will help participants keep track for themselves, and see connections that they might not have perceived on their own. You may use statements based on phrases such as "In this section we covered...", "the main points that I heard you articulate were..." or "given that we covered x, and y, we are now ready to move on to z." You can also ask if anyone has anything to add before moving on.

Given that often the meeting sections will flow from one section to another without any formal break, it is especially important to step in occasionally and state what has been happening and what you expect to happen. In this regard, summing up will be an important tool for you to structure the meeting and maintain a regular flow between sections.

### Information Gathering, Use of Questions and Problem Solving

As you move into moments of information gathering, it is necessary to ask more questions. But questions can be appropriate or inappropriate. Appropriate questions can do many different things. Appropriate questions:

- Invite the participant to speak,
- Obtain objective information,
- Pinpoint specific concerns.

### What and How Questions

“What” or “How” questions take the participant out of their brain into their experience and feelings. By demanding that the participant address the “what” and “how” of their own actions, these questions promote insight and encourage the participant to accept responsibility.

### Open and Closed Questions

**A closed question asks for a specific, limited bit of information.** The question “Were you angry?” is a closed question because it can be answered with a simple “yes” or “no.” With closed questions, the facilitator controls the exact direction of the conversation. Closed questions are useful for checking comprehension after new concepts are introduced.

**Open questions invite the participant to talk freely, guiding and pacing the discussion at a comfortable level for him/her-.** “How did that make you feel?” and “What would you do differently?” are open questions.

### Silence

Give yourself and the group space to think. Not every silence, no matter how uncomfortable, is an evil to be eliminated: instead of asking another question, allow the group to guide the relationship.

### Be Concrete

During the information phase, help the participant to see the situation in concrete terms. Something can be done about a concrete problem, while nothing at all will help a more generalized complaint. Concreteness can also help promote accountability. Deliver concreteness with genuine respect, warmth and empathy, so that the participant can more easily accept this behavior-oriented view of the situation. Improving trust is a partnership that requires all parties to be responsible. Through concrete steps, an effective plan of action can be developed.

Sometimes the facilitator needs to encourage this change with a small push such as, “OK, now what?” or “What will you do about that?” Sometimes a participant cannot address solutions because the problem itself is so overwhelming. Help the participant break the problem into concrete, manageable parts. Take first things first, then go on to the next.

### Problem Solving

Problem solving flows naturally from information gathering. As the participant describes the situation, the facilitator, stressing concreteness, focuses on present concerns rather than past history or speculation on the future. This helps the participant to turn from what has already been done to what is now at hand.

**Devise a plan that will implement the selected alternatives**

The plan needs to be:

- Specific and detailed (what, where, when, and with whom)
- Realistic, simple, and direct
- Within the abilities of the participant
- Can be carried out soon
- Have beneficial long-range consequences
- Stated in bite-sized steps
- Socially acceptable

**Ask For a Commitment.** The participant needs to state a specific time and place when the plan will be carried out. At the conclusion, the facilitator should re-confirm any plan of action specified.

**Gentle Refusal**

If during a group you find that it is necessary to set limits with participants, a very effective method is called “gentle refusal.” This skill provides facilitators with a way to say “no” to participants as gently and with as much care as possible, while inviting them to continue to communicate with you on a more constructive level. Facilitators should feel safe and respected.

*“Our goal is not to tell people what to do, but let them know how to do what they want. The participants in your group probably get subjected to lots of judgments outside the meeting. Your job here is to provide a safe place, free from judgment. Don’t judge, and don’t let others judge.”—Brian Casey*

**THE MODEL FOR GENTLE REFUSAL CONSISTS OF THREE STAGES****Reflection**

Let the participant know what you are hearing behind the question or demonstrate that you understand what is happening for him or her, e.g “it sounds as if you think I might be too young to understand your difficulty.”

**Setting Your Limits - Refusal**

Say as clearly as you can what your limits are and your reasons for them:

“I cannot...because...”

“I am not willing to...because...”

“I do not want to....because...”

“I am uncomfortable....because...”

**Offering the Invitation**

Say clearly to the participant what you and/or are willing to do. This invitation demonstrates the even you will not/cannot meet his or her specific request or demand, you are still concerned about the participant and want to keep your focus on him or her and his or her feelings.

Sometimes you may only need to use one or two of these steps to direct the participants; other times you may need to use all three steps several times.

## **DE-ESCALATION TECHNIQUES**

### **Acknowledging**

It is extremely important for an agitated person to have their concerns acknowledged. Acknowledging a situation does not mean you approve nor are you “giving in” to the participant. When someone is upset or angry, their concerns are most critical to him or her at that moment. It is important that you as the leader recognize these concerns and manage them as best as you can. Your leadership will guide the group in how they react to this participant in the future, therefore, make sure you are not sabotaging his or her further participation by humoring him or her. Your ability to manage these concerns will depend on their nature. If the problem is that he or she is not being heard, your listening and acknowledging may be enough to get the group moving again. If the problem is more serious, you may begin by acknowledging the concern. If this is not sufficient, you may have to use another technique.

### **Breaking**

Engaging in an argument in front of the entire group is a sure way of escalating the situation. If you feel you or your co-facilitator is being agitated, this is the time to take a short break. During a break you can cool off, discuss with your co-facilitator how you will handle the remainder of time and/or talk to the participant who is being disruptive in a less agitated environment.

### **Process Comments**

The term “process comment” refers to an observation by a facilitator that explicitly addresses the interactions between participants or participant and facilitator, on the surface, a process comment takes the conversation away from the topic at hand by

directly addressing something getting in the way of the session. A process comment may be used by the facilitator in cases when he or she feels the group is going in circles, when people are talking amongst themselves and distracting the group or when a participant is being disruptive. When a facilitator decides to make a process comment, make sure that the participant(s) will be able to hear the comment without being overly threatened. The distraction may be taking precedence for the participant(s). By being acknowledged and addressed, the distracting behavior may be dissolved.

### **Humor**

Humor can escalate an already explosive situation. Often, people who are angry or upset feel that people are not taking concerns seriously when humor is used. This should be used extremely judiciously.

### **Last Resort: Asking a Participant to Leave**

Asking a participant to leave is the most extreme action we can take as facilitators, it can be used, but it should be used extremely judiciously. Never ask a participant to leave without first using gentle refusal.

This may be the most difficult task volunteer facilitators have to endure. These are some guidelines that you should follow when you feel it is necessary to remove a participant from your group.

A participant is constantly being disruptive. The facilitators have tried other de-escalation techniques frequently and the participant continues to be hostile.

A participant makes a violent threat or has a weapon. If this is the case, send the co-facilitator to get security. It is important that facilitators do not try to handle this situation alone.

Never ask the participant to leave in front of the group. Break the group for a few minutes in order to ask the participant to leave.

### Using the Diversity in the Room

As a facilitator, it is your job to ensure that the diversity of origins and life experiences among participants becomes a tool, rather than a barrier. Difference can, in fact, enhance the quality and depth of the conversation instead of curtailing it.

What complicates this issue is that, in the real world, differences among groups of people are often associated with differences in power and are often interpreted in terms of cultural stereotypes. In terms of this last point, all people have some stereotypes in relation to race and ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, and/or class, among other characteristics that define groups. Participants are not exempt, nor are facilitators.

In terms of power, people may bring perceptions of themselves and develop perceptions of others that set them into a role that they would not take in a group with which they are comfortable –they may be silent as a result, afraid to express an opinion, detached, too dominating, or even confrontational.

The task of turning difference into a tool involves, then, dealing both with stereotypes in ways that are direct, yet also amicable, and promoting an environment in which everyone has the power to participate equally. For instance, if people express ideas that seem stereotypical or even offensive you might want to address the issue by turning to the group and asking: “Does everyone agree with this view? What do others think about this?” If you sense that someone is not participating out of a sense that his experience or point of view is too different from everyone else’s, you could say something like “what is the experience of others?” or “we are a pretty diverse group here and I am sure others have experience this differently.” Furthermore, if you are different in any way from the majority in the group, you can act as a model by saying things like “in my immediate social circle,

things are different,” or “growing up in a XX family, we thought...” (Where the XX could be middle-class, Latino, African-American, immigrant, suburban, etc.) The point is that, through your questions and your modeling, you may promote an atmosphere in which participants can acknowledge their differences and learn from the diversity or people on the room.

*“The meeting works for me when I follow my gut – when to talk, when to listen. I try to “tune in” to the intuitive sense before the meeting starts. My greatest challenge is to listen and reflect, rather than talk about the things that interest me at that particular time.” –Patrick Barresi*

### 15 POINTS TO GUIDE YOUR FACILITATION

1. A good facilitator makes it easy or easier for people to express themselves. Being at ease with yourself will help others to feel at ease in the group.
2. Be empathic. This is the ability to understand another’s experiences and to communicate that understanding. It is the ability to see the world as another see it.
3. Everyone wants to feel that they have been heard and understood. It’s very difficult for some people to talk in a group situation, and encouraging responses from the facilitator are very important.
4. Pay attention to the entire group process, including emerging themes, the general energy levels, tone, and feeling of the meeting. Pay attention to all the group members and to yourself. How you are feeling is probably how the group is feeling. Note dominating participants, silent participants, people who disagree and disruptive participants. Be flexible with breaks. If the group seems particularly restless or tired, an extra five minute break will pay off with more focused participation afterwards.
5. Adopt a non-judgmental attitude. We all have judgments and things that might “press our buttons.” Those feelings are yours, and you are entitled

to have them. Keep in mind your role is to facilitate participants' learning and discussion. Make sure you act as objectively as possible. That doesn't mean denying that the buttons exist; it means you need to learn what your buttons are and how to recognize that they are being pushed, so that you can stay in your role. Also, be prepared to play "devil's advocate" if no one disagrees with a participant's statement and you know that it's a subject of disagreement in the community at large.

6. Be what you ask your participants to be. Be open to new ideas and different opinions, and don't get defensive. In your role as facilitator, people may react harshly to you. Don't take it personally. If you need to, step back and count to ten before reacting if you're feeling particularly strongly about something. Ask someone else in the group for their opinion. You may choose to keep your personal views to yourself if you want.

Disclose information about yourself whenever you feel it is appropriate. Yet, DON'T TALK TOO MUCH. This is facilitating, not public speaking. There is a fine line between what is appropriate and what is not. You will get better at determining where this line is with every meeting. Use your own stories to catalyze theirs, not to deal with your issues.

7. Maintain control of the group. This will require different levels of direct intervention at different times. The ground rules will help you do that. Explain the reason they exist and stick to them.
8. If conflict emerges, or someone does or says something with which you strongly disagree, turn over the responsibility for the situation back to the group. Always act in what you feel is in the best interest of the group at large.
9. If there's a silence, let there be silence. This is a judgement call which you will become better at as you gain more experience. Most of us get uncomfortable sitting in a room where nobody is saying anything. Let the

silence be; someone will almost certainly fill it in. By trying to "save" the group, you run the risk of not letting them take initiative.

10. Use a piece of paper and record feelings and emotions expressed by people in their statements. Write the words down as unobtrusively and matter-of-factly as possible. You can then see at a glance the emotional tenor in the room, and use those words as you speak to recognize that those feelings are present. You can also spot what issues are not coming up ("The group uses the word 'fear' a lot, but no one says anything about loss or death. Does anyone have anything to say about that?").
11. Occasionally, give them a second chance to say something that they might not have said the first go-round, possibly because they didn't think it was appropriate. ("Does anyone have anything to say about the issue that they haven't said because they weren't sure it was appropriate?" is an easy and direct way.)
12. Recognize the diversity of the group. You may have younger and older members and people of different ethnic groups and social classes. It is important to give each of them a chance to express their concerns and thoughts. This is absolutely essential: if you recognize the diversity right off the bat, you will defuse a lot of tension and let people know that there is a place for them in the meeting (which is a microcosm, after all, of the community).
13. If you are aware of a dynamic that is present but not being addressed, summon your courage to do so. You may assume that if you feel something brewing, others do also, and it is probably beginning to smell either very good or very bad. If there is tension or a disagreement, you may want to bring it to the group's attention.
14. Don't use jargon or assume that everyone knows what someone else is talking about. Make sure to go over terms. Also, there may be terms that may mean one thing to you and something else to other people. Words

may have different meanings for different participants. Make sure to ask people what they mean.

15. Begin no later than 10-15 minutes after the original time announced. Let people know when the meeting will end and get their agreement. Make sure you are completely finished by the time that you promised the meeting would end. By keeping our commitments, we can assure people that we can be trusted during any future interactions that we have.