



Missouri State
U N I V E R S I T Y

BearWorks

MSU Graduate Theses

Fall 2020

The Impacts of Race and Video Angle on Judgments of Police Interactions

Shelby Gabrielle Wynn

Missouri State University, Shelby5019@live.missouristate.edu

As with any intellectual project, the content and views expressed in this thesis may be considered objectionable by some readers. However, this student-scholar's work has been judged to have academic value by the student's thesis committee members trained in the discipline. The content and views expressed in this thesis are those of the student-scholar and are not endorsed by Missouri State University, its Graduate College, or its employees.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/theses>



Part of the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wynn, Shelby Gabrielle, "The Impacts of Race and Video Angle on Judgments of Police Interactions" (2020). *MSU Graduate Theses*. 3586.

<https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/theses/3586>

This article or document was made available through BearWorks, the institutional repository of Missouri State University. The work contained in it may be protected by copyright and require permission of the copyright holder for reuse or redistribution.

For more information, please contact BearWorks@library.missouristate.edu.

**THE IMPACTS OF RACE AND VIDEO ANGLE ON JUDGMENTS OF POLICE
INTERACTIONS**

A Master's Thesis

Presented to

The Graduate College of
Missouri State University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science, Experimental Psychology

By

Shelby G. Wynn

December 2020

THE IMPACTS OF RACE AND VIDEO ANGLE ON JUDGMENTS OF POLICE INTERACTIONS

Psychology

Missouri State University, December 2020

Master of Science

Shelby G. Wynn

ABSTRACT

With the invention of video recording on cell phones and the increased use of social media, the ability to record and distribute instances of police misconduct has become much easier. In recent years, such videos have captured White police officers using extreme force towards black citizens, many times leading to their deaths. Despite the increase in access to these videos, many of the officers involved are not convicted (or even indicted) of any crimes. Researchers have begun to examine variables that impact how people judge videotaped police/civilian interactions. For example, it has been found that when viewing interrogation videos, people judge confessions to be more voluntary when the camera is focused solely on the suspect as compared to an angle focused on both the suspect and detective. This is especially the case when they are viewing people of color. The present research investigated whether this extends to situations outside of the interrogation room. I examined whether camera perspective and civilian race interact to affect bystander's judgements of police-civilian altercations. Participants watched a video of a police/civilian altercation that either depicted a Black or White civilian and was shown through the lens of a body camera angle or cell phone angle. After watching these videos, participants were asked a variety of questions to gauge how they perceived the actors in the video. Surprisingly, race and video angle did not impact participants' judgments of the officer or civilian. However, I found that people who perceived the officer's actions as more justified were more likely to have empathy for the officer and see him as playing a less causal role than the civilian. In contrast, people who perceived the actions of the civilian as more justified saw the police as playing a more causal role in the incident. There are a variety of factors that could have influenced the results. I explore these factors as well as address the implications of the role of pre-existing attitudes in making judgments.

KEYWORDS: racial salience, outgroup bias, confession, illusory causation, camera angle, prejudice, police, prejudicial judgments, race

**THE IMPACTS OF RACE AND VIDEO ANGLE ON JUDGMENTS OF POLICE
INTERACTIONS**

By

Shelby G. Wynn

A Master's Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate College
Of Missouri State University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Science, Experimental Psychology

December 2020

Approved:

David Zimmerman, Ph.D., Thesis Committee Chair

Ashley Payne, Ph.D., Committee Member

Bogdan Kostic, Ph.D., Committee Member

Julie Masterson, Ph.D., Dean of the Graduate College

In the interest of academic freedom and the principle of free speech, approval of this thesis indicates the format is acceptable and meets the academic criteria for the discipline as determined by the faculty that constitute the thesis committee. The content and views expressed in this thesis are those of the student-scholar and are not endorsed by Missouri State University, its Graduate College, or its employees.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Zimmerman for helping me navigate the often daunting road of academia. Thank you for being patient while encouraging me and helping me find my way these past 2 years.

I would like to thank Dr. Payne for going well beyond what is required of her to help me flourish throughout this process. I hope, one day, I am able to be to someone what you have been to me.

Thank you, Dr. Bogdan, for your helpful feedback and constructive criticism, it has helped me grow as a writer and overall scholar.

Lastly, thank you to my mom, Jacqueline Wynn, for showering me with love and reassurance every step of the way. Thank you to all my family for believing in me throughout this process. I couldn't have done it without you.

I dedicate this thesis to David Wynn.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	Page 1
Literature Review	Page 3
Video Evidence in the Court	Page 3
Bias in Processing Video Evidence	Page 4
Racial Identification	Page 6
Camera Angle	Page 8
Body Cam Evidence	Page 10
Present Research	Page 11
Hypotheses	Page 12
Methods	Page 14
Participants and Design	Page 14
Materials	Page 14
Procedure	Page 17
Results	Page 19
Data Screening	Page 19
Analytic Strategy	Page 19
Police Justification (Hypotheses 1-5)	Page 19
Effects of Racial Attitudes on Subsequent Judgments	Page 20
Effects of Attitudes Towards the Police	Page 21
Discussion	Page 23
Null Effect of Civilian Race	Page 24
Null Effect of Camera Angle	Page 25
Attitudes	Page 26
Pandemic-Related Limitations	Page 28
Future Research	Page 28
Conclusion	Page 29
References	Page 31
Appendices	Page 34
Appendix A. CoBRAS	Page 34
Appendix B. APLS	Page 36
Appendix C. Video Consent	Page 38
Appendix D. Justification	Page 39
Appendix E. Empathy	Page 40
Appendix F. Causality	Page 41
Appendix G. Demographics	Page 42
Appendix H. IRB Approval	Page 44
Appendix I. Consent Form	Page 45

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographics	Page 16
Table 2. Justification Means Across Video Angle and Civilian Race	Page 20
Table 3. Correlations of Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) and Dependent Variables	Page 22
Table 4. Correlations of Attitudes Towards Police Legitimacy Scale (APLS) and Dependent Variables	Page 22

INTRODUCTION

In 2018, police killed close to 1,000 people in the United States (Lopez, 2018). Black people account for 31% of these fatalities while only accounting for 13% of the population (Tate, et al., 2019). In recent years, social media has helped expose police brutality against Black Americans, as video recordings have produced vivid evidence of instances of harsh actions by the police. For example, in 2016, a police officer killed a Black man named Philando Castile. Castile's girlfriend, Diamond Reynolds, recorded the fatal interaction from the passenger's seat. According to Reynolds, Castile was reaching for his identification when the officer shot and killed him. This sparked outrage in the black community and reinforced that action needed to be taken regarding the way police use brutal force in their interactions with civilians, particularly black Americans (Croft, 2017). Amid recent tragedies like the Castile killing, the Black Lives Matter movement emerged, bringing police shootings of unarmed Black men to the forefront of the mainstream conversation.

In the pre- internet era, people typically heard accounts of police- civilian interactions through the newspaper or television news, and these accounts often came straight from the police officer. In recent years, however, the video recording feature on cell phones and police bodycams have made it much more common for interactions with police to be documented as they are occurring. Such recordings from a cell phone by a bystander, or perhaps with police bodycam footage, supposedly produce a more unbiased account of the events than was previously possible. Oftentimes, these videos make it hard for police officers to justify their use of force in certain situations. For example, in 2017 two officers in Georgia reported that there was a struggle between a motorist and themselves when the motorist resisted arrest. They claimed that the vehicle did not have a license plate and the motorist continued driving when

they tried to pull him over. However, a bystander captured video of the motorist getting out of the car with his hands up and not resisting the arrest (Sanchez, 2018). The officer is seen handcuffing the motorist on the ground and kicking and punching him. Once the video was released, the officers were fired and charged with felony violation of oath of office and misdemeanor battery. If the bystander had not recorded the events, it is quite possible that the officers would have gotten away with the assault. It is likely the court would have believed the two officers' fabrication of events and the motorist would have been charged. However, even with these bystander recordings, people do not always agree about the actions and motives of the police and civilians, which is why triers of fact often do not prosecute or convict police officers who assault or shoot unarmed (Black) people.

There appears to be ambiguity concerning what is considered unjustified force at the hands of the police. What qualifies as brutality is often highly contested and many factors seem to go into how people come to a decision. Additionally, the history between Black people and the police in the United States is marked by conflict and injustice. The first step to better understanding these mechanisms is to identify what factors affect how people perceive videos of police- civilian interactions. Understanding factors that affect such perceptions may shed light on why people have such divergent responses to these videos (McCamman & Culhane, 2017). Several studies have revealed potentially relevant variables such as the race of the civilian, camera angle, situational ambiguity, and medium of presentation. This study aims to examine the ways in which these mechanisms relate specifically to police- civilian interactions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Video Evidence in the Court

Traditionally, the law considers video evidence to be “demonstrative” (Granot, et al., 2018). Demonstrative evidence can exist in many forms depending on the context, but some believe that it should only be used as secondary support—in the way one would use graphs or a chart. This is due to the fact that demonstrative evidence is not generally used to prove facts on its own; it is more commonly used for illustrative purposes. In reality, many prosecutors build their whole case around video evidence, based on the assumption that this evidence is able to prove facts on its own without additional confirmation from another source. Because of this, some have argued that video should be classified as “substantive,” arguing that it proves facts on its own. The Supreme Court seems to agree that video evidence can be substantive evidence. In *Scott v. Harris* (2007), jurors determined whether an officer pursuing a suspect had just cause to ram the suspect’s vehicle, causing the suspect to run off the road. Jurors had to decide whether Harris (the suspect) posed a significant threat to the well-being of the public or at least enough to warrant being hit by the officer’s car. The chase and subsequent crash left Harris paralyzed. The jurors and ultimately the Supreme Court, ruled that the videotaped car chase initiated by Harris posed a substantial and immediate risk of serious physical injury to others and that the officer’s actions were reasonable. Despite this, Justice Stevens and other lower court judges argued that the video did not necessarily prove that Harris was driving recklessly enough to justify the officer’s use of deadly force, because plenty of reasonable people might interpret the video differently (Granot et al., 2018). *Scott v. Harris* (2007) illustrates that the courts might see video evidence as “objective,” denoting that viewers believe everything they see is an objective

account of events, despite the possibility that such evidence produces multiple interpretations. In what ways might people be systematically biased in their interpretations of video evidence?

Bias in Processing Video Evidence

In 1991, a civilian videotaped Los Angeles Police Officers pulling Rodney King out his car and brutally beating him for 15 consecutive minutes after an ensuing high-speed chase (Sastry & Bates, 2017). The assault resulted in skull fractures, broken bones and teeth, and permanent brain damage. Although the officers were charged with felony assault and other offenses, they were eventually acquitted of all charges. When hearing of the not guilty verdicts for the indicted officers, many people had very strong reactions (Marbella, 1992). These feelings were illustrated by the L.A riots, in which residents of Los Angeles took to the streets and destroyed stores, started fires, and engaged in looting. Many felt that the justice system had failed the Black community in what seemed to be an open and shut case—after all, the video showed police officers beating King almost to the point of death. However, the jury believed the police officers’ actions were justifiable and chose to acquit.

A number of biases might account for such disparate interpretations of a single videotape. For one, people may be prone to interpret video through the lens of the biases or expectations they hold (Granot et al., 2018). In a famous study, participants evaluated the academic performance of a fourth-grade girl by watching a videotape of her answering test questions (Darley & Gross, 1983). In the video, her academic proficiency was purposefully ambiguous. Those previously primed with information eluding to the fact that she came from a low-SES background instead of a high-SES background were more likely to rate her performance as indicative of below grade-level ability. This study illustrates that ambiguity in a video can cause

people to rely on their biases to make decisions; if triers of fact are not confident about what a video is conveying, they may reflexively fall back on pre-existing beliefs about the actors within the video. This is also a possible explanation for the differing perceptions of the Rodney King video footage. It is possible that the jury was not completely able to decipher who was at fault in the footage and used preexisting racially prejudiced beliefs to make their judgements. This possible explanation was further supported when Correll et al. (2002) found that when there was ambiguity about whether the civilian was armed or unarmed, people seemed to lean into stereotypes, shooting the unarmed Black person more often than the unarmed White person. Another potential bias pertains to people's abilities to process and remember all of the elements of a visual scene, as research has demonstrated that it is difficult for people to process all of the information in a video (Granot et al., 2018). Inattention blindness is a phenomenon whereby focusing on an object can cause people to ignore even conspicuous elements in the same video (Simons & Chabris, 1999). In one study demonstrating inattention blindness, researchers found that 46% of participants asked to track the number of passes in a scene with people passing a ball failed to notice a man in a gorilla suit or a woman with an umbrella walking straight through the center of the action. This may partially explain why jurors viewing the Rodney King video saw the officers as justified in their actions. Perhaps, they were not able to properly process all of the actors within the scene, making it difficult to clearly make judgments of guilt. Additionally, the poor quality of the video may have only made this process even more difficult. In summary, although we strive for people to adequately process all parts of a video in the court room, it may be hard to avoid perceptual biases. This, in turn, may impact how juror members view videos that are somewhat hectic. People may be especially susceptible to these biases when making judgments about Black people in a busy visual scene.

Racial Identification

Ingroup/ outgroup bias may also impact a person's judgment. According to social identity theory, people define themselves by the social group in which they identify (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This includes identities based on race, family, nationality and many others. This, in turn, impacts how they view themselves and others, with people seeing those inside of their group in a more positive light than those outside of their group. People tend to make higher blameworthiness judgments about outgroups than ingroups (Granot, et al., 2014). This tendency may contribute to how jurors process video information, impacting the way they judge video information when defendants are from outside of their ethnic group. People are aware of their shared values and their investment in a group, and this awareness coupled with the heightened impact of video evidence might magnify bias due to increased salience of racial identity of targets (Granot et al., 2014). For example, researchers looked at whether White people who highly identified with their racial group gave Black defendants more jail and probation time (Granot et al., 2018). The researchers also manipulated whether participants were instructed to watch the video naturally or holistically (attending to both actors and background). They found that those who were instructed to watch the video holistically assigned the Black defendant less jail/probation time than those who did not receive such an instruction—this effect was most pronounced among people who strongly identified as White. This pattern indicates that group identification bias moderates the relationship between visual attention and judgements of actors within a visual scene. A perceiver's racial identification affects their visual attention to outgroup members by causing them to visually attend to Black people (who are more salient), which in turn affects the way they assign blame.

Negative Racial Stereotypes. In addition to basic outgroup bias, Black people are stereotyped as aggressive, violent, and hostile (Hurwitz & Peffley, 1997). These negative stereotypes are noteworthy when considering how people perceive video that feature conflict between a Black civilian and a White officer. While the mere presence of an outgroup certainly contributes to the way Black people are viewed by White people, additional stereotypes associating Black people with criminality may also factor into perceptual biases. It has been demonstrated that these stereotypical associations extend to beliefs of guilt. Hurwitz and Peffley (1997) found that negative stereotypes are associated with a higher likelihood of seeing Blacks as guilty of crimes when the crimes are violent, and police are punitive. These images of Black people are reinforced through television shows, news accounts, and political messages, and they help to perpetuate stereotypes which contribute to the ways in which they are seen. Literature has shown that even when Black suspects have behaved in the same way as White suspects, they are seen as more guilty, more aggressive, given harsher punishment, and believed to be more likely to reoffend (Hurwitz & Peffley, 1997). This may result in people having more skewed perceptions of police- civilian interactions that feature a Black civilian and a White police officer. In addition, stereotyping of Black people may often be characterized as implicit, and these implicit associations could have dire consequences for the livelihood and well- being of Black people (Hehman et al., 2017). For example, implicit racial biases of White residents in a certain area predicted whether police disproportionately used lethal force with Black residents in that area.

Colorblind Racism and Interpretation of Video Evidence. Colorblind racism may also play a role in the way people process video. People who embrace colorblindness ideology tend to minimize or completely negate the part that racism plays in a person's life (Manning et al.,

2015). Advocates posit that people should not ‘see’ race and that decisions should not be made on the basis of race, even if the decisions help to rectify past or present injustices. While on the surface this ideology seems to be a just goal of any aspiring egalitarian society, the underlying tenet of this ideology assumes that society is already free of racism. Research has consistently suggested that race factors into many spheres of life. Older black people receive lower quality hospital care, less intensive hospital care, and are seen less by specialists compared to their white counterparts (Fiscella et al., 2000). Black criminals are more likely to remain unnamed, to be seen in handcuffs, are less likely to speak for themselves, and more likely to be depicted as physically threatening compared to White criminals (Hurwitz & Peffley, 1997). Additionally, engaging in colorblindness rhetoric in social situations has been shown to negatively impact the way White people are perceived by Black people (Apfelbaum et al., 2008). White people who engaged in colorblindness exhibited less nonverbal friendliness in interracial interactions. To what extent colorblindness attitudes impact perceptions of police- civilian interactions requires further exploration.

Camera Angle

Recorded video confessions have become a common type of video evidence in the courtroom, and camera perspective may impact how judges or members of a jury determine if a video confession was coerced (Lassiter, 2010). Lassiter argues with supporting evidence that if the camera focuses primarily on the suspect, as most video confession videos do, the person viewing the video will place more blame (for confessing) on the suspect than they would using a different camera angle. This phenomenon is called *illusory causation*, whereby increased visual conspicuousness of a person in a scene triggers viewers to attribute more causality to that person

for the events that occur—indeed, research indicates that visual attention is a mediator of this camera perspective bias (Ware et al., 2008). As a solution, Lassiter suggests equal camera focus on the suspect and the interrogator. When people are able to see both the suspect and interrogator clearly, they may be better equipped to recognize that a police officer potentially coerced a confession. Lassiter’s recommendation to focus the camera equally on suspect and interrogator flows from the concept of illusory causation via visual salience bias, but it is important to note that the supporting research used White interrogators and White suspects. Therefore, it is unclear whether shifting the camera angle would reduce attentional bias in cases in which both parties are not of the same race.

Racial Salience Bias and Camera Angle. When people view videos and there are only a few people of color in the video, they remember more about the members of the minority group than the members of the majority (Ratcliff et al., 2010). This occurrence is termed racial salience. Because racial minorities are more visually conspicuous than members of the majority, minorities may be assigned more causality for events in a visual scene than people within the majority. Therefore, it is fair to assume that the equal camera perspective may not resolve illusory causation under all circumstances; that is, people who view equal-focus interrogation footage may still be more likely to believe a confession was voluntary when the suspect is an ethnic minority and the interrogator is not. To test the potential effects of racial salience bias on judgments of confession voluntariness, Ratcliff et al. (2010) compared judgements of interrogations with suspects from minority groups and suspects from a majority group using an equal camera perspective. All of the conditions used White (majority group) interrogators. The minority group suspects were Chinese and Black, and the majority group suspects were White. The researchers used Chinese American and African American suspects because each minority

group has different stereotypes attached to them. They wanted to make certain that visual salience of the minority group—not stereotypical beliefs—accounted for any differences in judgments of voluntariness. Participants rated minority confession statements to be more voluntary than White confession statements (Ratcliff et al., 2010). Minority suspects were more likely to receive a rating of higher likelihood of guilt. On average, participants rendered more prejudicial judgments toward the minority suspect when viewing the videotape than when reading a transcript of the interaction. Moreover, even though there are different stereotypes for African Americans and Chinese Americans, both were attended to more than the Caucasian suspects.

Body Cam Evidence

Throughout the past few years, it has become more common for police forces around the United States to require their officers to wear body cameras (McCamman & Culhane, 2017). The U.S government has even provided grants specifically as a mean to provide bodycams for law enforcement. These cameras are intended to record instances of police- civilian interaction in order to protect the officer and the civilian. The footage is supposed to capture an unbiased account of the interaction that can be used later in court if needed. Are there any systematic biases associated with the use of or interpretation of body cam evidence?

Surprisingly, few researchers have manipulated the presence or use of body cam evidence to determine how such variations might affect judgments of this increasingly common form of evidence. In one study, McCamman and Culhane (2017) examined two questions concerning medium of presentation of body cam evidence. First, they tested whether seeing as opposed to hearing an interaction in which a police officer killed a civilian impacted the perception of that

officer's justification. Second, the researchers manipulated whether the officer's emotional response changed the way jurors perceived the officer's justification. They found that the medium of presentation significantly affected the way people perceived the officer's justification for use of deadly force. People who saw the body cam video of the interaction were less likely to see the shooting as justifiable. However, displays of remorse by the officer did not have a significant effect on the participants. These findings show that body camera evidence may allow for a different perspective of police officer-civilian interactions, but there are many open questions remaining about potential benefits/biases associated with the bodycam footage.

Perspective Taking and Empathy. An additional consideration regarding the potential effects of bodycam video is the fact that bodycams place the viewer in the perspective of the police officer. It has been demonstrated that taking the perspective of another person causes feelings of empathy for that person (Batson et al., 1997). If the bodycam serves as a perspective-taking manipulation, it is plausible that a bodycam view results in more empathy for the police officer as compared to a bystander view. Arguably, whether one takes on the perspective of the police or civilian will impact with whom one empathizes and (as a consequence) one's judgment of blame for the negative consequences of an altercation. Thus, along with illusory causation, taking the perspective of the police officer might factor into the perceptions of the actors in the video, further exacerbating bias against a civilian when viewed from a bodycam.

Present Research

Additional research is needed to understand the effects of camera angle and suspect race on judgments of both suspects and police. Although researchers have looked at camera perspective bias in the context of video confession, no one has examined how relevant biases

(e.g., illusory causation) might impact judgments of bodycam evidence—this is very important because of the ever-increasing availability of these body cam videos. In the current research, I aim to determine if judgments of bodycam video are impacted by the same perceptual biases associated with interrogation video. Specifically, I want to look at how people assign blame after viewing an interaction between a police officer and a civilian in which blame is not easily determinable, manipulating whether participants view the event via bodycam or bystander cell phone. This study seeks to answer the following research question: Do such camera perspective manipulations interact with or modulate racial (salience) biases in judgments of police-civilian interactions? By crossing the race of the suspect with a camera perspective manipulation, I may be able to identify the types of video/circumstances from the field that are most likely to bias judgments in favor of one party or the other. Finally, I will measure relevant attitudes about race and law enforcement, as such attitudes appear to be important factors affecting how, and perhaps under what circumstances, people will be more prone to blame civilians or police for negative (even violent) encounters.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: I predict a main effect of camera angle (body camera vs. cell phone). In the cell phone condition, I predict that participants will consider the actions of the police officer less justified than in the body cam condition.

Hypothesis 2: I predict a main effect of race (White vs. Black). In the White civilian condition, I predict that participants will consider the actions of the police officer less justified than in the Black civilian condition.

Hypothesis 3: The two main effects will be qualified by the camera angle x race interaction. Specifically, the effect of civilian race will be larger in the body cam condition than in the cell phone condition.

Hypothesis 4: I predict correlations between state empathy and justification. I predict that participants who have more empathy for the police officer will find the police officer's actions more justified.

Hypothesis 5: I predict correlations between judgments of causality and justification. Participants who assign more causality to the officer for the damage will find the police officer less justified.

METHODS

Participants and Design

The final sample consisted of jury-eligible undergraduate students (ages 18-49) at a predominately White, Midwestern university in the United States. The participants were recruited through the university's participant pool, which consisted primarily of undergraduate introduction to psychology students. Students were offered a course credit in their class for participation. We used a between subject's design where each participant was randomly assigned to a condition in a 2 (civilian race: Black vs. White) x 2 (type of video: cell phone vs. bodycam) design. The sample consisted of 55% male, 43% female and 88% White and 94% Non- Hispanic participants. (see Table 1 below for more demographics).

Materials

Attitudes Measures. Participants completed the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) (see appendix A) (Neville et al., 2000). This scale measures color-blind racism, which refers to the idea that race does not negatively impact a person's life today and that racism is a problem of the past. This scale was included in order to gauge if participants subscribe to colorblindness ideology, with the hope that this may help account for disparate perceptions of the police- civilian interaction videos. Ten questions on this scale were reversed coded. Due to a coding error, participants answered incomplete scale items. We determined that one item retained enough information to correctly convey the meaning of the question so we retained this question in our subsequent analyses. The second item, however, was not a complete sentence and was omitted in the mean score calculation. We conducted reliability tests with or without the

excluded item to ensure that this did not impact subsequent analyses and found that there was no difference in alpha levels between the two versions (Cronbach's $\alpha=.92$). Participants also completed the Attitudes Towards Police Legitimacy Scale (APLS) (see appendix B) (Reynolds et al., 2018). This scale measures attitudes about the ability and competence of members of law enforcement. Similar to the CoBRAS, this was included in order to help explain perceptions of the video. Both scales rendered composite mean scores on which I conducted analyses. This scale had good internal consistency with an alpha level of .97.

Police- Civilian Interaction. We created six videos using volunteer actors, all of whom consented to being videotaped (see appendix C). Each video depicted an ambiguous interaction between a male police officer and a male civilian. In the video, a police officer approaches a civilian and asks him to stop being disruptive. The civilian complains in an agitated manner and then refuses to comply, at which point the officer grabs his arm. The civilian then drops his phone. In the scuffle, the phone is cracked and rendered unusable. All six videos were carefully constructed to be identical to each other.

Civilian Race Manipulation. The interaction in the video either featured a White police officer and White civilian or White police officer and Black civilian. I used stimulus sampling by using three different Black and White civilians for this manipulation, matched for height/build/hair/etc (Wells & Windschitl, 1999). This culminated in a total of six videos. The race/identity of the White police officer remained constant. The videos were created to be ambiguous based on the theory of Sommers and Ellsworth (2000) that potential jurors are more likely to be biased by a defendant's race when race is a non-salient factor—that is, when race is salient, White participants may attempt to correct for biases in an effort to adhere to social norms.

Table 1. Demographics

	N	%
Gender		
Female	68	43%
Male	87	55%
Nonbinary	1	1%
Other	2	1%
Race		
<i>Did not Respond</i>	2	1%
Native American Alaska Native	3	2%
Asian	5	3%
Black or African American	9	6%
White	140	88%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	8	5%
Non-Hispanic	150	94%
Missing	1	1%
Income		
Less than \$20,000	181	93%
\$20,000 or more	14	7%
Political Leaning		
Extremely Liberal	11	7%
Liberal	16	10%
Slightly Liberal	19	12%
Moderate	55	35%
Slightly Conservative	18	11%
Conservative	32	20%
Extremely Conservative	6	4%
Missing	2	1%

Camera Angle Manipulation. This interaction was shown through police body camera footage using the pyle ppbccm9 hd body camera or through cell phone footage using the iPhone XR. The bystander used the iPhone XR to record the interaction from a few feet away—both the police officer and civilian were visible during the entire interaction. The police bodycam was located at chest level on the police officer. Since the camera was situated on the officer, this video was seen in closer view of the civilian than the bystander recording.

Post Video Questions. Participants answered five-point Likert-type items that gauged how much they believed the actions of the police officer in the video were justified (see appendix D) (Granot et al., 2014). This scale had sufficient internal consistency with an alpha level of .77. Then, participants answered questions used to measure state empathy; specifically, they responded to a series of measures gauging the extent to which they empathize with both the civilian and police officer in the interaction (see appendix E) (Shen, 2010). The scale had good internal consistency with an alpha level of .95 for the police empathy version and an alpha level of .93 for civilian empathy version. I rendered composite mean scores for these scales and conducted analyses. Next, they completed a single item assessing whether they believe the officer or civilian was the main cause of the event (see appendix F).

Demographics. Finally, participants filled out a demographic's questionnaire (see appendix G). This form asked participants about gender, ethnicity, age, jury eligibility, political leaning and whether they have experience with the criminal justice system.

Procedure

The IRB approved this study for commencing on January 27, 2020 (IRB-FY2020-477; see appendix H). I recruited participants using Missouri State University's research participant

platform, SONA. The study was originally planned to be split into two sessions and conducted in a laboratory setting. Unfortunately, due to unforeseen circumstances, the entire study was conducted online. Participants signed up online and were given a time frame to take the study. Once logged into SONA, they were directed to Qualtrics where they electronically signed a consent form (see appendix I). After that, they were given questionnaires that measured racial attitudes and attitudes about police legitimacy (counterbalanced between participants). Then, they watched the 1-minute video, after which they completed multiple dependent measures. This included the justification questionnaire, state empathy questionnaires, causality measure, and demographics survey—the latter three measures were presented in random order. Lastly, participants read a brief description of the study, were provided with a contact email for further questions, and thanked for their participation.

RESULTS

Data Screening

Although 177 responses were recorded in Qualtrics, only 158 were analyzed. One participant was removed due to failure to consent, five were removed due to failure to correctly identify the race of the civilian, and eight were removed due to failure to correctly identify the video angle used. Lastly, five were removed due to failure to correctly identify the race of the officer. (see Table 2 for *N*'s across cells).

Analytic Strategy

I analyzed the data using JASP version 0.13 (JASP Team, 2020). I conducted a 2 (Civilian Race: Black vs. White) X 2 (Camera Angle: body cam vs. cell phone) between subject's factorial ANOVA to identify the main and interactive effects of manipulations on the police justification measure, testing hypotheses 1- 3. I also ran Pearson product-moment correlations between the state empathy measures and justification measure and the causality measure and the justification measure to test hypothesis 4-5. Finally, I conducted multiple exploratory analyses to investigate how racial attitudes and attitudes towards the police contributed to the way people made judgments about the video.

Police Justification (Hypotheses 1-5)

Hypotheses 1-3. The main effect of race on judgments of police justification was not significant ($F(1,156) = 1.29, p=.26, \eta^2 = .01$). Whether the civilian in the video was White ($M=2.37, SD=0.79$) or Black ($M=2.23, SD=0.73$) did not significantly affect how people justified

the actions of the police. The main effect of video angle on judgments of police justification was also not significant ($F(1,156) = 1.87, p = .99, \eta^2 = 1.21$). Whether the participants viewed the video through the lens of a cell phone ($M = 2.30, SD = 0.74$) or a body cam ($M = 2.30, SD = 0.79$) did not significantly affect how people justified the actions of the police. Additionally, I did not find a significant interaction between race and video angle ($F(1,154) = .03, p = .87, \eta^2 = 1.87$). Therefore, the data did not support the first three hypotheses.

Table 2: Justification Means Across Video Angle and Civilian Race

	Black Civilian	White Civilian
Cell Phone	2.23 (.72)	2.38 (.75)
Body Camera	2.24 (.74)	2.36 (.83)

Note: Numbers in parentheses represent standard deviations. Justification Scale ranges from 1-5.

Hypothesis 4-5. I found a significant positive correlation between police justification scores and empathy for police. People who justified the actions of the police were more likely to empathize with police ($r(158) = .68, p < .001$). Similarly, there was a significant negative correlation between police justification scores and empathy for the civilian ($r(158) = -.53, p < .001$). This illustrated that people who empathized with the civilian were less likely to justify the police officer's actions in the video. Additionally, there was a significant negative correlation between police justification scores and the causality measure, indicating that people who justified the police officer's action were less likely to see the officer as playing a causal role in the events ($r(158) = -.72, p < .001$). These findings support both hypotheses.

Effects of Racial Attitudes on Subsequent Judgments

Prior to viewing the videos, participants were given questions that assessed their racial attitudes. Because the main and interactive effects of race and camera angle were not significant, I conducted exploratory analyses to test whether racial attitudes impacted how people perceived the video and its actors. This was evaluated using the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS), and there were numerous significant correlations (see Table 3). People who held more color-blind racial attitudes 1) were more likely to justify the police officers' actions, 2) had higher police empathy scores, 3) had lower civilian empathy scores, and 4) were less likely to cite the police officer as the cause of the incident.

Effects of Attitudes Towards the Police

Using the Attitudes Towards Police Legitimacy Scale (APLS), I assessed whether a person's belief in the efficiency and legitimacy of the police was related to perceptions of the video and its actors. Again, there were numerous significant correlations between police legitimacy attitudes and judgments of the video (see Table 4). People who rated police as more legitimate 1) were more likely to justify the police officer's actions, 2) had higher police empathy scores, 3) had lower civilian empathy scores, and 4) were less likely to cite the police officer as the cause of the incident.

Table 3: Correlations of Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) and Dependent Variables

Variable		1	2	3	4	5
1. COBRAS MEAN	Pearson's r	—				
	p-value	—				
2. Justification Mean	Pearson's r	0.43	—			
	p-value	< .001	—			
3. Causality Question	Pearson's r	-0.26	-0.72	—		
	p-value	0.00	< .001	—		
4. C Empathy Mean	Pearson's r	-0.20	-0.53	0.52	—	
	p-value	0.01	< .001	< .001	—	
5. P Empathy Mean	Pearson's r	0.32	0.68	-0.70	-0.37	—
	p-value	< .001	< .001	< .001	< .001	—

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4: Correlations of Attitudes Towards Police Legitimacy Scale (APLS) and Dependent Variables

Variable		1	2	3	4	5
1. APLS Mean	Pearson's r	—				
	p-value	—				
	Upper 95% CI	—				
	Lower 95% CI	—				
2. Justification Mean	Pearson's r	0.49 ***	—			
	p-value	< .001	—			
	Upper 95% CI	0.60	—			
	Lower 95% CI	0.36	—			
3. P Empathy Mean	Pearson's r	0.48 ***	0.68 ***	—		
	p-value	< .001	< .001	—		
	Upper 95% CI	0.59	0.76	—		
	Lower 95% CI	0.35	0.59	—		
4. C Empathy Mean	Pearson's r	-0.33 ***	-0.53 ***	-0.37 ***	—	
	p-value	< .001	< .001	< .001	—	
	Upper 95% CI	-0.18	-0.40	-0.22	—	
	Lower 95% CI	-0.46	-0.63	-0.49	—	
5. Causality Question	Pearson's r	-0.41 ***	-0.72 ***	-0.70 ***	0.52 ***	—
	p-value	< .001	< .001	< .001	< .001	—
	Upper 95% CI	-0.27	-0.63	-0.61	0.62	—
	Lower 95% CI	-0.53	-0.78	-0.77	0.39	—

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine whether civilian race and video angle influence people's judgments about videos of police- civilian interactions. I manipulated the race of the civilian (Black or White) and the video angle in which they viewed the video (cell phone camera or body camera). The data did not support the first 3 hypotheses. The race of the civilian did not impact how people justified the police officer or the civilian in the video. Based on the literature regarding racial salience, I hypothesized that people would have more prejudicial judgments of people that did not look like them. In addition to this ingroup- outgroup effect, I believed this effect would be accompanied by prejudicial perceptions of the black civilian due to stereotypes associated with criminality. Essentially, I believed that our majority White participants would judge videos with Black civilians more harshly than White, seeing Black civilians as playing a more causal role in the events that transpired. The evidence did not support this claim. Video angle also had no effect on how much people justified the actions of each actor. Whether the person saw the video through the lens of a police body camera or a bystander cell phone did not significantly impact how they justified the behavior of the police officer or the civilian in the video. Race and video angle did not interact to impact justification as well. However, my fourth hypothesis was supported, as the correlations between state empathy and justification were significant as well as the correlations for causality and justification. I also found significant correlations between the attitude measures and the justification, empathy, and causation measures. Unsurprisingly, people who thought of the police as a more legitimate agency were more likely to justify their actions and empathize with them, failing to see them as playing a causal role in the events that transpired. They also were less likely to empathize with the civilian.

People who held more colorblind racist attitudes exhibited similar biases to those with high police legitimacy ratings.

Null Effect of Civilian Race

Social Desirability. In an effort to avoid revealing the true intentions of the study, I attempted to create videos that were ambiguous so that participants did not perceive that the videos were racially- charged and attempt to mask their racial biases. Perhaps, the structure of these videos was not racially neutral and consequently, participants saw race as a salient factor. As a result, they may have answered in a way that concealed their true biases.

Similarly, it is possible that the premeasures impacted the participants' judgments of the video. The questions about racial attitudes and attitudes towards the police were given prior to the video which hinted to the participants about what the study was measuring. Although this was necessary for the purpose of the study, participants may have attempted to overcorrect when answering the second set of measures, in turn impacting the results. As evidenced by Sommers and Ellsworth (2000), once people are made aware of racial overtones, they often adjust accordingly. Thus, the drive to answer in a socially desirable way may have been triggered by the questions about race and police legitimacy upfront, resulting in a non-significant effect of the race variable. However, it is unlikely to imagine a real-world scenario in which the race of the civilian is *not* salient, given that triers of fact would likely be attuned to such dynamics in judging the events portrayed in these videos.

History Effects. Due to the timing of this study, these results are possibly different than they would be under usual circumstances. The first portion of the year saw a worldwide renewed interest in police reform and the Black Lives Matter movement due to the murders of Breonna

Taylor and Ahmaud Arbery (Jackson, 2020). Taylor's death was at the hands of a police officer and one of Arbery's killers was a former police officer. This was a very sensational news topic during the time, and although the Black Lives Matter movement has been at the forefront of social issues for the past eight or so years, their deaths seemed to revitalize support for the movement around the world. Furthermore, the murder of George Floyd soon after data collection seemed to be the culminating event that truly catapulted police brutality back into mainstream conversation. Arguably, their deaths contributed to a change in attitudes about police violence towards the Black community. At the same time, while their deaths revitalized support for this movement, it also seemed to regenerate support for pro- police/ anti-BLM movements. The possible impacts of these movements complicate the interpretation of the effects we found. Furthermore, although data collection took place in a conservative area, the sample had a relatively equal distribution across liberals and conservatives. Because of these various factors, it might be worthwhile to replicate this at another time.

Null Effect of Camera Angle

Visual Attentiveness as a Mediator. Based on the theories of racial salience and illusory causation, I hypothesized that people would place more blame on people they attended to more which were most likely people from outgroups. Granot et al. (2014) used eye- tracking to look at whether group identification and visual attention had an effect on punishment decisions. They found that social group identification did the best at predicting juror decision making. Whether people identified with the police or a member of an outgroup influenced the punishment they recommended when they fixated on outgroup members. This may suggest that using eye tracking

to determine who a participant looked at more (police vs. civilian) would help us better evaluate if participants assigned blame to the people they attended to more.

Medium of Presentation. McCamman and Culhane (2017) found that medium of presentation impacted how people perceived the actions of a police officer. People who watched an altercation between a civilian and police officer were less likely to justify the officer's actions than when they read about the altercation or listened to the events through an audio clip. I hypothesized that people would perceive cell phone video and body camera video differently as well. Based on my null results, it seems that people may interpret video and body camera in similar ways. Whereas, video and audio are distinctly different mediums, both video and body camera rely on sight. It also calls into question whether there is similar perspective taking when viewing each camera angle. People did not seem to take on different perspectives when watching a certain camera angle over another. People were no more likely to justify police officer when they saw the bodycam video, which was arguably more from the perspective of the officer. A rather simple explanation for this is that there are no effects of camera angle. It is feasible that people are not biased as a function of camera angle and that this has no effect on their judgments of various situations. In order to confidently make this claim, it might be beneficial to only compare mediums that rely on different senses. For instance, researchers could compare how people process reading, watching, or listening to an altercation while manipulating the race of the civilian.

Attitudes

Although race and video angle did not significantly impact the way participants viewed the actors in the video, their attitudes toward the police and whether they held colorblind

attitudes seemed to play an important part in their thought process. People who scored high on the colorblind attitudes and the attitudes towards the police measures were more likely to justify the actions of the officer, less likely to see the officer as playing a causal role, more likely to see the civilian as playing a causal role, and more likely to empathize with the officer. There are numerous explanations for this relationship.

Attitudes Towards the Police. Researchers have found evidence that attitudes towards the police are relatively stable. Rosenbaum et al. (2016) examined how attitudes changed over a one-year span, comparing attitudes before people had an interaction with a police officer and after they had an interaction with a police officer. They found that attitudes about the police are not easily impacted by a few police encounters. This may be why attitudes were a better indicator of how our participants perceived the police or civilian than the camera angle they viewed or the race of the civilian in the video they viewed. This is understandable since we purposefully made the situation ambiguous, further encouraging people to lean into their own default attitudes. Seemingly, people are unwavering about how they feel about police officers and are most likely going to pay attention to the cues from various scenarios that validate their beliefs.

Colorblind Racism. A key component of colorblindness is the idea that everyone has the same opportunities to prosper, and if people of color do not succeed, it is not because of any systemic bias, but due to their own shortcomings (Neville et al., 2000). Apfelbaum et al. (2008) note that people who endorse greater levels of colorblind racism are more likely to engage in racially insensitive behavior. In our study, we found that people who scored high on CoBRAS tended to be biased against the civilian regardless of race. Perhaps, this was due to its third variable relation to police legitimacy.

Pandemic-Related Limitations

Due to the coronavirus, this study was conducted online. Without researchers present to monitor the progression of the study, participants may lose focus or multitask (Whitley et al., 2012). They may have had distractions around them while they were taking the study, and/or their computers or other devices may have compromised the visual quality of the videos they were viewing. There are countless factors that could possibly influence online studies, factors that are easily avoided in a lab environment.

Moreover, there are also potential problems with conducting a study during a worldwide calamity. During this time of data collection, the coronavirus had significantly impacted the lives of Americans as the global pandemic continued to sweep throughout the world. Close to 9 out of 10 U.S adults have reported that their lives have been changed due to the coronavirus (Pew Research Center, 2020). Participants were possibly under emotional stress, dealing with fear and uncertainty that are not normally present in daily life. These unexpected stressors might have impacted how people answered, and we may see different results at a later time.

Future Research

There were many factors that possibly impacted the results of this study. Limitations such as online dispersion as a result of the pandemic may have impacted how people engaged with the videos. The quality of video may have varied from participant to participant as well as the number of distractors. Ratcliff et al. (2010) argued that racial salience had less to do with racial attitudes and more about how visually salient someone is because they look differently than you. My findings did not support this hypothesis because racial and police legitimacy attitudes did a better job at predicting whether someone would justify the actions of the police or civilian than

the race of the civilian in the video or the camera angle used to record the video. Perhaps, it would be advantageous to replicate this study using an eye tracking device similar to the device used in Granot et al. (2014). This would allow the researcher not to solely depend on the feedback from the participants and allow them to more effectively measure visual attentiveness and illusory causation. As a result, they may be able to more effectively measure whether the person someone attends to visually is truly the target to whom they assign blame. Of course, it is not clear whether measuring visual attentiveness through these devices compared to manipulating camera angle may elicit different results, but it may be valuable to identify whether there is a distinction. Furthermore, it may be beneficial to look further into medium of presentation and its effects on prejudicial judgments, perhaps using distinctly different mediums. The mediums in this study (body cam and cell phone) may have been too similar to elicit different perceptions.

Conclusion

The findings in this study demonstrate how complex it is to study race and medium of presentation. Although many of my hypotheses were not supported, I think it illuminated the fact that there are possibly several underlying explanations for why people see videos in a certain way. Despite these null effects, I think it is beneficial to continue researching what biases go into processing video as they have dire ramifications for juror decision making and even public opinion. It is important to know why people see a single video and process it differently. The more we know about this, the more we can correct for possible biases. My findings seem to indicate that police legitimacy attitudes play a greater role than civilian race and video angle at predicting judgments of blame. Despite these findings, it must be noted that demand

characteristics and social desirability responding likely contributed to the null race findings. I think it would be advantageous for future researchers to explore methods that are able to counteract this effect.

REFERENCES

- Apfelbaum, E. P., Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Seeing race and seeming racist? Evaluating strategic colorblindness in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(4), 918–932. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0011990>
- Batson, C. D., Early, S., & Salvarani, G. (1997). Perspective taking: Imagining how another feels versus imagining how you would feel. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(7), 751–758. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167297237008>
- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2002). The police officer's dilemma: Using ethnicity to disambiguate potentially threatening individuals. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 83, 1314–1329. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1314>
- Croft, J. (2017, June 21). Philando Castile shooting: Dashcam video shows rapid event. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2017/06/20/us/philando-castile-shooting-dashcam/index.html>
- Darley, J. M., & Gross, P. H. (1983). A hypothesis-confirming bias in labeling effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 20–33.
- Fiscella, K., Franks, P., Gold, M. R., & Clancy, C. M. (2000). Inequality in quality. *JAMA*, 283(19), 2579. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.283.19.2579>
- Granot, Y., Balcetis, E., Feigenson, N., & Tyler, T. (2018). In the eyes of the law: Perception versus reality in appraisals of video evidence. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 24(1), 93–104. doi:10.1037/law0000137
- Granot, Y., Balcetis, E., Schneider, K. E., & Tyler, T. R. (2014). Justice is not blind: Visual attention exaggerates effects of group identification on legal punishment. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(6), 2196–2208. doi:10.1037/a0037893
- Helman, E., Flake, J. K., & Calanchini, J. (2017). Disproportionate use of lethal force in policing is associated with regional racial biases of residents. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9(4), 393–401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617711229>
- Hurwitz, J., & Peffley, M. (1997). Public perceptions of race and crime: The role of racial stereotypes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(2), 375. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111769>
- Jackson, L. (2020, May 27). Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor and America's cruel justice equation. Retrieved from <https://www.abajournal.com/web/article/ahmaud-arbery-breonna-taylor-and-americas-cruel-justice-equation>

- JASP Team (2020). JASP (Version 0.13) [Computer software]. @MISC{JASP2020,AUTHOR = {{JASP Team}}, TITLE = {{JASP (Version 0.13)[Computer software]}}, YEAR = {2020}, URL = {https://jasp-stats.org/}
- Lassiter, G. D. (2010). Psychological science and sound public policy: Video recording of custodial interrogations. *American Psychologist*, 65(8), 768-779. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.65.8.768
- Lopez, G. (2018, November 14). There are huge racial disparities in how US police use force. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/identities/2016/8/13/17938186/police-shootings-killings-racism-racial-disparities>
- Manning, A., Hartmann, D., & Gerteis, J. (2015). Colorblindness in Black and White: An analysis of core tenets, configurations, and complexities. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 1(4), 532–546. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649215584828>
- Marbella, J. (1992, May 1). Defense tactic blunted impact of videotape focus was altered for jury, say experts. Retrieved from <https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/bs-xpm-1992-05-01-1992122040-story.html>
- McCamman, M., & Culhane, S. (2017). Police body cameras and us: Public perceptions of the justification of the police use of force in the body camera era. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science*, 3(2), 167-175. doi:10.1037/tps0000117
- Most Americans say coronavirus outbreak has impacted their lives.* (2020, March 30). Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2020/03/30/most-americans-say-coronavirus-outbreak-has-impacted-their-lives/>
- Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the color-blind racial attitudes scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47(1), 59–70. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59
- Ratcliff, J. J., Lassiter, G. D., Jager, V. M., Lindberg, M. J., Elek, J. K., & Hasinski, A. E. (2010). The hidden consequences of racial salience in videotaped interrogations and confessions. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 16(2), 200–218. doi: 10.1037/a0018482
- Reynolds, J. J., Estrada-Reynolds, V., & Nunez, N. (2018). Development and validation of the attitudes towards police legitimacy scale. *Law and Human Behavior*, 42(2), 119–134. doi: 10.1037/lhb0000281
- Rosenbaum, D.P., Schuck, A.M., Costello, S.K., Hawkins, D.F., & Ring, M.K. (2016). Attitudes toward the police: The effects of direct and vicarious experience. *Police Quarterly*, 8(3), 343-365.

- Sanchez, R. (2018, October 3). Is police misconduct treated differently in the cellphone video age?. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2017/04/14/us/police-misconduct-department-reactions/index.html>
- Sastry, A., & Bates, K. G. (2017, April 26). When LA erupted in anger: A look back at the Rodney King Riots. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2017/04/26/524744989/when-la-erupted-in-anger-a-look-back-at-the-rodney-king-riots>
- Scott v. Harris, 550 U.S. 372 (2007). <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/550/372/>
- Shen, L. (2010). On a scale of state empathy during message processing. *Western Journal of Communication*, 74(5), 504–524. doi: 10.1080/10570314.2010.512278
- Simons, D. J., & Chabris, C. F. (1999). Gorillas in our midst: Sustained inattention blindness for dynamic events. *Perception*, 28, 1059–1074.
- Sommers, S., & Ellsworth, P. (2000). Race in the courtroom: Perceptions of guilt and dispositional attributions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(11), 1367-1379.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of inter-group conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of inter-group relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tate, J., Jenkins, J., & Rich, S. (2019). Fatal Force: 2018 police shootings database. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2018/national/police-shootings-2018/?utm_term=.e7e283174fbf
- Ware, L. J., Lassiter, G. D., Patterson, S. M., & Ransom, M. R. (2008). Camera perspective bias in videotaped confessions: Evidence that visual attention is a mediator. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 14(2), 192-200. doi:10.1037/1076-898x.14.2.192
- Wells, G. L., & Windschitl, P. D. (1999). Stimulus sampling and social psychological experimentation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(9), 1115–1125. doi: 10.1177/01461672992512005
- Whitley, B. E., Kite, M. E., & Adams, H. L. (2012). *Principles of research in behavioral science* (3rd ed.). New York: Psychology Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. CoBRAS

Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). Using the 6-point scale, please give your honest rating about the degree to which you personally agree or disagree with each statement. Please be as open and honest as you can; there are no right or wrong answers. Record your response to the left of each item. (1) Strongly disagree- (6) Strongly agree

1. ____ Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.
2. ____ Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive in the U.S.
3. ____ It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American or Italian American.
4. ____ Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to help create equality.
5. ____ Racism is a major problem in the U.S.
6. ____ Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not.
7. ____ Racism may have been a problem in the past, but it is not an important problem today.
8. ____ Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as White people in the U.S.
9. ____ White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color their skin.
10. ____ Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension.
11. ____ It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society's problems.
12. ____ White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.
13. ____ Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and adopt the values of the U.S.
14. ____ English should be the only official language in the U.S.

15. ____ White people are more to blame for racial discrimination in the U.S. than racial and ethnic minorities.

16. ____ Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against White people.

17. ____ It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.

18. ____ Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.

19. ____ Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations.

20. ____ Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison.

Appendix B. APLS

Attitudes Towards Police Legitimacy Scale (APLS). Rate the degree to which you agree with the following statements on a scale from 1-5. (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither agree nor disagree, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly agree

1. Police officers usually make fair decisions when enforcing laws.
2. Police officers usually have a reason when they stop or arrest people.
3. Police do their best to be fair to everyone.
4. Police officers treat people with respect.
5. Police officers communicate well with people.
6. The presence of police makes me feel safe.
7. Police officers are generally kind.
8. If I have a problem, I feel confident that the police can help me solve it.
9. I'm not afraid to call the police when I need to.
10. People should trust the police to help.
11. I feel that police officers are willing to listen to me when I come into contact with them.
12. I believe what police officers tell me.
13. I can rely on police officers to ensure my safety.
14. I feel relieved to see police officers when I am out in the community.
15. Police officers desire justice.
16. People become police officers to serve their communities.
17. The explanations that police officers give for a stop are typically reasonable.
18. Police officers take their duty to protect and serve seriously.
19. People become police officers to help others.
20. People become police officers because they want to maintain order.
21. Law enforcement agencies hire the best people available.
22. People should be confident that police officers are only there to help.
23. Police officers are held to higher standards than regular citizens.
24. For the most part, police do a good job maintaining order in society.
25. Police officers are respected by the communities they serve.

26. Police officers' interactions with others makes me feel like they are part of my community.
27. Police officers' goals are to protect the community.
28. Police officers are a welcomed presence at community events.
29. My community is a better place because of the police.
30. Most police officers care about the communities they work in.
31. Most police officers define right and wrong the same way that I do.
32. Police officers uphold values that are important to me.
33. The police usually act in ways consistent with my ideas about what is right and wrong.
34. The police and I have many values and beliefs in common.

Appendix C. Video Consent

I consent to be videotaped for use in a research project examining laypersons' perceptions of a civilian/police interaction. I understand that research participants might view my videotape during the course of data collection. Furthermore, this videotape may be used in the context of education (e.g., a classroom demonstration) and/or research dissemination (e.g., a conference presentation). My name/identity will never be attached to this research and/or its dissemination without my express consent.

By signing and dating below, I am indicating that I understand and agree to the terms described above and give consent to be videotaped for this research.

Name (printed):

Signature Date

If you have further questions about this research, please feel free to contact the Principal Investigator David Zimmerman (dzimmerman@missouristate.edu) or Co-Investigator Shelby G. Wynn (Shelby5019@live.missouristate.edu). If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant please feel free to contact the Missouri State University Institutional Review Board Office at irb@missouristate.edu, or by phone at 417-836-8362 OR 417-836-8991. By signing and dating below, you are indicating that you understand and agree to the terms described above and give consent to be videotaped for this research.

Appendix D. Justification

Likert scale measuring justification. Rate the degree to which you agree with the following statements on a scale from 1-5. (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither agree nor disagree, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly agree

1. The police officer was justified in the ticketing of the suspect/ civilian.
2. The police officer initiated physical contact.
3. The police officer exhausted all other options before resorting to force.
4. The police officer used force against the civilian.
5. The police officer should be reprimanded for his actions.

Appendix E. Empathy

State Empathy Scale [police officer]. Rate the degree to which you agree with the following statements on a scale from 1-5. (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither agree nor disagree, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly agree

1. The police officer's emotions are genuine.
2. I experienced the same emotions as the police officer when watching this video.
3. I was in a similar emotional state as the police officer when watching this video.
4. I can feel the police officer's emotions.
5. I can see the police officer's point of view.
6. I recognize the police officer's situation.
7. I can understand what the police officer was going through in the video.
8. The police officer's reactions to the situation are understandable.
9. When watching the video, I was fully absorbed in the police officer's experience.
10. I can relate to what the police officer was going through in the video.
11. I can understand the police officer's situation in the video.
12. I can identify with the police officer in the video.

State Empathy Scale [civilian]. Rate the degree to which you agree with the following statements on a scale from 1-5. (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither agree nor disagree, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly agree

1. The civilian's emotions are genuine.
2. I experienced the same emotions as the civilian when watching this video.
3. I was in a similar emotional state as the civilian when watching this video.
4. I can feel the civilian's emotions.
5. I can see the civilian's point of view.
6. I recognize the civilian's situation.
7. I can understand what the civilian was going through in the video.
8. The civilian's reactions to the situation are understandable.
9. When watching the video, I was fully absorbed in the civilian's experience.
10. I can relate to what the civilian was going through in the video.
11. I can understand the civilian's situation in the video.
12. I can identify with the civilian in the video.

Appendix F. Causality

Causality Question. (1) Entirely the fault of the civilian, (2) More the fault of the civilian, (3) Neither actor's (civilian's or police officer's) fault, (4) More the fault of the police officer, (5) Entirely the fault of police officer

1. On a scale from 1-5, please indicate which actor (civilian or police officer) was the primary cause of the damage that occurred as a result of the incident.

Appendix G. Demographics

1. Gender (select one) FEMALE MALE TRANSWOMEN TRANSMEN NON-BINARY
OTHER

2. What is your age? _____

3. Are you a U.S. citizen? _____

4. Have you ever been convicted of a felony? _____

5. What is your occupation? _____

6. How many children do you have, if any? _____

How many of your children are under age 18? _____

7. Which of the following statements best describes your highest educational achievement?

_____ Some high school

_____ High school graduate (or GED)

_____ Trade school

_____ Some college

_____ College graduate

_____ Some graduate school

_____ Graduate degree

8. What is your ethnicity? (circle one)

Hispanic

Non-Hispanic

9. What is your race?

Native American/Alaska Native

Asian

African American

Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

White

10. Which of these opinions best represents your views?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely Liberal Slightly Moderate Slightly Conservative Extremely

Liberal Liberal Conservative Conservative

11. What was the race of the civilian in the video?

Black

White

12. What was the race of the police officer in the video?

Black

White

13. Which camera angle perspective did you view the video from?

Body camera

Bystander recording

Appendix H. IRB Approval

Screen Shot 2020-10-14 at 1.18.52 PM

View

Zoom

Share

Highlight

Rotate

Markup

Search

Date: 6-16-2020

IRB #: IRB-FY2020-477
Title: The Impacts of Race and Video Angle on Judgments of Police Interactions
Creation Date: 12-21-2019
End Date:
Status: **Approved**
Principal Investigator: David Zimmerman
Review Board: MSU
Sponsor:

Study History

Submission Type	Initial	Review Type	Expedited	Decision	Approved
Submission Type	Modification	Review Type	Expedited	Decision	Approved
Submission Type	Modification	Review Type	Expedited	Decision	Approved

Key Study Contacts

Member	David Zimmerman	Role	Principal Investigator	Contact	dzimmerman@missouristate.edu
Member	Shelby Wynn	Role	Primary Contact	Contact	shelby5019@live.missouristate.edu
Member	Shelby Wynn	Role	Investigator	Contact	shelby5019@live.missouristate.edu
Member	Shanna Borthick-Compton	Role	Investigator	Contact	shanna1986@live.missouristate.edu
Member	Kailee Prentice	Role	Investigator	Contact	prentice33@live.missouristate.edu
Member	Payton Owens	Role	Investigator	Contact	payton101@live.missouristate.edu

Appendix I. Consent Form

Researchers at Missouri State University are asking you to take part in a study on judgements of video-recorded encounters. The purpose of this research is to better understand how people judge the actions of individuals in a video-recorded interaction. We plan to have approximately 150 participants in this study. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to watch a short video. You will also complete questionnaires that measure your perceptions about what happened in the video. Participation should take about 45 minutes to 1 hour.

There are few foreseeable risks for participating in this research. You will receive course credit for participating. Benefits to you are the positive educational experience of participating in important research, and the potential benefits to society are increased knowledge of human perception.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have a right to refuse to participate without consequences. If you decide not to participate your decision will not affect your relationship with Missouri State University or any of the researchers involved with this study. If you decide to participate you may discontinue participation at any time. You may refuse to answer any specific questions or refuse to engage in any task at any time during the study. Withdrawal or refusing to answer specific questions or engage in specific tasks will not result in any consequences to you and will not affect your relationship with Missouri State University or any of the researchers involved with this study.

Your responses to all of the questions will remain confidential. Information gathered from you will be stored on password protected computers, and all of your responses will be completely confidential. By checking the box below, you indicate that you have read this consent form, that you fully understand the nature and consequences of participation and that you have had all questions regarding participation in this study answered satisfactorily.

If you have further questions about this research, please feel free to contact the Principal Investigator **David Zimmerman** (dzimmerman@missouristate.edu) or Co-Investigator Shelby G. Wynn (Shelby5019@live.missouristate.edu). If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant please feel free to contact the Missouri State University Institutional Review Board Office at irb@missouristate.edu, or by phone at 417-836-8362 OR 417-836-8991.