American Psychological Association
American Psychology-Law Society
Law and Human Behavior

© 2019 American Psychological Association
0147-7307/19/$12.00
2019, Vol. 43, No. 5, 421–435
http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000339

The Force of Fear: Police Stereotype Threat, Self-Legitimacy, and Support for Excessive Force

Rick Trinkner
Arizona State University

Erin M. Kerrison
University of California, Berkeley

Phillip Atiba Goff
John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Researchers have linked police officers' concerns with appearing racist—a kind of stereotype threat—to racial disparities in the use of force. This study presents the first empirical test of the hypothesized psychological mechanism linking stereotype threat to police support for violence. We hypothesized that stereotype threat undermines officers' self-legitimacy, or the confidence they have in their inherent authority, encouraging overreliance on coercive policing to maintain control. Officers (n = 784) from the patrol division of a large urban police force completed a survey in order to test this hypothesis. Respondents completed measures of stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, resistance to use of force policy, approval of unreasonable force, and endorsement of procedurally fair policing. Structural equation models showed that elevated stereotype threat was associated with lower self-legitimacy ($\beta = -.15$), which in turn was associated with more resistance to restrictions on force ($\beta = -.17$), greater approval of unreasonable force ($\beta = -.31$), and lower endorsement of fair policing ($\beta = .57$). These results reveal that concerns about appearing racist are actually associated with increased support for coercive policing—potentially further eroding public trust.

Public Significance Statement
This study links police officers' concerns with appearing racist when interacting with community members to diminished confidence in their legitimate authority and greater support for coercive policing. In this respect, negative stereotypes of police officers can potentially undermine officer morale and public safety.

Keywords: police, stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, use of force, procedural justice

Supplemental materials: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000339.supp

The "racist police officer" stereotype is one of the most enduring stereotypes of law enforcement in America, irrespective of officer race (Cochran & Warren, 2012; Skolnick, 2008; Tyler & Wakslak, 2004). A simple Internet search reveals millions of hits highlighting racism in law enforcement. Links between racism and policing can be seen throughout our cultural narratives (e.g., Edelman, 2016), newspapers (e.g., Owen, 2017), academic books (e.g., Rios, 2011), and media portrayals (e.g., Haggis et al., 2004). Over the last few years this social representation has become even more salient amid continuing racial disparities throughout the criminal justice system (Goff, Lloyd, Geller, Raphael, & Glaser, 2016; Mustard, 2001; Travis, Western, & Redburn, 2014) and a seemingly unending string of highly publicized controversial incidents involving police officers shooting (sometimes unarmed) non-White community members, particularly young Black men. Despite this salience, relatively little is known about how awareness of this stereotype influences officers and how they approach members of the community. This article examines how officers' concerns with appearing racist plays an ironic and underexplored role in support for coercive and aggressive policing.

Why would concerns with appearing racist be linked to greater officer violence? Drawing from the stereotype threat literature, Richardson and Goff (2014) argue that concerns about confirming the "racist officer" stereotype diminishes officers' sense of moral

This article was published Online First July 15, 2019.

Rick Trinkner, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Arizona State University; Erin M. Kerrison, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley; Phillip Atiba Goff, Center for Policing Equity, John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the MacArthur Foundation. We are also grateful for thoughtful feedback from the Center for Policing Equity Research Lab and to Mirelis Gonzalez for editorial feedback. The dataset used in this article was also used by Trinkner et al. (2016). Portions of the analysis described below have been presented at the American Psychology-Law Society's annual conference and the American Society of Criminology's annual conference.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Phillip Atiba Goff, Center for Policing Equity, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, 524 West 59th Street, Suite 6.63.30, New York, NY 10019. E-mail: goff@policingequity.org

authority, resulting in a greater reliance on coercive tactics to establish and maintain control when policing individuals, especially within non-White communities. Their hypothesized link between the undermining of officers' moral authority and greater support for coercive tactics is consistent with recent criminological work linking officers' self-legitimacy—that is, their confidence in the power imbued within their role as police officers (Bottoms & Tankebe, 2012)—and support for nonaggressive policing strategies (Bradford & Quinton, 2014; Tankebe & Meško, 2014). Richardson and Goff's (2014) perspective directly contradicts the arguments from those who stipulate that officers' fear of being caught engaging in purportedly racist behavior leads to the withdrawal of police officers from their duties (i.e., de-policing, Sutton, 2015). If true, then the undermining of self-legitimacy due to stereotype threat is not only problematic to officers and their institutions, but also presents pernicious risks to the communities they police.

However, to date there has been almost no research examining the relation between officers' concerns over appearing racist and support for coercive policing. Moreover, no study has empirically examined Richardson and Goff's (2014) argument that officers' sense of moral authority mediates this relation. The goal of the present article is to address this gap by testing their argument using data from a survey of patrol officers and sergeants in a large urban police department. In doing so, we also provide the first theoretical integration of the stereotype threat (Steele, 1997; Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002) and police legitimacy (Bottoms & Tankebe, 2012; Tyler, 2006) literatures.

Chronic Stereotype Threat and Social Identity

Stereotype threat refers to concerns with being evaluated in terms of or confirming a negative stereotype relevant to a valued group of which one is a member (Steele, 1997; Steele et al., 2002). Importantly, individuals do not actually have to endorse the stereotype to experience threat from it. Instead, it can arise whenever a person believes they will be evaluated in terms of the negative stereotype. For example, in their landmark series of studies, Steele and Aronson (1995) showed that Black students experience greater apprehension when they feel others are evaluating their test performance in terms of the stereotype that Blacks are intellectually inferior. Ironically, those students perform worse on a verbal ability test of "intellectual ability" than their similarly situated White student peers. However, in situations where they were told that the test was nondiagnostic of ability, Black students performed as well as their White counterparts. This finding highlights a malicious aspect of stereotype threat: Concerns about confirming a negative stereotype can elicit precisely the stereotypic behavior one is trying to avoid. Since their original study, hundreds of studies have found similar effects across a range of stereotypes, domains, and performance tasks (Pennington, Heim, Levy, & Larkin, 2016).

Importantly, while stereotype threat in educational settings has traditionally been studied as a situational phenomenon, it should also be understood in terms of the chronic effects it has on individuals' social identity. To the extent that social identities are an expression of self-concept (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999), stereotype threats in valued domains represent challenges to self-image and self-worth (Steele, 1997; Trinkner & Goff, 2016). At the same time, they also represent challenges to one's social group, as confirming a negative stereotype affects the way people view the group itself and other members (Steele et al., 2002). As a result, people are especially motivated to reduce the conflict associated with identity threats, often by aggressing against or avoiding the source altogether—both immediately and over time (Branscombe et al., 1999; Goff, Steele, & Davies, 2008; Major & O'Brien, 2005).

When individuals experience stereotype threat, they can respond by distancing themselves from the domain in which they are stereotyped, either momentarily disengaging or disidentifying with the domain more broadly (Steele, 1997; Steele et al., 2002). If individuals distance themselves from that domain in a given situation, a negative stereotype is less threatening. For example, Steele and Aronson (1995) showed that Black students avoided expressing preferences for activities typically associated with Black culture (e.g., jazz, hip-hop, basketball) during episodes when they experienced stereotype threat. Similarly, if an individual distances their social identity from a stereotype-relevant domain, then they are less susceptible to chronic stereotype threat. For instance, using longitudinal panel data, Woodcock, Hernandez, Estrada, and Schultz (2012) found that highly motivated Latinx college science students were more likely to shed their identity as scientists the more they experienced stereotype threat, depressing their interest in pursuing scientific careers. Taken together, the literature suggests stereotype threat poses both situational and chronic risks to individuals' self-concept.

Stereotype Threat in the Police Context

Scholars are increasingly utilizing stereotype threat theory within law enforcement contexts (Kahn, McMahon, & Stewart, 2018; Najdowski, 2011; Najdowski, Bottoms, & Goff, 2015). To date, this literature has exclusively focused on community members' experiences of stereotype threat, particularly among Black individuals, and how these experiences can potentially influence the way officers respond to them. For example, research by Najdowski, Bottoms, and Goff (2015) found that Black individuals reported more concern than White individuals that police officers would respond to them unfairly because of the stereotype that Black people are violent and criminal. Moreover, they also found that chronic stereotype threat among Black individuals was associated with behaviors that police find suspicious.

Less attention has been given to the ways in which officers' experience of stereotype threat may influence their responses to members of the community. Although stereotype threat within police officers can be induced by the application of any negative stereotype associated with the profession, the focus in this article is on the threat that arises when officers are concerned about confirming or being evaluated in terms of the "racist police officer" stereotype (Richardson & Goff, 2014; Trinkner & Goff, 2016).

Two important things need to be noted about the nature of this stereotype threat that distinguish it from other stereotype threats identified in the social psychological literature more broadly. First, in contrast to work in nonpolicing contexts showing that Whites are particularly susceptible to concerns of being judged as racists (e.g., Goff et al., 2008; Richeson & Shelton, 2007; Shelton &

Richeson, 2006), officers of all races have been shown to be equally susceptible to the racist police officer stereotype (Goff & Martin, 2012; Goff, Martin, & Gamson-Smiedt, 2012). Indeed, it is fairly common for officers of all races to report being called racist by same-race community members (Goff & Martin, 2012; Goff et al., 2012).

Second, the racist police officer stereotype threat functions at both an episodic/situational level and at a dispositional/chronic level. Officers are most likely to be confronted with a stereotype threatening event in situations when they are interacting with non-White community members. These instances are akin to those studied in the traditional stereotype threat literature (e.g., a Black student taking an aptitude test). Officers are also likely to encounter the stereotype many times throughout their careers, constituting a chronic condition that is not solely dependent on immediate encounters with non-White community members.

Despite the salience of the "racist police officer" stereotype, relatively little is known about the effects that awareness of it has on officer behavior. To date, only two studies have examined officers' concerns about confirming the stereotype, with both coming to similar conclusions as the broader stereotype threat literature: officers concerned about appearing racist are also more likely to engage in behaviors that confirm the stereotype. Goff, Martin, and Gamson-Smiedt (2012) examined the relation between stereotype threat and officers' use of force in the previous 2 years among 99 officers from the San Jose Police Department. In this study, officers completed measures of stereotype threat, as well as implicit and explicit racial bias. They found that the more officers reported concern about confirming the racist officer stereotype, the higher the proportion of their uses of force occurred against Black residents. Importantly, this positive association emerged controlling for implicit/explicit racial bias and officer demographics (i.e., age, ethnicity, length of service, education level, and income).

A second study of 196 officers from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department found similar results (Goff & Martin, 2012). Here, officers completed measures of stereotype threat, explicit prejudice, and general anxiety toward non-White racial and ethnic groups. Their analyses showed that higher levels of stereotype threat were associated with greater disparities in the severity of use of force against Black residents during the previous year. However, similar relations did not emerge in terms of disparities in the severity of use of force against Latinx or White residents. Again, these findings emerged even after controlling for officers' explicit racial biases and anxiety toward non-White racial and ethnic groups, as well as officers' age, race, ethnicity, and length of service. Together, these findings are consistent with the stereotype threat literature that individuals do not actually need to endorse the stereotype (i.e., be racist) in order to experience the negative consequences of simply being aware of it (Steele et al., 2002).

To explain these findings, Richardson and Goff (2014) argue that the experience of stereotype threat undermines officers' confidence in their moral authority to control situations in noncoercive ways. As they note, officers have two broad forms of authority they can rely on in order to maintain control of an encounter (see also Alpert & Dunham, 2004). The first is the unchallenged moral or legal authority that is afforded to law enforcement. The second is the coercive or physical authority they are allowed to use in situations they see as potentially dangerous. Typically, officers are trained to use their moral authority whenever possible to resolve conflicts (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). However, when officers believe that community members will judge them as racist, they may be more likely to believe that community members will not respect them or recognize that moral authority (Goff, Epstein, Mentovich, & Reddy, 2013; Nix & Wolfe, 2017; Richardson, 2015). If officers feel they cannot draw from their position as moral authorities to control situations, they may be more likely to exert control in more forceful ways. As a result, authority-threatening stimuli may produce greater reliance on physical coercion. Thus, the fear of being perceived as racist may implicitly facilitate the use of coercive behavior.

The argument put forth by Richardson and Goff (2014) maps onto Steele's (1997; Steele et al., 2002) notions of disengagement and disidentification. Steele and colleagues argue that individuals can respond to stereotype threat by diminishing the importance of that aspect of their social identity, thereby making them less susceptible to the application of the negative stereotype. A core part of police officers' moral authority comes from their identity as representatives of a legal system built on principles of justice and equality (Bradford & Quinton, 2014; Jackson, Bradford, Stanko, & Hohl, 2013). In situations where this foundation is threatened through the potential application of the negative stereotype that police officers are racist, a natural response can be to disengage from that aspect of their identity (Goff et al., 2013). Naturally, these stereotype threatening situations are most likely to arise when officers are interacting with non-White community members, which would explain the links between racially disparate use of force and officers' experience of stereotype threat found by Goff and his colleagues (Goff & Martin, 2012; Goff et al., 2012).

Given the pervasiveness of the racist police officer stereotype, officers likely have both situational and chronic reactions to it. This means that, in a given interaction, an officer may not be able to rely on the moral authority of policing. Similarly, over time, officers may distance themselves from the strict moral code of lawfulness and fairness that are most closely challenged by the negative stereotype. This disidentification is consistent with previous research on officer cynicism (Richardsen, Burke, & Martinussen, 2006). Left without that moral authority as a buffer, officers experiencing stereotype threat should increase thier support for the use of coercion more generally.

Self-Legitimacy as Normative Moral Authority

The argument put forth by Richardson and Goff (2014) concerning the influence of officers' moral authority on coercive policing is consistent with recent theorizing in criminology examining officers' perceptions of the legitimacy of their own authority. In its broadest sense, legitimacy signifies that an authority is consistent with a group's norms, values, beliefs, and practices (Zelditch, 2001). Applied to policing, legitimacy represents a moral binding between the public consent to be policed and legal authority, where community members believe it is their moral duty to obey the directives of the police and the police view it as their moral duty to maintain social order and protect members of society (Bradford & Quinton, 2014; Jackson et al., 2013; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). Typically, police legitimacy is thought of in terms of community members' perceptions of legal authority. The more they view the legal system and its agents as legitimate, the more

likely they are to support (Tyler, 2006), follow (Reisig, Tankebe, & Meško, 2014), and cooperate (Tyler & Fagan, 2008) with the law.

However, Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) provide an alternative view of police legitimacy, arguing that legitimacy arises from negotiated engagement—a dialogue—between those that hold power and those that do not hold power. Essentially, power holders make claims on the ability to use the power in their station to regulate society, to provide a moral social order. Nonpower holders either recognize those claims and internalize a duty to obey or reject them and feel no duty to cooperate with power holders. In this way, legal authorities can obtain a normatively justified monopoly on the power to regulate behavior. From this perspective, police legitimacy can be separated into two distinct constructs. First, there are community members' views of whether the police occupy a special place of authority in society that entitles them to deference and obedience (i.e., audience legitimacy) which is the focus of most police legitimacy research. Equally important, though widely understudied in comparison, are officers' own views on the justifiability of their position in society and their confidence in using the power inherent in that role—that is, self-legitimacy.

According to Bottoms and Tankebe (2012), legitimacy is not just a function of how others view police officers but must also come from within the officers themselves (see also Tankebe, 2014). Officers have a fundamental need to cultivate the belief that they have the legitimate right to hold power. In this respect, self-legitimacy is a cornerstone of officers' identity because it represents their own internal beliefs about their role within society. Like any other aspect of one's self-concept, self-legitimacy is self-constructed, in this case through the internalization of the belief that an officer occupies a special and distinct place in society (Bradford & Quinton, 2014; Tankebe, 2014). In liberal democracies such as the U.S., this comes from the belief that officers are representatives of a just and equitable legal system tasked with the neutral application of laws that represent the shared values of society (Bradford & Quinton, 2014; Jackson et al., 2013). To self-legitimated officers, the power they wield as agents of formal social control is both morally right and normatively appropriate.

Due to the scarcity of research on self-legitimacy, the sources of officers' self-legitimacy are not well understood (Bottoms & Tankebe, 2012; Bradford & Quinton, 2014; Tankebe, 2014). To date, most of the work has examined organizational factors. Work exploring sources outside of the organizational context has highlighted that officers are more likely to see themselves as legitimate when they believe residents think they are legitimate (Tankebe & Meško, 2014) and support them (Bradford & Quinton, 2014). Cynical officers who believe community members are apathetic toward the police are less likely to see themselves as legitimate as well (Trinkner, Tyler, & Goff, 2016). Low self-legitimacy is also associated with exposure to negative media portrayals in the news (Nix & Wolfe, 2017). Although none of these studies examined the impact of stereotype threat specifically, they are consistent with the underlying arguments of Richardson and Goff (2014) that officers' apprehension about being negatively evaluated by community members' can diminish their sense of moral authority.

Legitimacy scholars have argued that officers' self-legitimacy will influence the way they approach, interpret, and react to encounters with residents (Bottoms & Tankebe, 2012; Bradford & Quinton, 2014; Tankebe, 2014). In order to justify to community members the legitimacy of the power vested in them, officers must wield power in a way that mirrors their self-beliefs about their position in society as fair and equitable agents of the rule of law. To do otherwise would be inconsistent with their self-concept as a legitimate agent of social control upholding the moral social order. Moreover, reliance on brute force would be incongruous to their claims as rightful power holders because it would communicate to community members that police officers occupy their position simply because they can cause harm to the community rather than because they represent the shared values of society. If police officers' claims of legitimacy to community members are based on their belief that their power is ethically justified and morally appropriate, then self-legitimacy should be associated with greater support for less coercive policing. As Bradford and Quinton (2014) argued:

> Greater self-legitimacy may make [police officers] more assured; more able to engage in difficult decisions in constructive ways; more willing to allow members of the public a say during processes of interaction and, crucially, inclined only to use force as a last resort to reestablish order . . . By contrast, officers who have a weaker sense of their own legitimacy may be more timid and less willing to interact with the public because this might throw up difficult questions or challenges to their authority. Moreover, when they do interact, these officers . . . may be more sensitive to problems and provocations, and quicker to use physical force, because they lack the self-belief to assert and maintain their authority in other, less confrontational, ways. (pp. 1027–1028)

In part, research has supported these assertions. Officers' self-legitimacy has been linked to more commitment to fair treatment, more respect for suspects' rights, greater support for community policing, and a greater willingness to work with community stakeholders to solve neighborhood problems (Bradford & Quinton, 2014; Meško, Hacin, Tankebe, & Fields, 2017; Wolfe & Nix, 2016). Moreover, when officers are not confident in the justifiability of their power, they have difficulty maintaining control over situations, particularly those in which force is an available response option (Bottoms & Tankebe, 2013).

To date, only a handful of studies, mostly outside the U.S., have examined the relation between self-legitimacy and the use of force specifically. In a 2011 study, Tankebe found that self-legitimacy was unassociated with support for the use of force net of officer (e.g., commitment) and organizational (e.g., corruption) controls. However, in a later study, Bradford and Quinton (2014) found that officers higher in self-legitimacy were less supportive of using force. Similarly, Tankebe and Meško (2014) asked officers how they would respond to a situation involving a belligerent intoxicated person, finding that officers high in self-legitimacy were also more likely to resolve the situation by issuing a verbal warning instead of threatening the use of force. In the only study to date of officers in the U.S., Trinkner, Tyler, and Goff (2016) found a negative association between officers' self-legitimacy and their support for using force against community members.

Current Study

Richardson and Goff (2014) argue that for police officers, stereotype threat around racism promotes coercive police tactics via its effects on their sense of moral authority. To date, the

hypothesized mechanism linking stereotype threat to coercive policing has not been tested empirically. However, the argument is consistent with prior research positing that individuals can respond to stereotype threat by psychologically distancing themselves from the stereotyped aspects of their identity (Steele, 1997; Steele et al., 2002). Richardson and Goff's (2014) argument is also consistent with recent developments in police legitimacy theory showing that officers' beliefs in the legitimacy of their own authority is intricately tied to their self-concept (Bottoms & Tankebe, 2013), that self-legitimacy is tied to officers' views about how community members judge them (Bradford & Quinton, 2014), and that self-legitimacy influences how officers approach and evaluate their encounters with community members (Tankebe & Meško, 2014).

We provide the first empirical test of Richardson and Goff's (2014) hypothesized mechanism linking stereotype threat to coercive and noncoercive policing styles with survey data from a large metropolitan police department. Following their argument, we expected that (a) stereotype threat would be negatively associated with self-legitimacy; (b) self-legitimacy would be negatively associated with support for coercive police behavior and positively associated with support for noncoercive policing; and (c) that self-legitimacy would mediate the relation between stereotype threat and support for coercive and noncoercive tactics.

To assess noncoercive policing, this study measures participants' support for procedurally just policing. Endorsement of procedurally just policing was included as an alternative way to assess the relations among stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, and coercive policing tactics. Coercive policing tactics are rooted in an instrumental view of human nature whereby individuals behave in ways that maximize rewards and minimize punishment (Mastrofski, Snipes, & Supina, 1996). From this perspective, control over a situation can be maintained by officers through the warning of or actual use of force to secure compliance from the public. Procedurally just policing, on the other hand, is rooted in a value-based understanding of human nature which assumes that behavior is best motivated by individuals' internalized beliefs about what constitutes proper authority and their duties as community members to support the legal system (Jackson et al., 2013; Tyler, 2006). In this approach, the law and its agents utilize their power in socially normative ways (e.g., in a respectful, neutral, and benevolent manner) to instill a sense of shared values and feelings of obligation to obey police directives. Here, the police maintain control over the situation not through the application of coercive force, but rather by reminding individuals of their obligations as law-abiding community members. In this respect, procedural justice has been positioned as an alternative policing strategy to more coercive styles (Schulhofer, Tyler, & Huq, 2011; Tyler, Goff, & MacCoun, 2015; Tyler & Trinkner, 2018). If stereotype threat undermines officers' confidence in their normative authority—their self-legitimacy—which is associated with reliance on using force to maintain control of situations, then the diminishment of self-legitimacy should also blunt their endorsement of a policing style that eschews the use of force to secure compliance.

In addition, all the analyses discussed below control for officers' cynicism toward community members and their perceptions of the risks associated with their job. These control variables were included to provide a more robust test of the relations among stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, and coercive policing. Officer cynicism is characterized by apathy toward the job, distrust of community members, and a negative worldview (Bennett & Schmitt, 2002; Gilmartin, 2002; Loftus, 2010). Cynical officers have a low regard for their job and the institution of policing itself. Prior work has linked officer cynicism to lower levels of self-legitimacy (Trinkner et al., 2016). At the same time, they are also more suspicious of community members, believing that the public is actively working against them and has little respect for law enforcement. Greater cynicism in officers has been associated with more hostile interactions with community members (Regoli, Crank, & Rivera, 1990). A measure of officers' perceptions of risk was added because officers are more likely to use coercive police tactics when they work in more dangerous neighborhoods (Terrill & Reisig, 2003). We did not have access to neighborhood-level measures of violence, so officers' perceptions of danger in their work environment was used as a proxy.

Method

Participants

This study used a convenience sample drawn from patrol officers and sergeants from the patrol division of a large urban police force. Over an 8-week period, researchers attended each patrol roll call (i.e., morning, afternoon, and night shifts) at every individual station in the department. Approximately 1–2 weeks after the first visit, researchers returned to each roll call to remind officers about the survey and to distribute additional survey packets to those officers not present at the first visit or had lost their survey. Additionally, some stations that had a low response rate after the first two visits were visited a third time. For each usable survey returned, a $20 donation was made to a local police memorial foundation.

Seven hundred eighty-four usable surveys were returned. While we are unable to provide an exact response rate because of the possibility that such information will jeopardize the identity of the police department studied, we can confirm that the officers came from one of the 15 largest state and local law enforcement agencies in the United States. According to the most recent data available (Reaves, 2011), the fifteenth largest department had 2,181 total full-time sworn officers, while the second largest department had 13,354 officers. We removed the largest department (New York Police Department) because it is almost three times the size of the second largest department and we can confirm that our sample was not drawn from there. Using those two numbers as the denominators, we can say that the response rate in this study was between 5.8% and 25.7%. It should be noted that those endpoints are underestimates given that we only targeted officers in the patrol division to complete the survey. Unfortunately, Reaves (2011) does not provide the size of the patrol division for the 50 departments included in that list.

Of those that returned the survey, 507 officers provided complete data for this analysis. Further examination revealed that in a majority of cases with missing data, officers completed the psychological measures, but withheld basic demographic information (see Table 1). For those officers that did provide complete data, most of them were men (80%), patrol officers (90%), and individuals that completed some form of postsecondary education (79%). A little over half the sample (55%) reported being White. Sex, race, and rank of the sample were representative of the overall

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Sample Demographics

Variables	Completed	% Missing	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	α
Stereotype threat†	775	1.4	1.99	.98	1	5	.90
Self-legitimacy†	767	2.4	3.79	.80	1	5	.65
Resistance†	776	1.3	2.60	.73	1	5	.63
Unreasonable force†	768	2.3	1.39	.74	1	5	.68
Procedural justice endorsement†	782	.50	3.64	.64	1.11	4.95	.93
Cynicism†	782	.50	3.28	.52	1.79	4.86	.84
Risk†	774	1.5	3.50	.76	1	5.00	.93
Age	590	24.9	43.15	8.56	25	63	—
Experience	679	13.6	14.34	7.86	0	40	—
Sex	720	8.4		Men: $n = 579$, 80.42%			—
Rank	714	9.2		Sergeant: $n = 73$, 10.22%			—
College graduate	742	5.6		Graduate: $n = 587$, 79.11%			—
White	690	12.2		White: $n = 378$, 54.78%			—

Note. $n = 784$; Sex: 1 = man, 0 = woman; Rank:1 = sergeant, 0 = line officer; College graduate: 1 = yes, 0 = no; White: 1 = White, 0 = non-White.
† Observed scales constructed by averaging the measure's respective items.

demographic makeup across the entire patrol division of the department. On average, officers were 43-years-old with 14 years of job experience.

Measures

Unless otherwise noted, all items used a 5-point unipolar response scale (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *completely*/*always*) and were coded so that higher scores indicated a greater amount of the measured construct. Descriptive statistics for all measures, including scale reliabilities, are presented in Table 1. For those items not displayed in the tables below, see the supplemental appendix (available online at www.researchgate.net/profile/Rick_Trinkner). Except for the measure of stereotype threat, all items were used by Trinkner et al. (2016) in their study of organizational fairness within police departments.

Stereotype threat. Stereotype threat was measured with six items assessing officers' concerns about confirming a racist stereotype when interacting with community members. These items have previously been used by Goff et al. (2012).

Self-legitimacy. Self-legitimacy was measured with three items assessing the degree to which officers were confident in their authority and their position within society as formal agents of the law.

Resistance to use of force policy. The first measure of officers' support for coercive policing assessed officer's resistance to the department's use of force policy. Five items were included assessing officers' beliefs about the restrictiveness of the department's policy and how tolerant they were to violations of the policy. At the time data were collected, the police department's use of force policy could be characterized as restricting officers from using force except in situations where force was objectively reasonable to prevent injury or death; necessary to prevent injury, death, or compel compliance with a legal command; and proportional to the physical resistance or threat represented by the suspect. This language is paraphrased from the department's "Main Use of Force Policy."

Approval of unreasonable force. The second measure of officers' support for coercive policing tapped the approval of unreasonable uses of force. Two items were included asking officers how much they approved of striking a resident for saying vulgar things to officers and striking a suspect being questioned as a suspect in a murder case.

Procedural justice endorsement. The final measure of officers' support for coercive policing assessed officers' support for engaging with the public in a procedurally just manner. This 19-item measure was designed to tap into five areas of procedurally just officer behavior: voice (e.g., *When interacting with community residents, how important is it to allow community residents to voice their opinions when you make decisions that affect them?*), respect (e.g., *When interacting with community residents, how important is it for people to be treated with respect, regardless of their respect for the police?*), accountability (e.g., *How much of a waste of time do you think it is to explain your decisions to community residents?*), benevolence (e.g., *When interacting with community residents, how important is it to show them that you care about their problems?*), and neutrality (e.g., *When interacting with community residents, how important is it to be impartial with them?*).

Control variables. Two control variables were included to provide a more robust test of the relations among stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, and coercive policing. The first control was *cynicism toward community members*. To measure cynicism, 14 items were included assessing officers' cynicism toward the job (e.g., *In a typical day, how much of your time is spent dealing with people's petty problems?*) and the community (e.g., *How often do you have reason to be distrustful of community residents?*). The second control was officers' *perceptions of the risks* associated with their job. This measure consisted of seven items asking officers how often their current assignment puts them in situations involving risk (e.g., *How often does your current assignment put you in situations that present a serious danger of you being physically injured?*).

Procedure

Data collection procedures were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of California, Los Angeles. At each roll call session, researchers from the Center for Policing Equity (CPE) explained the mission of the research or-

ganization they represented and that they were conducting a survey examining officers' views about different aspects of their job and department. It was stressed that completion of the survey was voluntary, all surveys would remain anonymous, and raw data would not be released to the public or command staff. This is in keeping with the CPE's collaborative agreement with law enforcement that allows individual departments to remain anonymous in exchange for access to their data (see policingequity.org for more information). Researchers then addressed any officer questions and distributed the survey packets. Each survey packet contained a description of the goals of the study, contact information for the research team, the questionnaire, and a postage paid return envelope. If officers could not complete the survey immediately, they were told to complete it whenever they could and mail it back. Extra survey packets were left for officers that were not in attendance.

Results

All analyses were conducted using Stata 15 (StataCorp, 2017). Results from additional analyses that are discussed, but not presented, are available in the supplemental appendix.

Officer Race

Prior research in the general stereotype threat literature shows that Whites tend to be more susceptible to concerns with appearing racist (Richeson & Shelton, 2007; Shelton & Richeson, 2006). On the other hand, prior studies of racist stereotype threat in police officers have shown that White and non-White officers do not significantly vary in their concerns over appearing racist (Goff & Martin, 2012; Goff et al., 2012). However, those findings may have been due to a power issue given the comparatively smaller samples used in both studies. Despite the findings of Goff and colleagues, we wanted to examine the extent to which officer race predicted stereotype threat for three reasons. First, the large sample in the present analysis addresses the potential power problem from previous studies. Second, given the well-established findings from the general stereotype threat literature and the comparatively few studies examining racist stereotype threat among officers, it seemed premature to assume that officer race would have no association with stereotype threat. Third, the conflicting findings between the general stereotype threat literature and the police stereotype threat literature have important ramifications for our modeling strategy described below (i.e., whether officer race should be positioned as a predictor of stereotype threat or as a control variable when assessing the association between stereotype threat and self-legitimacy).

For this analysis we used multiple regression. Results are shown in Table 2. Cynicism ($\beta = .23$) was the only significant predictor of stereotype threat with more cynical officers reporting a greater concern with being stereotyped as racist. Officer race was not significantly associated with stereotype threat, indicating that White and non-White officers were equally susceptible to stereotype threat. This finding also suggests that it is unlikely that officer race is associated with self-legitimacy via its influence on officers' experience of stereotype threat. None of the other control variables were significantly related to stereotype threat.

Although no significant differences in the experience of racist stereotype threat was found between White and non-White officers, one could argue that the association between stereotype threat and self-legitimacy varies as a function of officer race. For example, it may be that while non-White officers are just as concerned about appearing racist when interacting with community members as White officers, that concern does not negatively affect their self-legitimacy in the same way as White officers. While this possibility has not been explored empirically or theoretically in the police officer stereotype threat literature (Trinkner & Goff, 2016), we wanted to explore it further to assess if any moderating effect between officer race and stereotype threat needed to be accounted for in the model test below. For this analysis we again used multiple regression. Results are shown in Table 2. As expected, stereotype threat ($\beta = -.16$) was negatively associated with

Table 2
Estimates From Multiple Regressions Examining the Relations Among Stereotype Threat, Self-Legitimacy, Controls, and Demographics

	Stereotype threat			Self-legitimacy		
Predictors	β	b [95% CI]	*SE*	β	b [95% CI]	*SE*
Age	−.004	−.000 [−.02, .02]	.01	.20**	.02 [.01, .03]	.01
Experience	−.08	−.01 [−.03, .01]	.01	−.18**	−.02 [−.03, −.003]	.01
Rank	.01	.03 [−.27, .33]	.15	.11*	.28 [.05, .51]	.12
Sex	.01	.04 [−.18, .26]	.11	.01	.02 [−.15, .19]	.09
College graduate	−.04	−.11 [−.32, .11]	.11	−.04	−.06 [−.22, .11]	.09
White	.05	.11 [−.07, .28]	.09	.11	−.25 [−.54, .05]	.07
Cynicism	.23***	.45 [.26, .64]	.10	−.30***	−.46 [−.61, −.31]	.08
Risk	.05	.07 [−.05, .20]	.06	.25***	.24 [.15, .34]	.05
Stereotype threat	—	—	—	−.16*	−.13 [−.23, −.03]	.05
Stereotype threat × White	—	—	—	.11	.07 [−.06, .20]	.07
Constant	—	.46 [−.48, 1.40]	.48	—	4.18 [3.46, 4.92]	.38
F(*df*)		5.83 (8, 517)***			7.46 (10, 512)***	
R^2		.08			.13	
n		526			523	

Note. Sex: 1 = man; College graduate: 1 = yes; White: 1 = White; Rank: 1 = Sergeant.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

self-legitimacy. Officer race was not associated with self-legitimacy, nor was there a significant interaction between stereotype threat and officer race on self-legitimacy. Older officers ($\beta = .20$) and those who thought policing was riskier ($\beta = .25$), were more likely to see themselves as legitimate authorities, while more job experience ($\beta = -.18$) and cynicism toward the community ($\beta = -.30$) were associated with less self-legitimacy.

Measurement Model

Next, data from the five primary variables of interest were subjected to a confirmatory factor analysis using Stata's structural equation modeling (SEM) package. The model used full information maximum likelihood (FIML) estimation to account for missing data. This model included five latent variables: stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, resistance, unreasonable force, and procedural justice endorsement. All latent variables were allowed to correlate. With the exception of procedural justice endorsement, all items were entered as indicators of their hypothesized latent variable. For the procedural justice endorsement variable, items were put into five parcels of procedurally fair behavior that were included as indicators of the latent outcome. Each parcel was constructed by averaging the responses for each component of procedural justice. We used parceling for two reasons. First, the primary interest in our analysis was in assessing the structural relationships among the latent variables, rather than the measurement portion of the model (Little, Cunningham, Shahar, & Widaman, 2002). Second, including a second-order factor in which the five procedural justice endorsement components were entered as latent variables would dramatically increase the complexity of an already complex model. To guard against possible bias, we ran five separate models in which the procedural justice endorsement latent variable was replaced with one of the parcels that was entered as a latent construct with its respective items as indicators. The results were similar to the confirmatory factor analysis presented below.

Factor loadings and fit statistics for the final confirmatory model are presented in Table 3; correlations among the latent variables are presented in Table 4. With respect to model fit, the chi-square value was significant, although this is a common occurrence with large samples (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008). The RMSEA was within acceptable parameters at .07 (Steiger, 2007). The CFI indicated marginally good fit at .92. Unfortunately, Stata does not provide SRMR when using FIML estimation; however, if the model is run with only complete cases (available upon request), the

Table 3
Standardized Factor Loadings for Measurement Model Assessing Relations Among Stereotype Threat, Self-Legitimacy, Resistance, Unreasonable Use of Force, and Procedural Justice Support

	Factor loadings
Stereotype threat	
How much do you worry that people may think of you as racist because you are a police officer?	.75
How much do you worry that people you deal with on the job might misinterpret something you say as racist?	.76
How much do you worry that because you are a police officer you may get negative reactions from people who are minority group members?	.84
How much do you worry that being a police officer makes it harder for you to be friendly with people from minority groups?	.78
How much do you worry that you being a police officer influences what people who are minority group members think of you?	.82
How much do you worry about whether you come across as racist when you deal with people from minority groups?	.72
Self-legitimacy	
How much do you, as a police officer, feel you represent the values of the public in areas where you work?	.59
How confident are you in using the authority that has been given to you as a police officer?	.66
How much do you believe that, as a police officer, you occupy a position of special importance in society?	.64
Resistance to use of force policy	
How restrictive are the department rules regarding the use of force?	.35
How justifiable are violations of the department's use of force policies?	.29
How often are you in situations where it is necessary to use more force than allowed by department policy?	.74
How tolerable is it to sometimes use more force than what is necessary?	.66
How much are the police restricted from using as much force as is often necessary?	.52
Approval of unreasonable use of force	
How much would you approve of a police officer striking a community resident who had said vulgar or obscene things to the officer?	.72
How much would you approve of a police officer striking a community resident who was being questioned as a suspect in a murder case?	.71
Procedural justice endorsement[†]	
Voice	.94
Respect	.83
Accountability	.74
Benevolence	.92
Neutrality	.64
Chi-square (*df*)	774.78 (179)
Chi-square sig	.000
RMSEA [90% CI]	.07 [.06, .07]
CFI	.92
Number of observations	783

[†] Individual items available in the supplemental appendix.

Table 4
Correlations Among Latent Variables in Confirmatory Factor Analysis Model

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Stereotype threat	—				
2. Self-legitimacy	−.19***	—			
3. Resistance	.27***	−.22***	—		
4. Unreasonable force	.20***	−.36***	.56***	—	
5. Procedural justice endorsement	−.11**	.62***	−.31***	−.40***	—

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

SRMR is .06 indicating good fit (Hooper et al., 2008). All items loaded on their respective factors and all latent variables were significantly correlated with each other in the expected directions.

Model Test

We used structural equation modeling to test Richardson and Goff's (2014) argument that officer's confidence in their authority (i.e., self-legitimacy) mediates the relation between stereotype threat and coercive policing. For this model, stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, resistance, support for unreasonable force, and procedural justice endorsement were entered as latent variables with self-legitimacy positioned as a mediator between stereotype threat and the three measures of coercive policing. The error terms for the three outcomes were allowed to correlate to account for other factors that might influence coercive policing but where not included in the model. Age, experience, rank, sex, college education, officer race, cynicism, and job-related risk perceptions were added as observed control variables. Once again, we used FIML estimation to account for missing data.

Bootstrapping (3,000 samples) and 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals were used to test the significance of the indirect associations of stereotype threat and the outcomes via self-legitimacy. Traditional significance testing of indirect effects is problematic because it assumes a normal sampling distribution of the indirect effect (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). However, calculating an indirect effect by multiplying two coefficients produces a non-normal sampling distribution, even in situations where the two coefficients are normally distributed (Allison, 2018). Bootstrapping is used to address this problem by repeatedly sampling the dataset and calculating the indirect effect. Doing this thousands of times allows for the construction of an empirical approximation of the sampling distribution which is then used to construct standard errors to establish confidence intervals for the indirect effect that are corrected for non-normality.

Parameter estimates from the model are presented in Table 5. The model accounted for 17% of the variance in officers' self-legitimacy. As expected, stereotype threat (β = −.15) was negatively associated with self-legitimacy with officers more concerned about being perceived as racist also reporting less confidence in their authority. Additionally, older officers (β = .20) and sergeants (β = .10) had higher self-legitimacy than younger officers and patrol officers. On the other hand, more experienced (β = −.17) officers reported lower self-legitimacy. More cynical officers (β = −.33) were associated with lower self-legitimacy, while officers' perceptions of risk (β = .28) were associated with higher self-legitimacy.

Table 5
Model Test of the Relations Among Stereotype Threat, Self-Legitimacy, Resistance, Unreasonable Force, and Procedural Justice Support

	Self-legitimacy			Resistance			Unreasonable force			Procedural justice endorsement		
Predictors	β	b [95% CI]	*SE*	β	b [95% CI]	*SE*	β	b [95% CI]	*SE*	β	b [95% CI]	*SE*
Self-legitimacy	—	—	—	−.17**	−.11 [−.19, −.04]	.04	−.31***	−.29 [−.40, −.18]	.06	.57***	.65 [.53, .77]	.06
Stereotype threat	−.15**	−.10 [−.16, −.04]	.03	.19***	.09 [.04, .13]	.02	.13**	.08 [.02, .14]	.03	.05	.04 [−.01, .09]	.03
Age	.20*	.02 [.002, .03]	.01	.09	.01 [−.003, .01]	.004	−.21*	−.02 [−.03, −.003]	.01	.08	.01 [−.004, .02]	.01
Experience	−.17*	−.01 [−.03, −.0002]	.01	.02	.001 [−.01, .01]	.004	.14	.01 [−.003, .02]	.01	.02	.001 [−.01, .01]	.01
Rank	.10*	.22 [.02, .42]	.10	−.14**	−.21 [−.34, −.07]	.07	−.10*	−.21 [−.40, −.02]	.10	−.06	−.15 [−.33, .02]	.09
Sex	.04	.08 [−.07, .22]	.07	−.04	−.05 [−.14, .05]	.05	.01	.02 [−.12, .15]	.07	−.09**	−.17 [−.30, −.05]	.06
College graduate	−.03	−.05 [−.19, .09]	.07	.03	.04 [−.06, .13]	.05	−.02	−.03 [−.16, .10]	.07	−.06	−.11 [−.23, .01]	.06
White	−.09	−.12 [−.24, .002]	.06	−.14**	−.12 [−.21, −.04]	.04	−.10*	−.12 [−.23, −.01]	.06	−.05	−.08 [−.18, .03]	.05
Cynicism	−.33***	−.42 [−.58, −.25]	.08	.19***	.17 [.07, .26]	.05	.05	.06 [−.06, .19]	.06	−.19***	−.28 [−.40, −.15]	.06
Risk	.28**	.24 [.15, .33]	.05	.15**	.09 [.03, .15]	.03	−.04	−.04 [−.12, .05]	.04	.05	.05 [−.03, .12]	.04
Indirect effect†	—	—		.03	.01 [.002, .03]	.01	.05	.03 [.01, .06]	.01	−.09	−.07 [−.12, −.01]	.03
R^2		.17			.23			.18			.45	
Model fit					$\chi^2(307) = 1123.22$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .06 (90% CI [.06, .06]), CFI = .90							

Note. Sex: 1 = man; College graduate: 1 = yes; White: 1 = White; Rank: 1 = Sergeant.
† Association between stereotype threat and each outcome via self-legitimacy. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The model accounted for 23% of the variance in officers' resistance to the department's use of force policy. As expected, officers that were less confident in the legitimacy of their authority were more likely to be resistant toward the use of force policy ($\beta = -.17$). Additionally, stereotype threat had a significant indirect association ($\beta = .03$) with resistance via its association with self-legitimacy. However, stereotype threat also maintained a direct association ($\beta = .19$) with resistance in that officers more concerned with appearing racist were also more likely to resist the department's use of force policy. Sergeants ($\beta = -.14$) and White officers ($\beta = -.14$) were less resistant to the use of force policy compared with patrol officers and non-White officers. Finally, both cynicism ($\beta = .19$) and risk perceptions ($\beta = .15$) were positively associated with resistance.

The model accounted for 18% of the variance in approval of unreasonable uses of force. Higher self-legitimacy ($\beta = -.31$) was associated with less approval of unreasonable force. Once again, stereotype threat had an indirect association ($\beta = .05$) with unreasonable force via self-legitimacy, while at the same time maintaining a significant direct association ($\beta = .13$) whereby officers more concerned about appearing racist also indicated more approval of unreasonable uses of force. Older officers ($\beta = -.21$), sergeants ($\beta = -.10$) and White officers ($\beta = -.10$) were less approving of unreasonable force than younger officers, patrol officers, and non-White officers.

The model accounted for 45% of the variance in support for procedurally just policing. Officers that were less confident in their authority were also less likely to endorse procedurally just policing ($\beta = .57$). Stereotype threat also had a significant indirect association ($\beta = -.09$) with procedural justice support with officers higher in self-legitimacy reporting greater endorsement of engaging with the public in a procedurally just manner. Unlike resistance and unreasonable force, stereotype threat did not maintain a significant direct association. Additionally, male officers ($\beta = -.09$) were less likely to support procedurally just policing than female officers. Finally, more cynical officers ($\beta = -.19$) were also less likely to support procedurally just policing.

Post Hoc Analyses

Power assessment. Given the lack of prior research examining the relations among police officers' experience of racist stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, and coercive policing, we were unable to conduct an a priori power analysis based on previously established effect sizes. However, we examined power post hoc following the recommendations of Wolf, Harrington, Clark, and Miller (2013). They provided estimates of minimum required sample sizes and power for SEM using Monte Carlo methods. They present results for observed power of direct and indirect effects given a range of path magnitudes (R^2), sample sizes, latent factor loadings, percent missing data, numbers of indicators per factor, and whether or not the model is a mediation model. The percentage of variance explained in the structural equation model presented above ranged from 17% to 45%. Wolf et al. (2013) suggest that power for latent mediation models is sufficient (≥80%) to detect indirect effects, and more than sufficient to detect direct effects with $R^2 = .45$ when the sample size is 180 or greater, and with $R^2 = .17$ when the sample size is 440 or greater. Thus, for our observed effects we have more than the minimum sufficient sample size ($n = 784$). However, this does not supplant the need to replicate the present results given that it is the first study to explore self-legitimacy as a mediator between stereotype threat and coercion.

Robustness checks. We ran multiple variations of the analyses above to assess the robustness of the present findings. First, because there were multiple stations within the department, we used clustered robust standard errors to examine if the results changed when adjusting for within station similarity. The preliminary analyses (i.e., the analyses of officer race and the measurement model) using clustered standard errors were identical to those presented above. With respect to the structural equation model tested in the primary analysis, clustered standard errors did not change the relations among the main variables of interest: stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, resistance, unreasonable force, and procedural justice endorsement. There were only two discrepancies once clustered standard errors were used: White was no longer significantly associated with support for unreasonable force, and college education was significantly associated with more procedural justice endorsement. Despite these minor discrepancies, we present and interpret the findings without the use of clustered standard errors for two reasons: The results among the primary variables of interest are substantively identical and Stata does not provide fit indices when using clustered standard errors with FIML estimation.

Second, as was the case in the measurement model discussed in the Results section above, we used parceling to model the support for procedurally just policing. To address possible bias, we again ran five separate models in which the procedural justice support latent variable was replaced with one of the parcels entered as a latent construct with its respective items as indicators. Across the five models, substantively similar results were found with respect to the prediction of self-legitimacy, resistance to the department's use of force policy, and approval of unreasonable uses of force. With respect to the prediction of the procedural justice parcels, there was some variability in terms of the associations between the control variables. However, and more importantly, the relations among the primary variables of interest were substantively similar. Across all models, stereotype threat was negatively associated with self-legitimacy and self-legitimacy was positively associated with each of the procedural justice parcels.

Discussion

This study explored Richardson and Goff's (2014) argument that the experience of racist police officer stereotype threat by police officers can promote coercive policing by reducing officers' belief in the normative justifiability of their power, their self-legitimacy. Drawing on stereotype threat (Steele, 1997; Steele et al., 2002) and police legitimacy (Bottoms & Tankebe, 2012; Tyler, 2006) literatures, we predicted that officers' chronic concerns with appearing racist would be negatively associated with officers' self-legitimacy. We further predicted officers' self-legitimacy would be negatively associated with their resistance toward their department's use of force policy and support for unreasonable force and positively associated with support for procedurally just policing tactics. Finally, we predicted that self-legitimacy would mediate the relationships between chronic stereotype threat and each of the beliefs about using coercion when interacting with

community members. Our results provided broad support for these predictions with one exception. Self-legitimacy only partially mediated the relation between stereotype threat and resistance toward the use of force policy and support for unreasonable force.

Few differences between White and non-White officers emerged. Both groups were equally likely to experience stereotype threat and had similar levels of self-legitimacy. Moreover, the association between stereotype threat and self-legitimacy did not vary between White and non-White officers. Taken together, these findings suggest race may not be as important to the experience of racist stereotype threat among officers as one might expect. Rather, the potential negative influence of stereotype threat should be of concern to all officers. This pattern was not unexpected given that prior work has not found race differences in officers' experience of stereotype threat (Goff & Martin, 2012; Goff et al., 2012) and police acculturation tends to socialize all officers to exhibit solidarity across officer characteristics (Crank, 2004; Skolnick, 2008). However, this is in stark contrast to the broader stereotype threat literature examining interracial interactions that indicates that Whites are more concerned with appearing racist (Richeson & Shelton, 2007; Shelton & Richeson, 2006). In light of this discrepancy, this area of work deserves more attention in future research. One intriguing possibility to explore is whether the nature of the stereotype threat in this instance means the same thing for White and non-White officers. For example, unlike White officers, non-White officers may have experienced racism in their lived experiences within their communities and might experience racist officer stereotype threat in fundamentally different ways (e.g., as reflective of their turning against their community). Unfortunately, the data collected here cannot speak to this issue.

Although officer race was not associated with the experience of stereotype threat or officers' self-legitimacy, it was associated with coercive policing in unexpected ways. Generally, diversity within police departments has been positioned as a means to produce better policing, particularly with respect to the use of force and racial disparities in police outcomes (e.g., Hong, 2016). In contrast, in the present analysis White officers were less likely to support coercive policing in that they reported less resistance to the department's use of force policy and less support for unreasonable force than non-White officers. We hesitate to draw any strong conclusions based on these results given that the relation between police officer diversity and quality of policing is a complex issue involving nuances that are likely not captured in the present research. However, this study underscores the need for scholars to explore this comparatively understudied issue more extensively.

Other officer attributes had important associations with self-legitimacy and/or coercive policing as well. Older officers were associated with higher self-legitimacy and less support for unreasonable uses of force. With respect to the latter finding, it is noteworthy that after self-legitimacy, age was the strongest predictor of support for unreasonable uses of force. This is not too surprising given the negative association between age and violence once individuals reach their 20s (Steffensmeier & Ulmer, 2002); however, it does suggest that older officers may be especially well positioned within a department to act as role models for younger officers, both as exemplars of the normative authority of police officers and as a source of restraint.

Interestingly, officer experience was actually associated with lower levels of self-legitimacy. Nix and Wolfe (2017) found a similar negative relation in their study of officers' self-legitimacy; however, it did not reach significance (see also Tankebe, 2014). It is important to note that work experience and self-legitimacy are not related at the bivariate level (see supplemental appendix), but rather the association emerges only after other demographic factors are accounted for such as officers' age, rank, and so forth. Nor does this appear to be a multicollinearity issue as tolerance levels were all within acceptable limits. It is not immediately obvious to us why this finding would emerge. Officers are often confronted with situations in which they need to break the law in order to uphold the moral values of society (e.g., the so-called "Dirty Harry" problem; Klockars, 1980) or the opposite (e.g., enforce laws that are morally ambiguous in society; Trinkner, Jackson, & Tyler, 2018). Such events may serve to eat away at their self-legitimacy over time. On the other hand, officers often report that they routinely deal with the same "trouble makers" while on patrol (Gilmartin, 2002). Such experiences could serve as a reminder that regardless of their actions, there is little they can do to fix the problems in their community thereby reducing their confidence in their authority. Alternatively, the current sample was largely made up of patrol officers. It might be the case that more experienced officers who have not obtained higher ranks in their career have had their self-legitimacy eroded over the years as they have been passed up for promotion. Regardless of the reason, more work should explore these hypotheses and the limiting conditions of the observed effects.

In another interesting finding, female officers were more likely to support procedurally just policing than male officers. On its face, this would support calls from some scholars that a greater infusion of female police officers would increase the quality of policing (Bergman, Walker, & Jean, 2016). This is especially important with respect to procedural justice, as it has been positioned as one of the major reforms to improve relations between law enforcement and communities (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015). However, research on gender differences in policing styles is often mixed with some showing few differences between men and women (e.g., Archbold & Schulz, 2012). Again, future research should explore these questions more robustly.

Officer cynicism was also a key variable in the present study. Cynicism has long been identified as a problem in policing (Neiderhoffer, 1967). The present results echo this work, finding that more cynical officers were less likely to see themselves as legitimate authorities, more likely to resist the department's use of force policy, and less likely to endorse a procedurally just style of policing. That cynical officers are less confident in their moral authority as police officers is hardly surprising, given a core component of officer cynicism is apathy toward the job (Martinussen, Richardsen, & Burke, 2007). Moreover, cynical officers are more likely to distrust the public (Gilmartin, 2002) and engage with community members in hostile ways (Regoli et al., 1990). In this respect, one would not expect them to support the department's use of force policy or engaging with the public in a fair and respectful manner to the same degree as less cynical officers.

Finally, officers' perceptions of risk in their daily duties was positively associated with both self-legitimacy and resistance to the department's use of force policy. It seems that officers who believe their job is more dangerous are more likely to be confident in their authority as agents of the law and be more likely to believe

that interactions require more force than dictated by department policy. The relation between risk perceptions and self-legitimacy is consistent with Bradford and Quinton's (2014) argument that self-legitimacy can be enhanced by the belief that officers represent the "thin blue line" between social order and societal chaos. Officers ascribing to this ideology are likely to see their job as especially risky as they alone are there to protect the public from dangerous criminals that want to cause harm. On this account, they occupy a special position in society, imbued with moral authority given their status as protectors of the public trust. At the same time, one would expect that such officers may balk at rules and policies restricting their ability to meet that dangerous world head on with a superior level of force.

Implications

These results raise the possibility of a particularly vicious cycle of stereotype threat, police force, and public trust. Coercive policing strategies that feature aggression and dominance have been shown to erode community members' trust in the police over time (Desmond, Papachristos, & Kirk, 2016; Kerrison, Cobbina, & Bender, 2018; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Police departments depend on community trust and cooperation in order to manage social disorder and crime effectively (Tyler & Fagan, 2008). Because stereotype threat is more likely to be activated when interacting with non-White community members (Goff et al., 2008), concerns with appearing racist may be associated with racial disparities in unnecessary police violence, further eroding trust within communities that can least afford it (Brooks, 2000; Jones, 2015; Trinkner & Goff, 2016). In other words, it is easy to imagine how an erosion in public trust could lead to increased unreasonable force, further eroding public trust. Importantly, this cycle could persist regardless of which direction the causal arrow points (e.g., from stereotype threat to unreasonable force or from unreasonable force to stereotype threat).

When the public discusses stereotypes within the police context it is typically focused on the prejudice officers bring with them while on patrol. There is no question such stereotypes exist (Smith & Alpert, 2007). However, this discourse should be expanded with the recognition that the police–community relationship is bidirectional in nature (Tyler & Trinkner, 2018), encompassing not only the stereotypes that officers hold about community members but also stereotypes that community members hold about officers. As shown here, officers' concerns about the latter category are tied to their beliefs about the appropriate way to interact with community members. This can potentially be the difference between a mutually beneficial encounter that increases the trust of both parties or a coercive encounter in which negative stereotypes are reinforced.

Future Research

Given the scant research on stereotype threat among police, there are multiple areas that need further examination. First, researchers should examine stereotype threat among police officers at the situational level, rather than at the chronic/dispositional level (as was done here). This level of analysis would make experimental manipulation more feasible, which would help to establish the causal direction among stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, and coercive policing. Moreover, this would allow for a greater examination of the factors that can initiate stereotype threat among officers as they go about their daily activities, while at the same time shedding light on how officers may respond to stereotype threatening events. For example, studies examining stereotype threat in other organizational contexts (e.g., negotiation skills) have shown that stereotype-confirming behavior is more likely to occur when stereotype threats are implicitly activated (Kray, Thompson, & Galinsky, 2001). On the other hand, when stereotype threat is explicitly activated, individuals are more likely to respond with stereotype-disconfirming behavior. This would suggest that officers may respond in a qualitatively different manner if the racist police officer stereotype is explicitly activated (e.g., a community member calling an officer racist) versus implicitly activated (e.g., an officer having a gut feeling that a community member is making such an attribution).

Additionally, if the relations revealed in the present article prove robust, it will be important to examine ways to reduce the negative influence of stereotype threat on officers. Previous research has demonstrated that using standardized scripts both attenuates stereotype threat (Avery, Richeson, Hebl, & Ambady, 2009) and promotes perceptions of legitimacy (Mazerolle, Antrobus, Bennett, & Tyler, 2013). Allowing officers to use scripts may also attenuate the potentially negative role that cognitive depletion (common to stereotype threat) may play in officer decision-making—though the role of cognitive depletion in the decision to use force deserves its own line of future research. Another possibility is to examine the fairness of the police department. Stereotype threat represents a threat to officers' identities and the democratic values underlying the police profession (Trinkner & Goff, 2016). Organizational fairness is a means by which institutions can impart their values onto workers (Tyler, 2011). Hence, increasing organizational fairness within the police department may reduce apprehension over appearing racist by buttressing the democratic values that such apprehension undermines.

Third, given prior research finding that stereotype threat depletes cognitive resources and hampers social fluency (Goff et al., 2008; Richeson & Shelton, 2007), future research should examine the degree to which stereotype threat depresses individuals' use of social skills to achieve their interaction goals. In particular, the depletion of cognitive resources may undermine officers' social "soft skills," or the ability to interact productively with others who hold interest positions that are different from their own (Lareau, 2015; Moss & Tilly, 1996). In this case, that means the soft skills necessary to avoid conflict will elude officers, resulting in an overreliance on force—even in situations where it is not warranted. Our understanding of this soft skill degradation among officers who feel threatened by the potential application of a negative stereotype would benefit from research explicitly aimed at measuring its presence (or absence).

Finally, our results are consistent with the hypothesis that self-legitimacy mediates the relation between stereotype threat and deleterious behaviors. Over the years, multiple mechanisms have been proposed to explain stereotype threat effects (Pennington et al., 2016). The present results introduce an additional mechanism that may explain such effects, particularly when examining stereotype threat in contexts where there are clear and strong power differentials as is the case in police–community interactions. However, the present analysis indicates other mechanisms should be explored in the policing context given that relations among ste-

reotype threat, resistance to policy, and unreasonable force were only partially mediated by self-legitimacy. Perhaps there are other aspects of police officers' identity beyond their role as moral authorities that are undermined by stereotype threat.

Limitations

Because this was a cross-sectional study, it cannot address issues of directionality. For example, low self-legitimacy may lead to more susceptibility to stereotype threat. Alternatively, the relation between self-legitimacy and stereotype threat could be reciprocal whereby stereotype threat undermines self-legitimacy, which in term increases the propensity to experience stereotype threat in a continuous downward spiral. Experimental and/or longitudinal methodology is needed to disentangle these issues. However, given the paucity of research in this area, the present results are an important step forward in broadening our understanding of the psychological underpinnings of coercive policing.

While the present study also supports the mechanism proposed by Richardson and Goff (2014), we were unable to examine if the race of suspect moderates these effects. Similarly, we were not able to account for officers' explicit/implicit racial attitudes. Whether accounting for such attitudes would change the model is unclear because previous research has not found a moderating effect of prejudice on stereotype threat (Goff et al., 2008). In addition, there was a low response rate. It is possible that the results might not generalize to the broader population of police officers in this department and beyond.

Finally, the use of self-report measures rather than behaviors limits the findings of the present study. This is a widespread problem in research examining policing given apprehension from both officers and police organizations with providing or collecting identifiable information. Indeed, officers reported to researchers that this was the reason why they left demographic questions unanswered. While behavioral intention measures are not ideal, intention is predictive of behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2011). Moreover, stereotype threat has previously been associated with objective indicators of police behavior (Goff et al., 2012).

Conclusion

The present study reveals the first empirical evidence that officers' concern with appearing racist is associated with their attitudes about unreasonable police use of force and the rules that govern it. This suggests a previously underexplored route to police abuse worthy of further scientific and practical exploration. Additionally, by integrating the literatures on stereotype threat and police legitimacy, this research suggests a new theoretical landscape for exploration by providing evidence that stereotyping the moral character of a group can be associated with immoral behavior. Most importantly, however, the present research emphasizes the findings of a recent National Academies of Science (2018) consensus report: We know too little about what leads to abuses of police power, and psychological science has yet to engage the issue as seriously as it can.

References

Allison, P. D. (2018). *Structural equation modeling*. Ardmore, PA: Statistical Horizons.

Alpert, G. P., & Dunham, R. G. (2004). *Understanding police use of force: Officers, suspects, and Reciprocity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511499449

Archbold, C., & Schulz, D. (2012). Research on women in policing: A look at the past, present and future. *Sociology Compass, 6,* 694–706. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2012.00501.x

Avery, D. R., Richeson, J. A., Hebl, M. R., & Ambady, N. (2009). It does not have to be uncomfortable: The role of behavioral scripts in Black-White interracial interactions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94,* 1382–1393. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016208

Bennett, R. R., & Schmitt, E. L. (2002). The effect of work environment on level of police cynicism: A comparative study. *Police Quarterly, 5,* 493–522. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/109861102237692

Bergman, M. E., Walker, J. M., & Jean, V. A. (2016). A simple solution to policing problems: Women! *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 9,* 590–597. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/iop.2016.59

Bottoms, A., & Tankebe, J. (2012). Beyond procedural justice: A dialogic approach to legitimacy in criminal justice. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 102,* 119–170.

Bottoms, A., & Tankebe, J. (2013). "A voice within:" Power-holders' perspectives on authority and legitimacy. In J. Tankebe & A. Liebling (Eds.), *Legitimacy and criminal justice: An international exploration* (pp. 61–82). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198701996.003.0005

Bradford, B., & Quinton, P. (2014). Self-legitimacy, police culture and support for democratic policing in an English constabulary. *British Journal of Criminology, 54,* 2013–2046. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azu053

Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity* (pp. 35–28). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Brooks, R. R. W. (2000). Fair and fairness in the city: Criminal enforcement and perceptions of fairness and perceptions of fairness in minority communities. *Southern California Law Review, 73,* 1219–1274.

Cochran, J. C., & Warren, P. Y. (2012). Racial, ethnic, and gender differences in perceptions of the police: The salience of officer race within the context of racial profiling. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 28,* 206–227. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1043986211425726

Crank, J. P. (2004). *Understanding police culture*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

Desmond, M., Papachristos, A. V., & Kirk, D. S. (2016). Police violence and citizen crime reporting in the black community. *American Sociological Review, 81,* 857–876. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0003122416663494

Edelman, E. (Director). (2016). *O.J.: Made in America* [Motion picture]. United States: ESPN Films, Laylow Films.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2011). *Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach*. New York, NY: Psychology Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203838020

Gilmartin, K. M. (2002). *Emotional survival for law enforcement: A guide for officers and their families*. Tucson, AZ: E-S Press.

Goff, P. A., Epstein, L. M., Mentovich, A., & Reddy, K. S. (2013). Illegitimacy is dangerous: How authorities experience and react to illegitimacy. *Psychology, 4,* 340–344. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/psych.2013.43A049

Goff, P. A., Lloyd, T., Geller, A., Raphael, S., & Glaser, J. (2016). *The science of justice: Race, arrests, and police use of force*. Los Angeles: Center for Policing Equity, University of California, Los Angeles.

Goff, P. A., & Martin, K. D. (2012). *Unity breeds fairness: The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity report on the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department*. Los Angeles: The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity, University of California Los Angeles.

Goff, P. A., Martin, K. D., & Gamson-Smiedt, M. G. (2012). *Protecting equity: The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity report on the San Jose Police Department*. Los Angeles: The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity, University of California Los Angeles.

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.1.91

Haggis, D., Cheadle, D., Harris, M., Moresco, B., Schulman, C., Yari, B. (Producers), & D. Haggis (Director). (2004). *Crash* [Motion picture]. United States: Lionsgate Films.

Hong, S. (2016). Representative bureaucracy, organizational integrity, and citizen coproduction: Does an increase in police ethnic representativeness reduce crime? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 35,* 11–33. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pam.21876

Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., & Mullen, M. R. (2008). Structural equation modeling: Guidelines for determining model fit. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods, 6,* 53–60.

Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Stanko, B., & Hohl, K. (2013). *Just authority? Trust in the police in England and Wales*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Jones, J. M. (2015, June 19). *Gallup: In U.S., confidence in police lowest in 22 years*. Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/183704/confidence-police-lowestyears.aspx

Kahn, K. B., McMahon, J. M., & Stewart, G. (2018). Misinterpreting danger? Stereotype threat, pre-attack indicators, and police-citizen interactions. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 33,* 45–54. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11896-017-9233-1

Kerrison, E. M., Cobbina, J., & Bender, K. (2018). Stop-gaps, lip service, and the perceived futility of body-worn police officer cameras in Baltimore City. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 27,* 271–288. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15313204.2018.1479912

Klockars, C. B. (1980). The Dirty Harry problem. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 452,* 33–47. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/000271628045200104

Kray, L. J., Thompson, L., & Galinsky, A. (2001). Battle of the sexes: Gender stereotype confirmation and reactance in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80,* 942–958. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.80.6.942

Lareau, A. (2015). Cultural knowledge and social inequality. *American Sociological Review, 80,* 1–27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0003122414565814

Little, T. D., Cunningham, W. A., Shahar, G., & Widaman, K. F. (2002). To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the questions, weighing the merits. *Structural Equation Modeling, 9,* 151–173. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_1

Loftus, B. (2010). Police occupational culture: Classic themes, altered times. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy, 20,* 1–20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10439460903281547

Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56,* 393–421. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070137

Martinussen, M., Richardsen, A. M., & Burke, R. J. (2007). Job demands, job resources, and burnout among police officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 35,* 239–249. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2007.03.001

Mastrofski, S. D., Snipes, J. B., & Supina, A. E. (1996). Compliance on demand: The public's response to specific police requests. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 33,* 269–305. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022427896033003001

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,* 33–64. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00289.x

Meško, G., Hacin, R., Tankebe, J., & Fields, C. (2017). Self-legitimacy, organizational commitment and commitment to fair treatment of prisoners: An empirical study of prison officers in Slovenia. *European Journal of Crime Criminal Law and Criminal Justice, 25,* 11–30. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/15718174-25012104

Moss, P., & Tilly, C. (1996). Soft skills and race: An investigation of black men's employment problems. *Work and Occupations, 23,* 252–276. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0730888496023003002

Mustard, D. B. (2001). Racial, ethnic, and gender disparities in sentencing: Evidence from the U.S. Federal Courts. *The Journal of Law & Economics, 44,* 285–314. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/320276

Najdowski, C. J. (2011). Stereotype threat in criminal interrogations: Why innocent Black suspects are at risk for confessing falsely. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 17,* 562–591. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023741

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,* 463–477. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000140

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Proactive policing: Effects on crime and communities*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Neiderhoffer, A. (1967). *Behind the shield: The police in urban society*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Nix, J., & Wolfe, S. E. (2017). The impact of negative publicity on police self-legitimacy. *Justice Quarterly, 34,* 84–108. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2015.1102954

Owen, T. (2017). ACLU v. Milwaukee Police. *Vice News*. Retrieved from https://news.vice.com/story/milwaukee-cops-sued-over-allegedly-racist-stop-and-frisk-program

Pennington, C. R., Heim, D., Levy, A. R., & Larkin, D. T. (2016). Twenty years of stereotype threat research: A review of psychological mediators. *PLoS ONE, 11*(1), e0146487. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0146487

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40,* 879–891. http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.3.879

President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final report of the president's task force on 21st century policing*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Reaves, B. A. (2011). *Census of state and local law enforcement agencies, 2008*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Regoli, B., Crank, J. P., & Rivera, G. F. J., Jr. (1990). The construction and implementation of an alternative measure of police cynicism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17,* 395–409. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093854890017004001

Reisig, M. D., Tankebe, J., & Meško, G. (2014). Compliance with the law in Slovenia: The role of procedural justice and police legitimacy. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 20,* 259–276. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10610-013-9211-9

Richardsen, A. M., Burke, R. J., & Martinussen, M. (2006). Work and health outcomes among police officers: The mediating role of police cynicism and engagement. *International Journal of Stress Management, 13,* 555–574. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.13.4.555

Richardson, L. S. (2015). Police racial violence: Lessons from social psychology. *Fordham Law Review, 83,* 2961–2976.

Richardson, L. S., & Goff, P. A. (2014). Interrogating racial violence. *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law, 12,* 115–152.

Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). Negotiating interracial interactions: Costs, consequences, and possibilities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16,* 316–320. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00528.x

Rios, V. M. (2011). *Punished: Policing the lives of Black and Latino boys*. New York: New York University Press.

Schulhofer, S. J., Tyler, T. R., & Huq, A. Z. (2011). American policing at a crossroads: Unsustainable policies and the procedural justice alternative. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 101,* 335–374.

Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2006). Interracial interactions: A relational approach. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 38,* 121–181. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(06)38003-3

Skolnick, J. H. (2008). Enduring issues of police culture and demographics. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy, 18,* 35–45. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10439460701718542

Smith, M. R., & Alpert, G. P. (2007). Explaining police bias: A theory of social condition and illusory correlation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34,* 1262–1283. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093854807304484

StataCorp. (2017). *Stata: Release 15. Statistical software*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air. How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist, 52,* 613–629. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.6.613

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 797–811. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.797

Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype and social identity threat. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 34,* 379–440. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(02)80009-0

Steffensmeier, D., & Ulmer, J. (2002). Age and crime. In S. Kadish (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of crime and justice* (pp. 31–37). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Steiger, J. H. (2007). Understanding the limitations of global fit assessment in structural equation modeling. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42,* 893–898. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.017

Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. (2003). Moral solidarity, identification with the community, and the importance of procedural justice: The police as prototypical representatives of a group's moral values. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 66,* 153–165. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1519845

Sutton, R. (2015, May 5). The dangers of de-policing: Will cops just stand down? *New York Post*. Retrieved from https://nypost.com/2015/05/05/the-dangers-of-de-policing-will-cops-just-stand-down/

Tankebe, J. (2014). Rightful authority: Exploring the structure of police self-legitimacy. In A. Liebling, J. Shapland, & J. Tankebe (Eds.), *Crime, justice and social order: Essays in honour of A. E. Bottoms* (pp. 1–30). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2499717

Tankebe, J., & Meško, G. (2014). Police self-legitimacy, use of force, and pro-organizational behavior in Slovenia. In G. Meško & J. Tankebe (Eds.), *Trust and legitimacy in criminal justice: European perspectives* (pp. 261–277). New York, NY: Springer.

Terrill, W., & Reisig, M. D. (2003). Neighborhood context and police use of force. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 40,* 291–321. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/00224227803253800

Travis, J., Western, B., & Redburn, S. (Eds.). (2014). *The growth of incarceration in the United States: Exploring causes and consequences*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Trinkner, R., & Goff, P. A. (2016). The color of safety: The psychology of race & policing. In B. Bradford, B. Jauregui, I. Loader, & J. Steinberg (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of global policing* (pp. 61–81). London, UK: Sage. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781473957923.n5

Trinkner, R., Jackson, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2018). Bounded authority: Expanding "appropriate" police behavior beyond procedural justice. *Law and Human Behavior, 42,* 280–293. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000285

Trinkner, R., & Tyler, T. R. (2016). Legal socialization: Coercion versus consent in an era of mistrust. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 12,* 417–439. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110615-085141

Trinkner, R., Tyler, T. R., & Goff, P. A. (2016). Justice from within: The relations between a procedurally just organizational climate and police organizational efficiency, endorsement of democratic policing, and officer well-being. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 22,* 158–172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/law0000085

Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tyler, T. R. (2011). *Why people cooperate: The role of social motivations*. New York, NY: Princeton University Press.

Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Why do people cooperate with the police? *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law, 6,* 231–275.

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,* 75–109. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1529100615617791

Tyler, T. R., & Trinkner, R. (2018). *Why children follow rules: Legal socialization and the development of legitimacy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tyler, T. R., & Wakslak, C. J. (2004). Profiling and police legitimacy: Procedural justice, attributions of motive, and acceptance of police authority. *Criminology, 42,* 253–282. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2004.tb00520.x

Wolf, E. J., Harrington, K. M., Clark, S. L., & Miller, M. W. (2013). Sample size requirements for structural equation models: An evaluation of power, bias and solution propriety. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 76,* 913–934. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164413495237

Wolfe, S. E., & Nix, J. (2016). The alleged "Ferguson Effect" and police willingness to engage in community partnership. *Law and Human Behavior, 40,* 1–10. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000164

Woodcock, A., Hernandez, P. R., Estrada, M., & Schultz, P. W. (2012). The consequences of chronic stereotype threat: Domain disidentification and abandonment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103,* 635–646. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029120

Zelditch, M. J. (2001). Theories of legitimacy. In J. T. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations* (pp. 33–53). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Received June 14, 2018
Revision received May 23, 2019
Accepted May 31, 2019 ■