The Function of the Police Force: A Behavior Analytic Review of the History of how Policing in America Came to Be

Natalie Parks, Ph.D., BCBA-D^{1, 2}

Beverly Kirby, M.S., BCBA²

¹ Behavior Leader, Inc.

² TeamABA LLC

Author Note

We have no known conflict of interest to disclose.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Natalie Parks, Behavior Leader, Inc., 9530 Trescott Ave., St. Louis, MO 63114. Email: Natalie.Parks@BehaviorLeader.com

Abstract

The racial differentiation of policing in America has been widely researched and documented (Walker & Katz, 2008; Wilson & Kelling, 1982; Eck & Spelman, 1987; Braga, Weisburd, Waring, & Mazerolle, 1999). However, while there is large documentation of these discrepancies, there have been few changes within the policies, procedures and laws governing police officers. The results of this are two-fold. First, it has led to the continuation of individual acts of racism of police officers across the country. Second, it has upheld the systemic racism that results in the discrepancies in outcomes between Black people and white people, making it both more likely that Black individuals will interact with police officers and have more negative outcomes as a result of these interactions. The reasons for this are plentiful including lack of data regarding the race of the police officers involved in fatal officer-involved shootings, reliance on self-report of officers regarding instances of excessive force, and lack of accountability of individuals and departments alike. These issues are symptoms of the larger problems of individual and institutionalized racism that not only increases racism within those within the police force, but also increases the likeliness that any police officer will engage in violence against a person of color. To fully understand and develop effective interventions that will change policing behaviors and the racism observed within the police force, one must first understand the historical development and function of policing in America and its intersection with both individual and institutional racism. This paper will first provide a clear definition of racism followed by a function-based behavior analytic examination of the historical development of police departments in America.

Keywords: institutional racism, police, behavior analysis, brutality, racism

Editor's Note:

This manuscript is being published on an expedited basis, as part of a series of emergency publications designed to help practitioners of applied behavior analysis take immediate action to address police brutality and systemic racism. The journal would like to especially thank Jovonnie Esquiedo-Leal and Melody Sylvain for their insightful and expeditious reviews of this manuscript. The views and strategies suggested by the articles in this series do not represent the positions of the Association for Behavior Analysis, International or Springer Nature.

Guest Editor, Denisha Gingles

Accepted Author Manuscript, In Press, Behavior Analysis in Practice

The Function of the Police Force: A Behavior Analytic Review of the History of how Policing in America Came to Be

Introduction

Racism and discrimination in America are well researched and documented (Aboud, 1988; Arhin & Thyer, 2004; Corenblum & Annis, 1993). Both racist and discriminatory acts and beliefs have been observed in children as young as six years of age (Katz, 2003). Studies have shown that white children demonstrate the highest levels of discrimination against those who are Black and of other non-white groups (Corenblum & Annis, 1993). While racism and discrimination affect all areas of American society and structure, racism within the police force is especially important. Several studies have documented the discrepancy of police interactions with people of color in the United States (DeVylder, et al., 2017; Edwards, Lee, & Esposito, 2019; Ross, 2015; Ross, 2017). Despite the lengthy list of research articles and extensive documentation of racism in America and within the police force, there exists little change to both individual acts of racism and institutional policies and systems that uphold and reinforce this behavior (Matsuda, Garcia, Catagnus, & Brandt, 2020). There are several reasons for this lack of progress and change. These reasons include the historical development of the police force in America, the current constitution of the police force, lack of clear and consistent policies within and across police departments, poor training, and lack of accountability. This paper will investigate the unique aspects of policing in America that relate to institutional and/or individual racism by analyzing its historical and present functions.

A Note on Race and Racism

There are several articles and studies that have examined race and racism in America (Ahrin & Thyer, 2004; Dixon, Dymond, Rehfeldt, Roche, & Zlomke, 2003; Du Bois, 1903; Hesse, 2011; Matsuda, Garcia, Catagnus, & Brandt, 2020; Memmi, 2000; Miles & Brown, 2003; Weinstein, Wilson, Drake, & Kellum, 2008). However, while the words “race” and “racism” are used in everyday language and widely

researched, their definitions are not always clearly stated and differ among researchers and theoretical orientations. There are ongoing discussions regarding the difference between individual acts of racism and institutional racism, questions regarding whether or not individuals who are white or of the dominant race are the only individuals who can engage in racism, and how to determine if an individual instance of behavior is racist, biased, ignorant, or simply poor timing. Thus, prior to discussing race and racism in the police force, it is important to provide a framework of these terms so readers of this paper have a shared understanding.

W. E. B. Du Bois discussed race in his early works, stating that race was a “badge” that those who have “suffered long disaster” are forced to wear and is focused on those who have similar and shared memories and experiences of the past (Du Bois, 1903). This social construction of the idea of “race” is based on the idea that there is biological difference between individuals and that these differences are hierarchical in nature (Hesse, 2011). However, while the premise of “race” is based on the idea of biological differences, there is discrepancy even in the way in which race is defined by the US Census Bureau (2020). Two documents on the 2020census.gov website explaining racial categories define Black as “a person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa” including “African American, Jamaican, Haitian, Nigerian, Ethiopian, Somali, Ghanaian, South African, Barbadian, Kenyan, and Bahamian”. The definition of white includes individuals who identify with “one or more nationalities or ethnic groups originating in Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa” including “German, Irish, English, Italian, Lebanese, Egyptian, Polish, French, Iranian, Slavic, Cajun, and Chaldean.” However, while those from the Middle East or Northern Africa are asked to identify as white on the US Census and other legal documents that request racial identification, American policies have singled out individuals from the Middle East as separate from those from Europe and other white Americans (Rutgers University, 2020). This study investigated how individuals of European descent viewed individuals from the Middle East and policies that discriminate against these individuals. There were two relevant findings: 1) there

was not agreement among participants as to whether individuals of Middle Eastern descent are white; and 2) those who did not agree that individuals of Middle Eastern descent were white were more likely to support discriminatory policies against them. It is easy to disprove the idea that race somehow differentiates individuals based on their biology; however, the development of the concept was intended to and has resulted in the discrimination of Black and Brown people.

Researchers have attempted to define race outside of the US Census categories of ancestral origin; however, still struggle to identify exactly what characteristics separate individuals of different races. Memmi (2000), for example, defined race to include physical and behavioral characteristics. These categorizations are just as, if not more flawed than those based on ancestry, as behavioral characteristics are learned throughout one's lifetime and differ across regions, socio-economic status, education levels, and many additional characteristics found throughout the United States. Additionally, Witherspoon and colleagues (2007) found that genetic and behavioral differences are more varied within populations of people than between them. In short, while racial categories first emerged in the 15th century, over six centuries later, we are still arguing about what it means.

Despite the errors in race as a concept or categorization of individuals, for the purposes of this paper, we will define race within the context of policing in America. Thus, race is defined as a categorical assignment, or tact, of a person based on that person's physical characteristics including skin pigmentation.

Not surprisingly, racism is as difficult to define as the term "race." For the purposes of examining the historical development of the police force, it is important to distinguish between individual racism and institutional racism, as it is the intersection of both of these response classes that make policing a unique institution that increases the likeliness that individuals will engage in racist behavior against Black and Brown people.

To define institutional racism, one must first understand when the term “race” was introduced into society and the historical motivations for creating the term. The term “race” was born in the 1400s during the Portuguese slave trade under the rule of Prince Henry (Kendi, 2017). It was during this time that the slave trade, which originally enslaved Eastern European Slavs, began enslaving individuals in Africa. During this time, Prince Henry instructed an author to write *The Chronicle of the Discovery and Conquest of Guinea* (de Zurara, 1896). In this book, the author first introduced race to highlight the differences between Portuguese and African people and justify slavery by introducing the notion that African people were less than Portuguese people. Thus, the term “race” was constructed as a way to legitimize the dominance of white people [Portuguese] over non-white people [Africans]. The reason for this was so that Prince Henry could justify the mass murder and enslavement of individuals in Africa. Ultimately, the motivation was to gain access to land, wealth, and political power. This ideology was brought to the United States and is well documented as early as 1790, when the nation first began taking a census of the racial demographics in the country (Prewitt, 2005). The purpose of racial categories were initially to distinguish between civil statuses of free or enslaved, taxed or untaxed. The initial census of 1790 had three distinct categories of race: European, African, and [untaxed] Native American. This census provided the foundation of all racial categorizations to follow. Since then, the racial categories have shifted, largely due to the political influences associated with each change. For example, in 1790, enslaved persons were only counted as 3/5 of a person so that the Southern states did not have more political power than the Northern states, which had fewer individuals who were enslaved (Prewitt, 2005). This continued in the early 1800s, when the new classification of “free colored” was created to separate individuals who were free and Black from those who were enslaved and those who were white. The classification changes can also be seen with other groups including Mexican, Chinese, and Japanese, all of which have changed in classification over time. In short, the development and continuation of race and racial categorization of individuals in America is largely tied

to political influences, wealth, and power. Thus, *institutional racism*, is defined as the response class or set of behaviors that result in acquisition and retention of wealth and political power by those who currently have it. More specifically, the function of institutional racism is to retain political power and wealth of those who currently have it (white people). As explored in detail below, the police force is the direct result of institutional racism in that it was developed to protect and retain the interests of the wealthy and those in political power.

Individual racism, however, is different. To understand individual racism, one must understand the complexity of individual behavior and the different environmental factors responsible for the development and maintenance of the behavior of an individual. However, individual racism cannot solely be defined based on function. One can learn and engage in racism maintained through a variety of social reinforcers: positive reinforcement in the form of social approval; positive reinforcement in the form of access to tangible items and activities; and negative reinforcement in the form of escape or avoidance of aversive stimuli and environments. Individual racism is developed through a learning history that includes respondent and operant conditioning as well as the development of relational framing (Ahrin & Thyer, 2004; Dixon, Dymond, Rehfeldt, Roche, & Zlomke, 2003; Matsuda, Garcia, Catagnus, & Brandt, 2020; Weinstein, Wilson, Drake, & Kellum, 2008).

While individual racism is developed through a complex learning history, it is important to note that individual racism is a form of response bias. Response bias is a pattern of behavior that is controlled by some idiosyncratic influence (Bourret, Iwata, Harper, & North, 2012). Response bias has been studied throughout history as a way to identify when individuals are responding to what is viewed as the prevailing contingencies by the experimenter, versus when they are responding to some idiosyncratic variable. Biases develop based on learning history and reinforcement of biased responding. Racial bias, or individual racism, is the responding to or interaction with an individual based on stimulus control by that person's race, as opposed to broader aspects of who that person is (e.g., their behavior, beliefs,

etc.) . It is the result of faulty stimulus control in that the race of one individual is what exerts control over the behavior of another. In America, this faulty stimulus control may develop unnoticed (e.g., a police officer paying more attention to Black drivers and therefore pulling them over more often) or maybe intentionally taught and reinforced (e.g., a police trainer directly telling trainees that Black people are more likely to commit crimes). Whether intentional or not, such learning history results in one responding to a white person differently than a Black person.

Identifying individual acts of racism can be difficult, as this identification often relies on topographical definitions. As individual racism is a form of biased responding, one must observe differential responding between two people of different races or a pattern of responding with individuals of one race in order to determine if this responding is in fact biased. However, individual racism can be identified based on the individual's pattern of responding when interacting with individuals of different races. Tying this definition to the responding of police officers, individual acts of racism can be identified by examining interactions of an officer with individuals of different races. If it is identified that an officer interacts with a white person different than a Black person, bias based on race can be concluded. For the purposes of this paper, we focus on the individual acts of police officers that result in the prevention and removal of wealth, political power, and the opportunities to gain wealth and political power of Black people. Examples include differing rates of Black people being killed by police officers as compared to white people, the increased likeliness to be stopped by a police officer if you are Black, and the increased likeliness you will be charged with a crime if stopped by a police officer if you are Black (DeGue, Fowler, & Calkins, 2016; Edwards, Lee, & Esposito, 2019).

The interconnectedness of institutional racism and individual racism is important to note. In policing, both individual racism and institutional racism account for the heightened likeliness of a Black person being stopped by a police officer. Individual racism explains the tendency for similar behaviors to be interpreted differently depending on your race. For example, if a police officer asks a white person

for their identification and the white person asks “why”, the officer may not see this as a threat and answer the question. However, if this officer engages in racial bias, or individual racism, they may interpret this same question, “why” from a Black citizen as a threat or an aggressive act and instead respond with an order or threat of escalation of force. Further, institutional racism accounts for the way that “criminal behavior” is defined and regulated by those in the police force. To understand this, we must investigate the development of the police force in America.

A Functional Perspective on the History of Police in America

Before understanding the current climate of police systems in America, it is important to understand their establishment and development throughout history. This paper will not provide an extensive review of the history of police in America, but will provide an overview to highlight three main variables: 1) the function of police; 2) the involvement of police in political power; and 3) the coercive nature of police. These three variables provide a lens for which one can understand the unique context of how and why the police force increases the likeliness of racism.

The police system in America had two beginnings, one in the North and one in the South (Waxman, 2017); however, both were developed to keep political power and wealth with one set of individuals; primarily the Dutch and British immigrants. In Southern America, the police force began as the “slave patrol”, created in 1704 in the Carolina colonies. Its primary functions were to: 1) find and return enslaved Black people to their owners; 2) prevent and deter revolts; and 3) maintain discipline for enslaved Black people if they violated any plantation rules (Reichel, 1992). In Northern America, while the police were not developed as “slave patrols”, they were developed for a similar purpose. Here, the focus was on German and Irish immigrants. The wealthy business owners of the time hired police to control and regulate the behavior of the German and Irish immigrants for two main purposes: 1) to ensure immigrants were able to work as cheap labor for the wealthy business owners; and 2) to ensure

immigrants' behavior was regulated such that they could not gain wealth or political power (Gaines, Kappeler, & Vauhn, 1999; Parks, 1976). In both regions of the United States, police forces were developed to regulate the behavior of those who did not hold any wealth or political power at the time. Behaviors that threatened the continued cheap or free labor such as public drunkenness, prostitution, refusing to work, rebelling, and fleeing the plantations were criminalized with one purpose in mind: to keep the wealth with the wealthy and the political power with those who had it (Gaines, Kappeler, & Vauhn, 1999; Waxman, 2017). In the early 1900s the Great Migration, which resulted in Black people moving into Northern and Western urban areas, shifted the focus of Northern police from European immigrants to Black people. This was largely due to the novelty and lack of experience and exposure to Black people of white people living in those communities at the time (Moore, 2020). This resulted in fear and hostility of white people towards Black people, due to the perception that Black people engaged in behavior that would threaten their safety and security as well as the perception that Black people would take all of the jobs, leaving white people without work (Moore, 2020). As such, police departments began focusing on Black people (Moore, 2020). By the end of the 19th century, police were characterized by their focus on regulating the behavior Black people, those they presumed to not hold wealth and political power to ensure it remained with those who held it, namely white people (Lundman, 1980).

Further supporting the focus of the police force is the historical intertwining of police in politics and business ownership. Police executives (chiefs) were initially appointed by the local political party leader and were often the owners of the local taverns (Walker & Katz, 2008). These appointed police chiefs were largely involved in gambling, prostitution, and gangs and acted on behalf of the political leaders who placed them in power (Walker & Katz, 2008). Today the involvement in politics of police chiefs continues, as police chiefs are either elected by the citizens in the region, appointed by the mayor, or the city council. Putting this together with the historical underpinnings of the function of police officers, one can deduce that police chiefs who want to maintain their position may be motivated

to behave in accordance with those in political power, thus continuing the cycle of the police force being largely focused on individuals who may threaten to take control of that power.

Police also have a history of using coercion and physical force to control the behavior of others (Lundman, 1980; Sliver, 1967; Walker & Katz, 2008). This coercive nature continues today, as is seen throughout the justice system, which focuses on implementing punishment for breaking the law. Research has demonstrated that coercive interactions typically result in additional coercion from the other party, as both parties escalate in hopes of ending the interaction (Biglan, 2015; Sidman, 1989). In other words, when one person does something aversive that the other person wants to end, the other person does something more aversive to attempt to end the interaction. In turn, the initial person may do something even more aversive to end the behavior of the other, further escalating the situation. Tracing this pattern, it is easy to see how police interactions can escalate. Functionally, police officers are called or arrive on scene to control the behavior of others. This is observed by their lead in giving demands and the expectation that their demands will be followed. Let's examine a police officer being called to a scene of an alleged crime. In this situation, anxiety is likely already raised in the individual citizens who are interacting with the police officer. Additionally, the police officer is likely in a heightened state from adrenaline that may increase the likelihood of impulsive responding. Because someone has been accused of committing a crime, the officer may arrive on the scene and immediately take an aggressive stance, for example, by providing firm, direct instructions for compliance. The officer may say "give me your ID" to one of the individual's, expecting immediate compliance. However, instead of handing over identification, the individual instead responds by saying, "no, why are you bothering me? I'm not involved in this". This interaction is the first instance of negative interaction, which leads to coercive strategies on the police officer's part to gain compliance and control over the situation. Thus, the police officer may escalate by threatening to put the individual in cuffs if they do not hand over their ID. The individual, behaving in the same coercive manner then yells, "leave me alone, ACAB!" Continuing

with the coercive nature of the interaction, the police officer pulls out a taser and threatens to use it if the individual does not comply.

This pattern of coercion, or use of force, is escalated until the officer gains control of the situation, meaning that all parties are complying with officer requests. This coercive interaction is documented in many departments' use of force policies and procedures (Atlanta Police Department, 2013; Metropolitan Police Department – City of St. Louis, 2014; Oakland Police Department, 2014; Albuquerque Police Department, 2017), which document that force may be used to gain control of a situation to prevent harm of themselves or others, to gain control of an arrest, to prevent a person suspected of a crime from fleeing, preventing a crime, or in response to the person's resistance. Force, as documented in these policies includes verbal persuasion, physical tactics, canines, batons and impact weapons, electronic control weapons (tasers), chemical agents, and firearms or other lethal force. In summary, the policies and procedures of many police departments document that coercion should be used to gain control of situations.

It is important to note that the pattern of coercive interactions described here does not consider how these interactions may be different based on individual racial bias. If an officer also engages in racial bias, that officer would be more likely to engage in a coercive interaction with one individual over another, not based on specific behavioral differences, but due to the difference in race. Data on the use of force of police officers when interacting with those who are Black and Brown versus those who are white verifies that racial bias plays a role in these interactions. For example, data on New York City's Stop and Frisk program shows that Black and Latinx individuals are more likely to have an interaction with the police that involves use of force (e.g., slapping or grabbing individuals, pushing individuals into a wall or onto the ground, etc.) than white individuals (Fryer, 2016). Additional review of these data show that the probability of use of force is not related to the individual's likeliness to comply with instructions (e.g., displaying identification) or whether or not the interaction occurred in a high- or low-

crime area. Additionally, these data show that while drawing a weapon is much more rare, Black citizens are 21.3 percent more likely to be involved in an incident where a police officer draws a weapon than white citizens. This illustrates that while police officers are taught to engage in coercive interactions with the public, they are more likely to engage in coercion when interacting with a Black citizen. This is the result of both individual racial bias and institutional racism. Individual racial bias is observed in the individual interaction that the officer has with a citizen. The pattern of responding of each individual officer can be traced and when the officer engages in more instances of coercion and use of force with Black citizens than white citizens, individual racial bias is observed. However, institutionally, racism is upheld and reinforced when individual officers are not held accountable for these actions. Police departments rarely collect data on interactions with citizens that do not result in arrests, making it almost impossible to provide feedback. Additionally, the data that are provided, such as NYC's Stop and Frisk program, do not lead to policy changes in how police officers are trained, provided oversight, and receive feedback. This lack of feedback and correction allows the behaviors to continue, further perpetuating the problem.

Finally, police officers are largely given the responsibility to determine if an individual is engaging in a behavior that is criminal. This requires that officers make immediate decisions regarding people and their behavior. In America, the behaviors of those who are Black and Brown have been the focus of regulation throughout history. These paired together focus police on regulating the behavior of Black and Brown individuals, which is further fueled by the behavioral principles previously referenced, that are involved in the development and continuance of racism.

While this paper does not afford a full detailed description of all nuances in the development of police today, it provides the history of the initial motivation and reinforcers for police behavior and illustrates the relationship between police departments, political leaders and wealthy business owners. While there continues to be much variance in regulation of police behaviors across and within

departments, one thing holds true: police were established and continue to fill the function of regulating public behavior of citizens to ensure those in political power, and those who hold wealth, keep it.

Acceptable public behavior is still not well defined, leaving discretion to police officers to determine individually and as a department. Ambiguous definitions open the door for biased responding. Bias, as defined above, is the result of faulty stimulus control, meaning that the individual is attending to an irrelevant part of the stimulus. Here race differences have been established as stimulus control for behavior and this is seen in how individuals respond to individuals of different races who are engaging in the same behaviors. This is especially harmful when a police officer observes a Black individual and a white individual engaging in similar behaviors, yet determines the Black individual is engaging in “criminal” or “suspect” behavior. More specifically, a white citizen may question or refuse to comply with a demand of a police officer and the officer may not respond with use of force; however, a Black citizen may engage in this same behavior and the officer may respond with use of force. While the two individuals are engaging in the same behavior, one is interpreted as not dangerous while the other is interpreted as dangerous. Similarly, the results of these two interactions may be that the white individual is not arrested while the Black individual is arrested. This is illustrated in various reports across the nation regarding arrest records and the discrepancies between white and Black Americans (Fite, Wynn, & Pardini, 2015; Hinton, 2018). It is also observed in the differential rates of Black people being stopped and searched by police officers as opposed to white people (Williams, 2016). Arrests remove finances from the individual, further upholding the function of racism. While the justice system is responsible for determining if individuals are convicted of crimes, police officers are responsible for introducing individuals into this system. By increasing the likeliness that someone who is Black enters the justice system, one is also increasing the likeliness that Black citizens will be convicted of a crime. This further removes finances and opportunities to gain economic wealth and political power, further perpetuating institutional racism. This type of differential responding of police officers arresting Black

people over white people is observed throughout different geographic regions and neighborhoods, as well as demographic variables including the socio-economic status, religion, and gender of the individual citizen (Edwards, Lee, & Esposito, 2019; Statistica, 2020; Woodow, 2020).

So What Now?

Review of the historical and present-day functions of the police force illustrates that the police force was developed to uphold and maintain institutional racism. It also displays ways in which the use of physical force can unnecessarily escalate a situation that is likely already influenced by racial bias about the citizen. This paired with the individual learning histories of each individual within the police department makes solving the problem of racism in the police force about as simple as solving racism in America. However daunting, the discussions above set the stage for recommending specific actions that police chiefs can take to immediately counteract and combat racism in their departments. These actions include focusing on accountability of individual officers, objectively clarifying behaviors defined as “criminal” or “suspect”, separating political influences within the police department, redeveloping policies and procedures as they relate to use of force, and training. Future research should evaluate the effectiveness of interventions that implement these recommendations, targeting both the behavior of individuals within the police force, as well as the policies that govern the organizations. Additionally, future research should evaluate which 911 calls are most appropriate for police officer response. For example, police officers may not be equipped with the specific expertise and knowledge of mental health issues or drug addiction to respond appropriately to individuals who are escalated or in crisis. As such, different agencies and professionals should be identified to respond to these types of calls. In conclusion, understanding the historical roots of institutional racism as part of the foundation of policing, as well as understanding how individual bias can affect the interactions that individual officers have with the public, can set the stage to develop and test practical interventions that hold the promise of contributing to a future of policing that will be more equitable and just.

References

- About, F. E. (1988). *Children and prejudice*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Albuquerque Police Department. (2017). *Use of Force Policy*. Retrieved from:
<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/56996151cbced68b170389f4/t/5b44cd5ef950b755901a7919/1531235678667/Albuquerque+SOPs.pdf>
- Arhin, A., & Thyer, B. A. (2004). The causes of racial prejudice: A behavior analytic perspective. In J. L. Chin (Ed.), *The psychology of racial prejudice and discrimination, Racism in America* (Vol. I, pp. 1–19). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Atlanta Police Department. (2013). *Police Manual*. Retrieved from:
https://muckrock.s3.amazonaws.com/foia_files/2015/06/26/APD.SOP.3010_Use_of_Force.pdf
- Biglan, A. *The Nurture Effect: How the Science of Human Behavior can Improve our Lives and our World*. New York: New Harbinger Publications.
- Bourret, J. C., Iwata, B. A., Harper, J. M., & North, S. T. (2012). Elimination of position-biased responding in individuals with autism and intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 45(2), 241-250.
- Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., Waring, E. J., & Mazerolle, L. G. (1999). Problem-oriented policing in violent crime places: A randomized controlled experiment. *Criminology*, 37(3), 541-580).
- Cooper, J. O., Heron, T. E., & Heward, W. L. (2007). *Applied Behavior Analysis, 2nd Edition*. Pearson Education, Inc.: Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Corenblum, B., & Annis, R. C. (1993). Development of racial identity in minority and majority children: An

- affect discrepancy model. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science / Revue Canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 25(4), 499-521.
- DeGue, S., Fowler, K. A., & Calkins, C. (2016). Deaths due to use of lethal force by law enforcement: Findings from the national violent death reporting system, 17 U.S. States, 2009-2012. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 51(5), S173-S187.
- DeVylder, J. E., et al. (2018). Association of exposure to police violence with prevalence of mental health symptoms among urban residents in the United States. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1(7). Doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1001%2Fjamanetworkopen.2018.4945>
- de Zurara, G. E. (1896). *The Chronicle of the Discovery and Conquest of Guinea*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, M. R., Dymond, S., Rehfeldt, R. A., Roche, B., & Zlomke, K. R. (2003). Terrorism and relational frame theory. *Behavior and Social Issues*, 12, 129-147.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches*. Johnson Reprint Corp.: New York, NY.
- Eck, J. E., & Spelman, W. (1987). *Problem-solving: Problem-oriented policing in Newport News*. National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC. Retrieved on 9/29/2020 from: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/111964NCJRS.pdf>
- Edwards, F., Lee, H., & Esposito, M. (2019). Risk of being killed by police use of force in the United States by age, race-ethnicity, and sex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(34), 16793-16798. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1821204116>

Fite, P., Wynn, P., & Pardini, D. (2015). Explaining discrepancies in arrest rates between black and white male juveniles. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 77(5), 916-927.

Fryer, R. G. (2016). An empirical analysis of racial differences in police use of force. *National Bureau of Economic Research*. DOI: 10.3386/w22399

Gaines, L., Kappeler, V., & Vaughn, J. (1999). *Policing in America (3rd Ed.)*, Anderson Publishing Company: Cincinnati, OH.

Hesse, B. (2011). Marked unmarked: Black politics and the western political. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 110(4), 974-984.

Hinton, E. (2018). An unjust burden: The disparate treatment of Black Americans in the criminal justice system. *Vera Evidence Brief*. Vera Institute of Justice: Harvard University.

Katz, P. A. (2003). Racists or tolerant multiculturalists? How do they begin? *American Psychologist*, 51(1), 897-909. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.58.11.897b>

Kendi, I. X. (2017). *Stamped from the Beginning: The Definitive History of Racist Ideas in America*. Bold Type Books.

Lundman, R. J. (1980). *Police and Policing: An Introduction*. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston: New York, NY.

Matsuda, K., Garcia, Y., Catagnus, R., & Brandt, J. A. (2020). Can behavior analysis help us understand and reduce racism? A review of the current literature. *Behavior Analysis in Practice*, Feb. 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40617-020-00411-4>

Memmi, A. (2000). *Racism*. University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, MN.

Metropolitan Police Department – City of Saint Louis. (2014). *Special Order, Use of Force*. Retrieve from:

<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/56996151cbced68b170389f4/t/569ac4c9d82d5e0d876a06d5/1452983576668/St.+Louis+Metro+PD+use+of+force.pdf>

Miles, R., & Brown, M. (2003). *Racism, 2nd Edition*. Routledge: New York, NY.

Moore, L. (2020). Police brutality in the United States. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from Britannica.com on July 25, 2020.

Oakland Police Department. (2014). *Use of Force Policy*. Retrieved from:

<http://www2.oaklandnet.com/oakca1/groups/police/documents/webcontent/oak053209.pdf>

Parks, E. (1976). From constabulary to police society: Implications for social control. In W. Chambliss & M. Mankoff (Eds.), *Whose Law? What Order?* Wiley: New York, NY.

Prewitt, K. (2005). Racial classification in America: Where do we go from here? *Daedalus*, 134(1), 5-17.

Reichel, P. L. (1992). The misplaced emphasis on urbanization in police development. *Policing and Society*, 3(1).

Ross, C. T. (2015). A Multi-level Bayesian analysis of racial bias in police shootings at the county-level in the United states, 2011-2014. *PloS One*, 10(11). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141854>

Ross, C. T. (2017). Digging deeper: Population-level racial disparities, exposure to police victimization and psychological trauma. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Science* 25(5), 478-480.

Rutgers University. (2020). *Perceived 'whiteness' of Middle Eastern Americans correlates with discrimination*. Retrieved on 10/6/2020 from: <https://phys.org/news/2020-07-whiteness-middle-eastern-americans-discrimination.html>.

- Sidman, M. (1989). *Coercion and its Fallout*. Boston, MA: Authors Cooperative, Inc.
- Silver, A. (1967). The demand for order in civil society: a review of some important themes in the history of urban crime, police, and riot. In D. Bordua (Ed.), *The Police: Six Sociological Essays*. Wiley: New York, NY.
- Statista. (2021). Number of people shot to death by the police in the United States from 2017 to 2020, by race. Retrieved January 11, 2021, from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/585152/people-shot-to-death-by-us-police-by-race/>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). *Quick Facts, United States*. United States Census Bureau. Retrieved June 9, 2020, from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045219>
- Walker, S., & Katz, C. M. (2008). *The Police in America: An Introduction*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Waxman, O. B., (2017). How the U.S. got its police force. *Time*.
<https://time.com/4779112/police-history-origins/>
- Weinstein, J. H., Wilson, K. G., Drake, C. E., & Kellum, K. K. (2008). A relational frame theory contribution to social categorization. *Behavior and Social Issues*, 17(1), 40-65. Doi: <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.5210/bsi.v17i1.406>
- Williams, T. (2016). San Francisco police disproportionately search African-Americans, report says. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/12/us/san-francisco-police-disproportionately-search-african-americans-report-says.html>
- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken windows: the police and neighborhood safety. *The Atlantic*, 29-38.
- Witherspoon, D. J., Wooding, S., Rogers, A. R., Marchani, E. E., Watkins, W. S., Batzer, M. A., & Jorde, L.

B. (2007). Genetic similarities within and between human populations. *Genetics*, 176(1), 351-359.

Woodrow, M. (2020). Data analysis: Black people 4x more likely to be arrested than white people in Bay Area. *ABCNews*. <https://abc7news.com/police-arrests-bay-area-systematic-racism/6243588/>

Accepted Author Manuscript, In Press, Behavior Analysis in Practice