SPECIAL ISSUE ARTICLE

WILEY

Look there! The effect of perspective, attention, and instructions on how people understand recorded police encounters

Kristyn A. Jones[1] | William E. Crozier[2] | Deryn Strange[3]

[1]John Jay College of Criminal Justice and the Graduate Center, CUNY, New York, USA

[2]Duke University, Durham, NC, USA

[3]John Jay College of Criminal Justice, CUNY, New York, USA

Correspondence
Kristyn A. Jones, John Jay College of Criminal Justice and the Graduate Center, CUNY, 524 W 59th St, New York, NY 10019, USA.
Email: krjones@jjay.cuny.edu

Now more than ever, body cameras, surveillance footage, dash-cam footage, and bystanders with phones enable people to see for themselves officer and civilian behavior and determine the justifiability of officers' actions. This paper examines whether the camera perspective from which people watch police encounters influences the conclusions that people draw. Consistent with recent findings showing that body camera footage leads people to perceive officers' actions as less intentional (Turner, Caruso, Dilich, & Roese, 2019), our first study demonstrates that participants who watched body-camera footage, compared with people who watched surveillance footage of the same encounter, perceived the officer's behavior as being more justified and made more lenient punishment decisions. In our second study, only one of the four police encounters that participants watched led participants to perceive the officer more favorably when they watched body-camera footage compared with bystander footage. Our results demonstrate that some body-camera footage—specifically videos that capture an officer using his or her body to apprehend a civilian—can lead to biased perceptions of police encounters that benefit the officer. Our findings suggest that this occurs because: (i) in body-camera footage, the civilian is the more easily visible figure, thus making less salient the officer's role in the encounter; and (ii) the body camera—attached to an officer's uniform—is unable to adequately capture certain use of force movements that are important in determining an officer's intent.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Whether people can view visual legal evidence objectively and form valid conclusions has long been a concern. With greater access to technology, and with it more opportunities to access footage of police incidents, the factors that influence how people view police footage have been an important focus of research (Jones, Crozier, & Strange, 2017, 2018). Studies from a variety of disciplines, including visual perception, cognitive and social psychology, and political science, have demonstrated that people who view the same police videos sometimes reach disparate conclusions about what they see, forming biased conclusions (Granot, Balcetis, Schneider, & Tyler, 2014; Kahan, Hoffman, & Braman, 2008). Nonetheless, law enforcement authorities, courts, and the general public rely heavily on footage to make sense of police encounters. Indeed, the United States has spent millions of dollars on implementing body-worn cameras (BWCs) so that people can view police–civilian firsthand encounters and scrutinize behavior.

Although there is little doubt that BWCs have improved police transparency—at least in jurisdictions where the footage is routinely released—the technology is still imperfect. One potential limitation is that BWCs attach to officers' uniforms and thus limit observation of officer behavior and instead draw attention to civilian behavior. A classic social psychological phenomenon, the illusory causation effect (McArthur, 1980; Taylor & Fiske, 1975), illustrates the problem. The effect describes how people attribute causality to whatever is salient in one's visual field. For example, within the context of the recorded police interrogations, the camera perspective bias (Lassiter, Geers, Handley, Weiland, & Munhall, 2002; Lassiter & Irvine, 1986) demonstrates that viewing a recorded interrogation that focuses solely on a suspect leads people to judge the suspect's confession as more voluntary and the suspect more likely to be guilty compared with when the camera focuses on the interrogating detective or equally on the suspect and detective. Similarly, a BWC recording that inherently focuses on civilians instead of on officers and officers' behavior may lead people to perceive civilians as being more causal in police encounters and consequently judge civilians to be more deserving of punishment. Conversely, because the cameras fail to capture officers, people may fail to consider the role that officers play in police encounters, leading people to judge officers as less deserving of punishment.

Though issues of perspective associated with BWCs have been considered since their widespread implementation in 2014 (Miller, Toliver, & Police Executive Research Forum, 2014), only recently have researchers tested this question experimentally. In a series of experiments, Turner et al. (2019) compared BWC footage with dash-cam footage to understand the effect that the camera perspective has on how people understand police encounters. They found that, when people watched the same event, BWC footage led to lower judgments of officer intentionality compared with dash-cam footage, and concluded that the perspective of the BWC leads to more favorable judgments of officer behavior.

Importantly, researchers have shown that, in addition to camera perspectives impacting what is salient and thereby influencing people's explanations for behavior, the focus of the viewer's attention matters too (Chabris, Weinberger, Fontaine, & Simons, 2011; Simons & Chabris, 1999). Ware, Lassiter, Patterson, and Ransom (2008) found that, when participants viewed a recorded police interrogation with the suspect and detective in equal view, participants who were instructed to "pay special attention to the suspect" judged the suspect's confession as more voluntary and the suspect more likely to be guilty than participants who were instructed to pay special attention to the detective or both the suspect and detective. This finding suggests that the camera perspective bias is perceptually based and that attention is a mediator. Consistent with this idea, Sternisko, Granot, and Balcetis (2017) stated that interventions that direct the viewer's attention—such as instructing people to view recorded police encounters holistically or with equal attention to both the officer and civilian—are potentially important for reducing bias in legal judgments when people view visual evidence.

Another way to reduce bias resulting from the camera perspective is by describing the phenomenon to people before they watch any video footage. Notably, however, studies attempting to eliminate the camera perspective bias have shown that it is highly resistant to change, persisting even when people are forewarned about the bias (Lassiter et al., 2002a), are high in attributional complexity (e.g., have the ability to understand complex human behavior;

Lassiter et al., 2005), are conferred heightened personal accountability (i.e., participants were told that they would have to explain their verdict to a judge; Lassiter, Munhall, Geers, Handley, & Weiland, 2001), or are provided judicial instructions designed to reduce camera perspective bias (Lassiter et al., 2002aa, 2002b). However, a study conducted by Elek, Ware, and Ratcliff (2012) showed that instructions that employ the "flexible correction model"—i.e., instructions that not only delineate the camera perspective bias but also describe the direction and magnitude of the bias (Wegener & Petty, 1995, 1997)—can reduce camera perspective bias.

Based on the previous research examining the camera perspective bias, in the present study we examined two different types of instruction to eliminate the camera perspective bias in BWC footage. One instruction led people to focus on the officer's actions, the civilian's actions, or both to determine if viewing a scene more holistically would reduce bias resulting from the camera perspective. The second instruction examined whether telling people about the camera perspective bias would lead people to adequately correct for it.

Another emerging issue with BWC footage is that the videos can be contaminated by other sources of information. Jones et al. (2017) found that a misleading police report biased participants' understanding of footage. Specifically, information that portrayed the officer in a positive light, even though it was self-reported by that officer, led to more positive views of the officer's actions. However, this pro-officer bias was only reported in that single paper. Here, we seek to replicate it and observe how it interacts with the camera perspective. For example, people might be more susceptible to misleading information provided by an officer's account of an event if they view the police encounter from the officer's perspective (i.e., BWC footage) than if they view the police encounter from a more holistic perspective.

Taken together, we sought to replicate the camera perspective bias in police footage and the finding by Turner et al. (2019) that BWC footage leads to lower officer-intent and punishment ratings. In Study 1, we extended this avenue of research by determining whether directing attention and showing multiple camera perspectives would attenuate the positive bias that BWC footage lends to the wearer of the BWC. We also sought to replicate the finding that a misleading police report influences people's understanding of BWC footage. In Study 2, we tested whether an instruction explaining the direction and magnitude of the camera perspective bias could help mitigate bias.

2 | STUDY 1

2.1 | Method

2.1.1 | Design

The study was approved by the first author's college's institutional review board and was pre-registered on the Open Science Framework (OSF). The project page can be found at https://osf.io/7kvea, and the pre-registration can be found at https://osf.io/d3bj9. Our study was a 2 (officer's report: present versus absent) × 4 (camera perspective: officer's BWC, surveillance, surveillance + BWC, or BWC + surveillance) × 4 (viewing instruction: officer, civilian, both, or none) full-factorial design, resulting in 32 possible conditions.[2] In the "BWC" condition (n = 191), participants watched the encounter via an officer's BWC. In the "surveillance" condition (n = 171), participants watched the same recorded encounter but via a surveillance camera that captured the encounter. Some participants were randomly assigned to view the BWC footage first and then the surveillance footage (n = 146), while other participants were randomly assigned to watch the surveillance footage first and then the BWC footage (n = 119). For the officer's report manipulation, participants randomly assigned to the "present" condition (n = 313) read the officer's report prior to viewing any footage of the event, whereas participants randomly assigned to the "absent" condition (n = 314) did not read the officer's report. Finally, for our viewing instruction manipulation, participants were either instructed to focus on the civilian's actions (n = 157), focus on the officer's actions (n = 171), or focus on both the officer's and the civilian's actions (n = 156). Participants in the "none" condition did not receive a viewing instruction (n = 161).

2.1.2 | Participants

According to a G*Power analysis (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009), we needed 613 participants to detect a small–medium effect size ($f = 0.17$) with 85% power at a 0.05 alpha-level for an ANOVA: fixed effects, special, main effects, and interactions. Altogether, we obtained completed surveys from 945 Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) workers residing in the United States who had at least a 90% approval rate (minimum 100 previous HITs) and who were paid $0.75, and from 165 US college students, for two course credits. Based on pre-registered criteria we excluded participants who self-reported to have not followed the instructions (e.g., they took notes, used a search engine, asked for help, $n = 323$), failed the embedded attention check ($n = 29$; Oppenheimer, Meyvis, & Davidenko, 2009), or failed our manipulation checks ($n = 131$), leaving us with 627 participants for analyses. These participants had a mean age of 38.86 (SD = 13.37) and 62.7% were female (37.3% male). A majority of our participants identified as White (72.9%), while 10% identified as Hispanic/Latino, 8.1% identified as Black or African American, 5.6% identified as Asian, 0.3% identified as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and 3.0% identified as other. In terms of education, 44.7% had finished a 4-year undergraduate degree, 41.5% completed high school, 0.5% did not finish high school, and 13.45% received a Master's or PhD degree.

2.2 | Materials

2.2.1 | Footage and police report

The BWC footage and police report describing the police encounter are identical to those used in the work of Jones et al. (2017). The video shows an officer conversing with an intoxicated male. When the civilian walks away from the officer, the officer follows him and tries to handcuff him. When the civilian refuses to cooperate, the officer strikes the civilian repeatedly with his baton until the civilian is on the floor, bracing himself. The police report describes the incident but contains two pieces of misleading information not shown in the video: the civilian hit the officer and the civilian was carrying a knife. For the purposes of this study, we also used the accompanying surveillance footage that captured the event, and unlike Jones et al. (2017) we excluded audio from the BWC footage. We muted the video because the surveillance footage did not have sound, and we wanted to minimize the differences in information between the surveillance footage and BWC footage.

2.3 | Measures

2.3.1 | Fact questions

To determine participants' ability to understand and remember the recorded police encounter, we asked three forced-choice fact questions: "Who was the officer interacting with?", "Why was the officer interacting with the civilian?", and "Where did the altercation take place?" Participants selected from five options for each question, including an "unsure" option. See the appendix for the questions and response items for all dependent variables. Participants provided their confidence level after each question unless participants selected the "unsure" response. The confidence scales ranged from 1 (*not at all confident*) to 7 (*completely confident*).

2.3.2 | Misinformation questions

We asked two questions to determine the extent to which participants relied on the misleading officer's report to make sense of the interaction. The questions were, "From the responses listed below, which of the following do you

think contributed the most to the officer's decision to arrest the civilian?" and "From the responses listed below, what do you think was the primary cause of the officer's use of force?" These two questions about misinformation acceptance had four responses—two that were consistent with the officer's report and two that were consistent with the footage (see the appendix).

2.3.3 | Ratings of officer and civilian questions/statements

We asked participants questions about the officer and civilian. Four items were about the officer's actions and four items were about the civilian's actions. The questions were "How forceful did the officer [civilian] seem?", "How appropriate were the officer's [civilian's] actions?", and "To what extent was the officer [civilian] responsible for the encounter?" Participants also responded to the statement "The officer [civilian] completely caused the civilian [officer] to behave as he did." All participants responded to these dependent variables using Likert scales that ranged from 1 to 9. Finally, participants selected from four options the actions that the police department should take: "In your opinion what is the most important course of action the police department should take after learning about this encounter?" (for possible answers, see the appendix).

2.3.4 | Punishment decisions

Participants responded to two statements about punishment for both the officer and the civilian. The first statement was "The officer [civilian] should be punished in some way." The second statement was "Imagine that the officer [civilian] is held responsible for his actions. Now rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statement: The officer's [civilian's] punishment should be extremely harsh." Both of these statements had Likert scales ranging from 1 (*strong disagreement*) to 9 (*strong agreement*).

2.3.5 | Exploratory questions

For our exploratory questions, participants answered whose perspective they took when watching the surveillance footage/BWC footage on a scale ranging from 1 (*mostly the civilian's perspective*) to 9 (*mostly the officer's perspective*). We also asked participants to rate how easy it was to see what was happening in the surveillance footage/BWC footage, on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all easy*) to 9 (*extremely easy*).

2.3.6 | Identification with Police Scale (IPS)

Originally developed by Tyler and Fagan (2008), the Identification with Police Scale measures the extent to which people identify with police. In this study participants responded to the abbreviated version used by Granot et al. (2014). This version is seven questions long and has a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (*strong disagreement*) to 7 (*strong agreement*).

2.3.7 | Procedure

After consenting to participate, participants assigned to the officer's report present condition read the officer's police report and then completed a two-minute card-flipping delay task. Next, participants randomly assigned to receive a viewing instruction learned that they should focus on the officer, civilian, or both the officer and civilian while watching the recorded police encounter. To ensure that participants understood their instruction, we asked

participants, "Who were you instructed to focus on?" immediately after the viewing instruction. Participants who failed to select the correct option were prompted again with their assigned instruction. Next, all participants watched footage of the encounter from the officer's BWC, the surveillance camera, or both. After watching the footage, participants completed a three-minute card-flipping delay task. Finally, participants completed our dependent measures: fact questions, misinformation questions, judgment questions, exploratory questions, and Identification with Police Scale. Participants also answered demographic questions. All participants were debriefed and thanked for their time.

2.4 | Results and discussion

First, we describe participants' responses to the fact questions. Then, we describe the misinformation scores, ratings of the officer, and ratings of the civilian that we analyzed with three ANOVAs. Each ANOVA used the full-factorial model with report, camera perspective, and attention instruction as the independent variables and mean-centered IPS as the covariate. We mean-centered IPS to avoid multicollinearity issues. All reported pairwise comparisons and means are examined with Bonferroni adjustment.

2.4.1 | Fact questions

For the fact question, "Who was the officer interacting with," 94.10% correctly answered "a young man" and had a mean confidence rating of 6.34 (SD = 0.94). For the fact question, "Why was the officer interacting with the civilian?" responses were mixed. For participants who received the report, 74.10% correctly answered that a witness called the police and had a mean confidence rating of 6.10 (SD = 1.04). For participants who did not receive the report, 81.20% responded that they were unsure. These results demonstrate that when participants received the correct information, they were fairly accurate at understanding the encounter, demonstrating that participants paid attention to the materials and encoded the information presented to them.

2.4.2 | Misinformation items

We recoded the two misinformation questions such that choices containing misinformation received a 1 and choices that did not contain misinformation received a 0. We summed participants' scores to these two questions, creating a misinformation score ranging from zero to two. See Table 1 for means and standard deviations of participants' misinformation scores per experimental condition. Participants who received the report made more references to misinformation than participants who did not receive the report, $F(1, 594) = 16.88$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.028$. Participants who received the report had a mean misinformation score of 0.53 and participants who did not receive the report had a mean misinformation score of 0.31 ($d = 0.33$, 95% CI [0.28, 0.38]). IPS was a significant predictor, $F(1, 594) = 6.13$, $p = 0.014$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.010$. Neither the camera perspective nor the attention instruction had a statistically significant effect on people's tendency to report misinformation ($p = 0.994$ and $p = 0.162$, respectively) and no significant interactions emerged.

2.4.3 | Ratings of officer

We formed a composite measure for ratings of the officer with our four dependent variables about the officer. The composite measure had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.82. Then, we ran the ANOVA with the composite officer score the dependent variable. The analysis revealed that participants who received the police report had more favorable ratings of the officer (M = 4.64, SD = 1.81) compared with participants who did not receive the police report (M = 5.63, SD = 1.81; $F(1, 594) = 49.71$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.077$, $d = 0.57$, 95% CI [0.43, 0.70]), suggesting that the misleading information about the officer led people to have a more positive view of the officer.

TABLE 1 Study 1 means (and standard deviations) of dependent variables per experimental condition

	Misinformation score	Officer rating	Civilian rating	Officer punishment	Civilian punishment
No report	0.30 (0.57)	5.63 (1.73)	5.70 (1.54)	5.16 (2.49)	4.90 (1.91)
Report	0.53 (0.68)	4.64 (1.82)	6.60 (1.46)	3.91 (2.53)	5.51 (1.87)
BWC	0.41 (0.67)	4.79 (1.80)	6.24 (1.49)	3.90 (2.46)	5.14 (1.91)
Surv.	0.43 (0.62)	5.20 (1.80)	6.17 (1.66)	4.67 (2.56)	5.39 (1.91)
BWC + surv.	0.41 (0.63)	5.42 (1.87)	6.03 (1.52)	5.02 (2.61)	5.13 (1.84)
Surv. +BWC	0.39 (0.64)	5.19 (1.93)	6.12 (1.61)	4.78 (2.60)	5.15 (2.02)
Civilian instruction	0.49 (0.73)	5.02 (1.98)	6.16 (1.66)	4.50 (2.54)	5.32 (1.95)
Officer instruction	0.32 (0.59)	5.20 (1.85)	6.11 (1.40)	4.56 (2.59)	5.05 (1.85)
Both instruction	0.45 (0.63)	5.07 (1.72)	6.25 (1.57)	4.37 (2.52)	5.29 (1.85)
No instruction	0.39 (0.64)	5.21 (1.86)	6.08 (1.63)	4.71 (2.68)	5.16 (2.00)

Note: Surv., surveillance. Means (and standard deviations) presented without adjustments.

The camera perspective also had an effect, $F(3, 594) = 4.84$, $p = 0.002$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.024$: Participants who viewed the interaction via the BWC footage ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 1.70$) provided more positive ratings of the officer compared with participants who viewed the interaction via the surveillance footage ($M = 5.20$, $SD = 1.67$ $p = 0.038$, $d = 0.29$, 95% CI [0.11, 0.46]), via the BWC footage first and then surveillance footage ($M = 5.37$, $SD = 1.73$, $p = 0.004$, $d = 0.38$, 95% CI [0.20, 0.56]), and via the surveillance footage first and then the BWC footage ($M = 5.24$, $SD = 1.78$, $p = 0.063$, $d = 0.30$, 95% CI [0.11, 0.50]). These results show that the BWC perspective led people to view the officer more positively than surveillance footage. Though the latter pairwise comparison was not statistically significant with Bonferroni adjustment, the pattern of these results suggests that viewing a camera perspective in addition to BWC footage shifts people's judgments and reduces the positive ratings people give when they watch only BWC footage.

Finally, our viewing instruction did not have a statistically significant effect on people's ratings of the officer ($p = 0.677$). Unsurprisingly, however, people with greater identification with the police rated the officer more positively, $F(1,594) = 76.22$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.114$.

2.4.4 | Ratings of civilian

We created a composite measure with our four questions about the civilian (Cronbach's alpha = 0.77) and ran an ANOVA with civilian composite score the dependent variable. The ANOVA revealed that participants who received the officer's report viewed the civilian more negatively ($M = 6.56$, $SD = 1.54$) than participants who did not receive the officer's report ($M = 5.73$, $SD = 1.45$), $F(1, 594) = 48.10$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.075$, $d = 0.56$, 95% CI [0.44, 0.67]). Neither camera perspective nor attention instruction had a statistically significant influence on people's ratings of the civilian ($p = 0.591$, $p = 0.836$, respectively). Again, IPS was a significant predictor, $F(1, 594) = 78.21$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.116$. The more people identified with the police, the more they had negative ratings of the civilian.

2.4.5 | Officer punishment decisions

We combined the two questions related to the officer's punishment (Cronbach's alpha = 0.92). Participants who read the misleading officer's report were in less agreement that the officer should be punished than participants who did not read the officer's report, $F(1, 594) = 37.12$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.059$. The camera perspective also had a statistically

significant effect on people's punishment decisions, $F(3, 594) = 7.88$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.038$. Pairwise comparisons showed that participants who watched the BWC footage were in less agreement that the officer should be punished than participants who watched the surveillance footage ($p = 0.004$, $d = 0.36$, 95% CI [0.12, 0.60]), participants who watched the BWC footage and then surveillance footage ($p < 0.001$, $d = 0.46$, 95% CI [0.21, 0.72]), and participants who watched the surveillance footage and then the BWC footage ($p = 0.002$, $d = 0.44$, 95% CI [0.17, 0.70]). IPS also predicted people's punishment decisions, $F(1, 594) = 79.10$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.118$. Participants who more strongly identified with the police were in less agreement that the officer should be punished. Our instruction manipulation was not a statistically significant predictor, $p = 0.920$.

2.4.6 | Civilian punishment decisions

We created a composite score for the two questions about civilian punishment (Cronbach's alpha = 0.70). Participants indicated that the civilian should be punished more when they received the police report compared with participants who did not receive the report, $F(1, 594) = 9.92$, $p = 0.002$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.016$. Participants' identification with police also predicted punishment decisions, $F(1, 594) = 81.72$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.121$. People who identified with the police were more likely to indicate that the civilian should be punished. Our perspective manipulation and attention manipulation were not statistically significantly predictors of the civilian's punishment, $p = 0.643$ and $p = 0.411$, respectively.

2.4.7 | Exploratory questions

Overall, when participants watched the surveillance footage, their ratings were more in line with taking the civilian's perspective ($M = 4.93$, SD = 2.27). When participants watched the BWC footage, their ratings were more in line with taking the officer's perspective ($M = 6.16$, SD = 2.69). Participants also rated that it was less easy to see what was happening when they viewed the BWC footage ($M = 3.99$, SD = 2.16) than when they viewed the surveillance footage ($M = 4.58$, SD = 2.24).

2.4.8 | Summary

Results from Study 1 demonstrate that BWC footage led to more favorable ratings of the officer compared with surveillance footage, replicating the findings of Turner et al. (2019). The camera perspective only affected what people thought about the officer's actions, not the civilian's actions. In addition, participants who viewed the BWC and then surveillance footage provided ratings for the officer that were not statistically different from participants who only viewed the surveillance footage, suggesting that multiple camera perspectives help reduce bias resulting from the BWC footage. The attention instruction did not attenuate or exacerbate people's judgments of the officer or the civilian. Finally, participants who read the officer's police report containing misleading information provided responses that were more favorable for the officer and less favorable for the civilian, replicating the results of Jones et al. (2017). For Study 2, we focus on the role that more specific, directive instructions might have in attenuating the positive bias that BWC footage affords officers.

3 | STUDY 2

In Study 2, we were interested in whether judicial-like instructions, rather than attention instructions, would help combat the positive bias that BWCs extended to the officer in Study 1. Because BWC recordings typically limit

people's view of the officer's actions, instructions that explain the camera perspective bias might be more effective than an attention instruction. In other words, the reason that the attention instruction might have failed in Study 1 might have been because participants had difficulties "focusing on the officer's actions" when a majority of his actions were not captured by the camera.

In addition, one limitation of Study 1 is that we tested people's judgments about one recorded police–civilian encounter. Thus, we cannot exclude the possibility that the quality of the recording or certain characteristics of the event itself led people to have disparate conclusions. This fact reduces our confidence that the phenomenon of the camera perspective bias occurs across recorded police encounters, regardless of the information that is being recorded and the quality of the video. To account for this potential issue, we tested four different police–civilian encounters in Study 2. We also dropped the misleading report manipulation, because although our Study 1 results replicated those of Jones et al. (2017), the camera perspective did not predict differential memory distortion on the misinformation score measure.

3.1 | Method

3.1.1 | Design

The design was a 2 (perspective: BWC recording versus other) × 2 (instruction: yes versus no) × 4 (event: Event 1, Event 2, Event 3, Event 4), with "event" being a within-subject variable. For the event manipulation, participants watched four videos (described below). For the perspective manipulation, depending on random assignment, participants watched the videos from the perspective of the officer's BWC or from the perspective of a bystander or dash-cam. We compared BWC footage with both bystander and dash-cam footage because we were interested in testing the difference that viewing footage in which the civilian is salient versus viewing footage in which both the officer and civilian are salient would have on people's judgments. We also hypothesized that if the BWC footage bias occurs because the officer is shown on screen less, then BWC footage would lead to more positive ratings of the officer compared with both bystander and dash-cam footage. Finally, for our second between subject manipulation, "instruction," participants either received information about the camera perspective bias and its magnitude and direction or did not receive any information.

3.1.2 | Participants

According to a G*Power analysis (Faul et al., 2009), for a between factors repeated ANOVA, a sample size of 228 was needed to detect an effect size of $f = 0.175$ with 80% power. Three hundred MTurk participants located in the United States who had at least a 90% approval rate (minimum 100 previous HITs) completed the study; 25 participants were excluded because they failed the embedded attention check and 50 participants were excluded because they did not follow the instructions (e.g., they took notes, asked for help, used a web browser). There are two reasons our number of exclusions is much smaller compared with Study 1. First, unlike Study 1, this sample did not include students. Research has shown that MTurk workers are more attentive to instructional manipulation checks than college subject pool samples (Hauser & Schwarz, 2016). Second, this experiment did not use a manipulation check as in Study 1. Recall that in Study 1 we asked participants to remember on whom they were instructed to focus. Participants' failure to correctly answer this manipulation check accounted for many of our exclusions in Study 1.

The final sample included in our analyses had a mean age of 40.12 (SD = 12.76) and 59.8% were female (40.2% male). A majority of our participants identified as White (71.9%), while 6.3% identified as Hispanic/Latino, 9.8% identified as Black or African American, 11.2% identified as Asian, 0 identified as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and

0.9% identified as other. In terms of education, half of the sample had completed an undergraduate degree (50%), 34.4% finished high school, 13.4% received a Master's or PhD degree, and 2.2% did not finish high school.

3.2 | Materials

3.2.1 | Footage

We used four different police encounters that were publicly available, and all of which had BWC footage. Two of the police encounters had corresponding dash-cam footage. The BWC and dash-cam footage from these two events were identical to the materials used by Turner et al. (2019). The other two police encounters were available on YouTube and had corresponding bystander footage. All the videos are available on OSF and Table 2 provides details about each video.

3.2.2 | Instruction

We based our instructions on those described by Elek et al. (2012), who found that their instructions attenuated the camera perspective bias in recorded police interrogations. Specifically, participants assigned to receive an instruction read the following statement before watching the videos:

> One last thing before you view the videos, please be aware that body camera footage has been found to bias viewers' judgments. Specifically, research has demonstrated that encounters recorded via the body camera lead people to believe that the officer's actions were less intentional and that the officer is less deserving of punishment. One reason this might occur is because people are unable to see the actions of the officer, who is mostly not recorded and thus not shown in the footage. Research has demonstrated that most people are unaware that they are affected by this bias. So, we ask that while viewing the video, you keep in mind these research findings.

3.2.3 | Measures

After each video, participants answered three questions about the encounter using Likert scales, ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*extremely*): "How intentional were the officer's actions?", "How responsible was the civilian for the encounter?", and "How responsible was the officer for the encounter?" Participants also responded to four statements, ranging from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 7 (*strongly disagree*): "To what extent do you agree/disagree with the statement: The officer [civilian] completely caused the civilian to behave as he/she did" and "To what extent do you agree/disagree with the statement: The officer [civilian] should be punished." Participants also responded to the same Identification with Police Scale (IPS) as described in Study 1.

3.2.4 | Procedure

After providing consent, participants received instructions on how to complete the survey. All participants learned that they would watch four different videos. Participants randomly assigned to receive the instructions read the instruction before watching the videos. Next, all participants watched four different videos involving a police–civilian encounter in randomized order. Participants watched all four events from the same perspective (BWC or other)

TABLE 2 Descriptions of police footage used in Study 1 and Study 2

Event	Camera perspective	Description	Source	Sound	Length of video	How violent was the video?	How clearly could you see what happened?	How difficult was it to see the officer's actions?	How confident are you in your understanding of what happened?	Rate the quality (e. g., pixilation, graininess) of the video
1a	BWC (n = 31)	White officer shoots a black civilian who is walking toward the officer.	Turner et al., (2019)	No	10 s	5.45 (1.41)	4.39 (1.82)	3.58 (1.79)	3.90 (1.87)	3.74 (1.65)
1b	Dash-cam (n = 29)		Turner et al., (2019)	No	10 s	5.55 (1.27)	4.38 (1.68)	4.10 (1.84)	4.00 (1.83)	3.83 (1.31)
2a	BWC (n = 26)	White officer shoots a black civilian.	Turner et al., (2019)	No	8 s	3.88 (1.66)*	2.42 (1.30)*	5.58 (1.27)	2.35 (1.52)	2.23 (1.18)
2b	Dash-cam (n = 30)		Turner et al., (2019)	No	8 s	4.80 (1.70)*	3.23 (1.61)*	4.93 (1.41)	2.60 (1.61)	2.33 (0.92)
3a	BWC (n = 31)	White officer grabs a white civilian from her vehicle and drags her across the floor.	YouTube	Yes	18 s	4.48 (1.61)*	4.26 (1.83)	3.45 (1.84)	4.10 (2.04)	4.58 (1.31)*
3b	Bystander (n = 21)		YouTube	Yes	18 s	5.43 (1.36)*	4.52 (1.66)	3.62 (1.86)	3.29 (1.62)	2.67 (0.86)*
4a	BWC (n = 25)	White officer grabs a black civilian, slams her to the	YouTube	Yes	18 s	3.60 (1.56)*	2.76 (1.74)*	5.16 (1.63)*	2.88 (2.13)*	3.96 (1.40)

(Continues)

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Event	Camera perspective	Description	Source	Sound	Length of video	How violent was the video?	How clearly could you see what happened?	How difficult was it to see the officer's actions?	How confident are you in your understanding of what happened?	Rate the quality (e. g., pixilation, graininess) of the video
		ground, and arrests her.								
4b	Bystander (n = 42)		YouTube	Yes	18 s	5.31 (1.28)*	4.64 (1.69)*	3.02 (1.85)*	4.21 (1.79)*	4.19 (1.07)
Study 1a	BWC (n = 29)	See description in Section 2.1	YouTube	No	122 s	4.93 (1.36)	3.76 (1.66)	5.24 (1.43)*	3.83 (1.79)	3.28 (1.28)
Study 1b	Surv. (n = 24)		YouTube	No	122 s	5.25 (1.39)	4.21 (1.22)	3.92 (1.41)*	3.83 (1.79)	3.21 (1.10)

Note: Surv., surveillance.

*Participants' ratings of BWC footage were significantly different from participants' ratings of the other camera perspective at the 0.05 level. Parenthetical values for means are standard deviations.

based on random assignment. Each video appeared on its own page. After watching each video once, participants advanced to the next screen where they answered the dependent variables. Participants could not go back after advancing the page. Participants completed this process a total of four times, once for each video. Like Study 1, participants responded to the IPS scale, answered demographic questions, indicated whether they had followed the survey instructions, and were debriefed.

3.3 | Results and discussion

To analyze the data, we first mean-centered IPS to avoid multi-collinearity issues. Then, in line with our analysis plan, we entered the data into repeated measures ANOVAs with event the within subject variable, instructions and camera perspective the between subject variables, and IPS the covariate. We used the same model for each dependent variable that we tested; the results from these analyses are available on OSF.

The four-level within-subject event variable accounted for a significant amount of variance, making our results difficult to interpret. In other words, our manipulations revealed different effects that were dependent upon the event (e.g., the type of police encounter) that people watched. Because the aim of this study was to assess the role of perspective and instructions across multiple events, we changed our analytic approach to a more sophisticated set of linear mixed effects. By employing a linear mixed model, we controlled for the unique variance in the four different police events, as well as differences in participants. This type of analysis improves our precision in examining whether BWC footage leads to different judgments of police encounters compared with other types of camera perspective, regardless of the specific details of the police encounter. For these analyses, the model was identical for each tested dependent variable. Specifically, we entered camera perspective (BWC versus other) and instructions (yes versus no), the interaction between camera perspective and instructions, and IPS as fixed effects. We entered event and participant as random effects. For each dependent variable, we had 224 participants respond four times (once for each event). Thus, each variable had 896 observations. Means and standard deviations of each dependent variable per experimental condition are shown in Table 3.

3.3.1 | Linear mixed models

As shown in Tables 4 and 5, camera perspective, instructions, and the interaction between the two predictors did not statistically significantly predict any of our dependent variables. However, IPS was a statistically significant predictor of some dependent measures. Namely, IPS predicted participants' responses to officer punishment, civilian punishment, civilian responsibility, whether the officer caused the civilian to behave as he/she did, and whether the civilian caused the officer to behave as he did. IPS predicted these variables in the directions that we expected: participants with stronger identification with police were in stronger agreement that the civilian was responsible for the encounter ($B = -0.03$, 95% CI [-0.05, -0.01]), that the officer should *not* be punished ($B = -0.04$, 95% CI [-0.06, -0.02]), and that the civilian should be punished ($B = 0.03$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.05]). In addition, people who more

TABLE 3 Study 2 means (and standard deviations) of dependent variables per experimental condition

	Officer rating	Civilian rating	Officer punishment	Civilian punishment
BWC	4.64 (1.82)	6.56 (1.46)	4.28 (2.66)	6.23 (2.13)
Other	4.72 (1.80)	6.26 (1.49)	4.13 (2.60)	5.79 (2.11)
Instruction	5.20 (1.80)	6.17 (1.66)	4.94 (2.67)	5.93 (2.21)
No Instruction	5.37 (1.87)	6.08 (1.61)	5.24 (2.73)	5.71 (2.18)

Note: Means (and standard deviations) are presented without adjustment.

TABLE 4 Study 2 linear mixed model results

Predictors

	Officer intention				Officer responsibility				Civilian responsibility				Officer caused civilian to behave as he/she did			
	Per.	Instruc.	Per. * Instruc.	IPS	Per.	Instruc.	Per. * Instruc.	IPS	Per.	Instruc.	Per. * Instruc.	IPS	Per.	Instruc.	Per. * Instruc.	IPS
Effect	−0.17	−0.09	0.08	0.00	−0.10	0.13	0.03	0.01	0.09	0.32	−0.40	−0.03	0.01	0.25	−0.36	−0.02
95% CI	[−0.56, 0.22]	[−0.48, −0.30]	[−0.49, 0.65]	[−0.01, 0.02]	[−0.56, 0.36]	[−0.33, 0.58]	[−0.63, 0.70]	[−0.01, 0.03]	[−0.35, 0.52]	[−0.12, 0.75]	[−1.03, 0.22]	[−0.05, −0.01]	[−0.39, 0.41]	[−0.15, 0.65]	[−0.93, 0.22]	[−0.04, 0.00]
p	0.391	0.665	0.774	0.745	0.667	0.582	0.927	0.207	0.697	0.151	0.208	<0.001	0.961	0.215	0.223	0.015
Random effects																
σ^2	2.37				2.80				2.87				2.33			
τ_{00} SS_Number	0.57				0.88				0.69				0.61			
τ_{00} Event	0.04				0.30				0.32				0.20			
ICC	0.21				0.30				0.26				0.26			
Marginal R^2 / conditional R^2	0.002/0.207				0.005/0.300				0.023/0.278				0.016/0.271			

Note: N event = 4.
N participants = 224.
N observations = 896.

TABLE 5 Study 2 linear mixed models continued

Predictors	Civilian caused officer to behave as he did				Officer punishment				Civilian punishment			
	Per.	Instruc.	Per. × Instruc.	IPS	Per.	Instruc.	Per. × Instruc.	IPS	Per.	Instruc.	Per. × Instruc.	IPS
Effect	−0.17	−0.09	0.08	0.00	−0.10	0.13	0.03	0.01	0.09	0.32	−0.28	−0.03
95% CI	[−0.56, 0.22]	[−0.48, −0.30]	[−0.49, 0.65]	[−0.01, 0.02]	[−0.56, 0.36]	[−0.33, 0.58]	[−0.63, 0.70]	[−0.01, 0.03]	[−0.53, 0.32]	[−0.48, 0.36]	[−0.33, 0.89]	[0.01, 0.05]
p	0.391	0.665	0.774	0.745	0.667	0.582	0.927	0.207	0.628	0.778	0.367	0.001
Random effects												
σ^2	2.37				2.80				2.87			
τ_{00} SS_Number	0.57				0.88				0.69			
τ_{00} Event	0.04				0.30				0.32			
ICC	0.21				0.30				0.26			
Marginal R^2 / conditional R^2	0.002/0.207				0.005/0.300				0.023/0.278			

Note: N event = 4.
N participants = 224.
N observations = 896.

strongly identified with the police agreed less often that the officer caused the civilian to behave as he/she did ($B = -0.02$, 95% CI [$-0.04, -0.00$]) and were more likely to agree that the civilian caused the officer to behave as he did ($B = 0.03$, 95% CI [$0.01, 0.05$]). Finally, as shown in Table 4, a large amount of variance in the models was attributed to both individual participant differences and the Event that people watched.

3.3.2 | Ratings of videos

To elucidate the unique characteristics of the police encounters that we presented to participants in Study 2, as well as the police encounter in Study 1, we had MTurk workers watch the videos and answer questions about them (see Table 2). Each participant watched one video and answered questions about the video's violence, the video's clarity, and the video's quality (e.g., pixilation). Participants also answered questions about how well they could see the officer's actions and how confident they were in understanding what happened. Participants responded to these questions using scales that ranged from 1 (*not at all/strong disagreement*) to 7 (*extremely/strong agreement*). We ran independent *t*-tests to determine if participants who watched the BWC perspective provided different ratings than participants who watched the Other camera perspective.

In Table 2, asterisks represent statistically significant differences (at the 0.05 level) between the two camera perspectives (BWC versus other) for a given event. For each pair of videos—except the pair from Study 1 and the pair from Event 1 (Study 2)—participants rated the other video as being significantly more violent than the BWC video. In addition, participants who watched the BWC video from Study 1 and the BWC video from Event 4 (Study 2) indicated that it was more difficult to see the officer's actions than participants who watched these police encounters from the other camera perspective. Interestingly, a *t*-test examining people's responses to our original dependent variables for Event 4 only revealed that participants who watched the BWC video rated the officer as having less intent than participants who watched the bystander video, $t(204.70) = 2.10$, $p = 0.037$. Moreover, compared with participants who watched the bystander video, participants who watched the BWC video rated the officer as being less responsible ($t(222) = 2.14$, $p = 0.034$) and the civilian being more responsible ($t(222) = 2.64$, $p = 0.009$). These results suggest that the clarity of the officer's actions may be an important aspect of the BWC perspective bias.

4 | GENERAL DISCUSSION

Does the camera perspective influence how people understand police encounters? Results from our two studies suggest that BWC footage can lead people to perceive officers more favorably than they would have if they had viewed the same encounter from a camera perspective that captured both the officer and civilian. This finding is consistent with the robust illusory causation effect, which shows that people perceive stimuli that are salient in their visual fields as being more causal than less visually salient stimuli (Taylor & Fiske, 1975). In addition, similar to the camera perspective bias associated with positioning of the camera in recorded police interrogations, our results provide evidence of another legal setting where the camera perspective shapes legal outcomes.

Our results also partially comport with the findings from Turner et al. (2019). In a variety of contexts, they found that people who watched events from the BWC perspective rated the person wearing the BWC as having less intent than people who watched the same event from a different camera perspective (e.g., dash-cam footage). Our findings from Study 1 showed that participants who viewed BWC footage rated the officer's actions more favorably and made punishment decisions that were more lenient than participants who viewed surveillance footage, replicating the results from Turner et al. (2019). However, results from Study 2 did not demonstrate this same pattern of results. In our Study 2, linear effect models accounting for four different police encounters revealed that people who viewed BWC footage did not form different beliefs about intent, causality, responsibility, or punishment compared with people who watched the corresponding dash-cam or bystander recordings. These null results ran counter to our

hypotheses and failed to replicate the findings from Study 1 and Turner et al. (2019). Our results are surprising, given that we used two stimuli that the participants of Turner et al. (2019) watched and that we asked similar questions about officer intentionality.

How then do we reconcile these differences? Although Study 2 was similar to the work of Turner et al. (2019), the two studies differed in a key way: Turner et al. (2019) asked participants to rate the intentionality of specific officer actions (e.g., "The officer intentionally [broke the car window/shot the suspect]."), whereas our questions about officer intentionality were more general (i.e., "How intentional were the officer's actions?"). This difference means that participants in the study by Turner et al. (2019) were guided to consider specific actions—an important difference given that participants indicated that it was somewhat difficult to see the officers' actions in both the BWC videos and other videos. These findings suggest that bias from the BWC footage compared with other camera perspectives may only be apparent when people are made aware of or focus on the specific actions that an officer takes, rather than taking a more holistic view of the encounter.

Our results also suggest that people who watch BWC footage, compared with other camera perspectives, are likely to perceive officer behavior more favorably and make more lenient punishment decisions when the surveillance footage more clearly shows the officer's actions. This may particularly be the case in incidents that involve an officer physically using his or her body to apprehend someone. For example, in the two events that had statistically significant differences in people's ratings of how difficult it was to see the officer's actions, the videos depicted the officer either striking a civilian with his baton (Study 1) or picking up a civilian to put her on the ground (Study 2, Event 4). Analyses examining just these two police encounters demonstrated that participants who viewed the BWC videos attributed a positive bias to the officer compared with participants who viewed the other camera perspectives. It appears then that, when people are not guided to consider specific police actions, viewers who watch encounters in which officers use their bodies to forcibly apprehend civilians are especially likely to regard the wearer of the BWC with positive bias.

The second goal of this paper was to determine whether we could eliminate the BWC perspective bias by allowing people to watch a police encounter from an additional camera perspective (in Study 1) and by providing people with viewing instructions (in Studies 1 and 2). In Study 1, we found that when participants watched both the BWC and surveillance footage of the police–civilian encounter their ratings were similar to those by people who only watched the surveillance footage. Put differently, we found that receiving multiple camera perspectives reduced the BWC bias. This finding suggests that people are considering new information when they watch additional camera perspectives—rather than viewing the video in the exact same way as the initial review.

However, attention instructions directing people to focus on the officer, civilian, or both did not have any effect on people's ratings of the officer or the civilian. Recall that we hypothesized, because research has shown that the camera perspective bias is partially mediated by attention, that specific attention instructions would help reduce or eliminate the camera perspective bias (Ware et al., 2008). One reason why this type of instruction might have failed is that because directing attention is difficult with BWC footage, where the civilian is the only visibly salient actor. Thus, in Study 2, we developed instructions that told people about the BWC perspective bias before they watched any videos. This type of instruction was based on previous research that found the instruction to be effective at reducing the camera perspective bias in recorded false confessions (Elek et al., 2012). However, in Study 2, our instruction did not have a statistically significant effect on any of our dependent variables, nor did the instruction manipulation interact with camera perspective. At the same time, this null result is not entirely surprising, given the fact that the camera perspective bias did not emerge in Study 2. Because the camera perspective did not influence people's ratings to begin with, it is unlikely that the instructions would have any corrective effect for a bias that was not present.

Taken together, our results provide some evidence to support that the illusory causation effect and camera perspective bias extends to recorded police encounters. However, it appears that this effect does not extend to all types of police encounter, especially when the police officer's actions are unclear to observers. Compared with recorded interrogations, police encounters are typically more ambiguous in nature, because they often lack sound, and the

image quality is often poor. BWCs exacerbate these problems because the camera is physically attached to a moving officer whose movements often obstruct the field of view it is trying to capture.

Despite the ambiguity inherent in the recording of police encounters, our findings suggest that there are specific types of police encounter that are particularly likely to lead people to perceive officers in a more positive light when they view BWC footage compared with footage captured by other camera perspectives. These police encounters involve officers using their bodies to physically apprehend a civilian. Because BWCs attach to officers' uniforms, it appears that, in these cases, BWCs are unable to demonstrate the true force enacted on a civilian that a bystander or surveillance camera is more apt to capture. Future research should further examine the range of police encounters where BWC footage may lead observes to biased perceptions of what they see. Future research should also elucidate the role that clarity and image quality plays in this bias, and whether more specific instructions about the camera perspective bias could help attenuate it.

A final finding that we want to highlight is the effect that people's identification with police had on participants' responses to the videos that they watched. For almost every dependent variable, the extent to which people reported to identify with the police predicted their responses. This finding is consistent with previous research examining how people consider police encounters (Granot et al., 2014; Jones et al., 2017, 2018). However, in Study 2, IPS was not always a significant predictor. This suggests that identification with police may be a lens through which people view ambiguous situations, but may not matter if the appropriateness of an officer's actions is clear. In sum, our findings underline that individual-level identity can bias views of police–civilian interactions. Both practitioners and researchers should be cognizant of this fact when using footage (particularly BWC footage) and temper expectations of objectivity accordingly.

The data and conclusions we present do come with several limitations. Perhaps the most important limitation is illustrated by the results of Study 2: differences in the individual events can result in wide variation in biased interpretation. Here, we used recordings for relatively similar events: only one or two police officers interacting with one suspect in a violent, but sometimes difficult to discern, short encounter. Understanding of the event (and any bias) may change based on the addition of multiple police officers acting as a unit, multiple civilians acting differently or similarly, or longer encounters containing more complex events. Second, we did not measure all experiences that may bias people against or in favor of the police. For example, personal experiences with police may shape interpretation of BWC events. Some of this variation should be captured by the IPS measure, but likely not all.

Our MTurk sample is also a limitation for at least two reasons. Although MTurk participants are fairly representative of people who may be on a jury or in a community, they may be different from other evaluators of footage, such as police officers or district attorneys. These latter groups may evaluate footage differently than our participants here based on their experience viewing police footage or living through such encounters. Similarly, their specific goals and specialized knowledge while viewing the footage would likely impact their understanding—such as whether an officer's actions meet a specific legal standard—differently from the laypeople in our sample. Second, although we know that our sample consisted of participants residing in the United States, we do not know in which jurisdiction they were living or whether their location may have influenced their understanding of the videos. Indeed, our findings on the role of IPS demonstrates that individual differences are important, and such individual differences are likely driven by a variety of factors that can vary by area, such as police culture, politics, the quality of the community–police relationship, and demographic differences between officers and civilians. Future research should examine whether these differences may affect viewers opinions of police footage, as well as whether people view footage from their own jurisdictions differently than footage outside their location.

In conclusion, our findings support the illusory causation hypothesis for BWC footage: people hold more favorable ratings of police officer's actions and intent during violent interactions when they see BWC footage than when they see a third-person perspective. This effect is not, however, ubiquitous; variations in the recorded event, including the clarity and violence depicted in the video, can offset the perspective bias. Fortunately, viewing both BWC and third-party perspectives can decrease the perspective bias; unfortunately, instructions directing participants' attention or explaining the perspective bias were unsuccessful in reducing the bias. Further, consistent with the

literature, identification with police predicted how people understood each encounter, regardless of the perspective. Together, these results illustrate that BWC footage can positively bias people towards a police officer relative to other perspectives, that BWC footage should not be used in isolation, and that individual differences can bias responses to footage.

ENDNOTE

[2] This number differs from our OSF pre-registration because we added BWC + surveillance and surveillance + BWC conditions to our footage manipulation and a fourth "no instruction" level to our viewing instruction manipulation prior to data collection.

REFERENCES

Chabris, C. F., Weinberger, A., Fontaine, M., & Simons, D. J. (2011). You do not talk about Fight Club if you do not notice Fight Club: Inattentional blindness for a simulated real-world assault. *Perception*, 2(2), 150–153.

Elek, J. K., Ware, L. J., & Ratcliff, J. J. (2012). Knowing when the camera lies: Judicial instructions mitigate the camera perspective bias. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 17(1), 123–135.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41, 1149–1160. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149

Granot, Y., Balcetis, E., Schneider, K. E., & Tyler, T. R. (2014). Justice is not blind: Visual attention exaggerates effects of group identification on legal punishment. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(6), 2196–2208. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037893

Hauser, D. J., & Schwarz, N. (2016). Attentive Turkers: MTurk participants perform better on online attention checks than do subject pool participants. *Behavior Research Methods*, 48(1), 400–407. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0578-z

Jones, K. A., Crozier, W. E., & Strange, D. (2017). Believing is seeing: Biased viewing of body-worn camera footage. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 6(4), 460–474.

Jones, K. A., Crozier, W. E., & Strange, D. (2018). Objectivity is a myth for you but not for me or police: A bias blind spot for viewing and remembering criminal events. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 24(2), 259–270.

Kahan, D. M., Hoffman, D. A., & Braman, D. (2008). Whose eyes are you going to believe—Scott v. Harris and the perils of cognitive illiberalism. *Harvard Law Review*, 122, 837–906.

Lassiter, G. D., Beers, M. J., Geers, A. L., Handley, I. M., Munhall, P. J., & Weiland, P. E. (2002a). Further evidence of a robust point-of-view bias in videotaped confessions. *Current Psychology*, 21(3), 265–288.

Lassiter, G. D., Geers, A. L., Handley, I. M., Weiland, P. E., & Munhall, P. J. (2002b). Videotaped interrogations and confessions: A simple change in camera perspective alters verdicts in simulated trials. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5), 867–874. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.5.867

Lassiter, G. D., & Irvine, A. A. (1986). Videotaped confessions: The impact of camera point of view on judgments of coercion. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 16(3), 268–276.

Lassiter, G. D., Munhall, P. J., Berger, I. P., Weiland, P. E., Handley, I. M., & Geers, A. L. (2005). Attributional complexity and the camera perspective bias in videotaped confessions. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 27(1), 27–35.

Lassiter, G. D., Munhall, P. J., Geers, A. L., Handley, I. M., & Weiland, P. E. (2001). Criminal confessions on videotape: Does camera perspective bias their perceived veracity. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 7(1), 1–10.

McArthur, L. Z. (1980). Illusory causation and illusory correlation: Two epistemological accounts. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 6(4), 507–519.

Miller, L., Toliver, J., & Police Executive Research Forum (2014). *Implementing a Body-Worn Camera Program: Recommendations and Lessons Learned*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Oppenheimer, D. M., Meyvis, T., & Davidenko, N. (2009). Instructional manipulation checks: Detecting satisficing to increase statistical power. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(4), 867–872.

Simons, D. J., & Chabris, C. F. (1999). Gorillas in our midst: Sustained inattentional blindness for dynamic events. *Perception*, 28(9), 1059–1074.

Sternisko, A., Granot, Y., & Balcetis, E. (2017). One-sighted: How visual attention biases legal decision-making. In D. Delagarza (Ed.), *New Developments in Visual Attention Research* (pp. 105–139). Hauppauge, NY: Nova.

Taylor, S. E., & Fiske, S. T. (1975). Point of view and perceptions of causality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32(3), 439–445.

Turner, B. L., Caruso, E. M., Dilich, M. A., & Roese, N. J. (2019). Body camera footage leads to lower judgments of intent than dash camera footage. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(4), 1201–1206.

Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities. *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6, 231.

Ware, L. J., Lassiter, G. D., Patterson, S. M., & Ransom, M. R. (2008). Camera perspective bias in videotaped confessions: Evidence that visual attention is a mediator. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 14*(2), 192–200. https://doi.org/ https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-898X.14.2.192

Wegener, D. T., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Flexible correction processes in social judgment: The role of naive theories in corrections for perceived bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(1), 36–51.

Wegener, D. T., & Petty, R. E. (1997). The flexible correction model: The role of naive theories of bias in bias correction. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 29, 141–208.

APPENDIX A.

Fact questions

1. Who was the officer interacting with?
   a. an old man
   b. a young woman
   c. another police officer
   d. a young man
   e. unsure

2. Why was the officer interacting with the civilian?
   a. a witness called the police
   b. the officer happened to be on scene
   c. the civilian called the police
   d. the civilian's friends called the police
   e. unsure

3. Where did the interaction take place?
   a. parking lot
   b. 7–11
   c. a park
   d. a school
   e. unsure

Misinformation questions

1. Which of the following do you think contributed the most to the officer's decision to arrest Mr. Lange?
   a. Video inconsistent
      i. the civilian assaulted the officer
      ii. the civilian was carrying a weapon
   b. Video consistent
      i. the civilian was drunk and disorderly
      ii. the civilian was trespassing private property

2. What was the primary cause of the officer's use of force?
    a. Video inconsistent
        i.   the civilian struck the officer
        ii. the civilian had a weapon
    b. Video consistent
        i.   the officer became frustrated
        ii. the civilian didn't follow the officer's requests

Ratings of officer and civilian and punishment decisions

On scales ranging from 1 (strong disagreement/not at all) to 9 (strong agreement/extremely)

1.   To what extent was the officer responsible for the encounter?
2.   To what extent was the civilian responsible for the encounter?
3.   To what extent did the officer cause the civilian to behave as he did?
4.   To what extent did the civilian cause the officer to behave as he did?
5.   How aggressive did the civilian seem?
6.   How aggressive did the officer seem?
7.   The civilian should be punished in some way.
8.   The officer should be punished in some way.
9.   Imagine that the officer was punished for his actions. How lenient or harsh should the punishment be?
10. Imagine that the civilian was punished for his actions. How lenient or harsh should the punishment be?
11. In your opinion, what is the MOST important course of action the police department should take after learning about this encounter?
     a. Punish the officer for his use of force
     b. Punish the civilian for drunk and disorderly conduct
     c. Punish the civilian for assaulting an officer
     d. No course of action should be taken

Exploratory questions

While watching the body camera [surveillance] footage, whose perspective did you take? (1 = mostly the civilian's perspective; 9 = mostly the officer's perspective)

How easy was it to see what was happening in the body camera [surveillance] footage? (1 = not at all easy; 9 = extremely easy)

Identification with Police Scale

On a scale ranging from 1 (strong disagreement) to 7 (strong agreement)

1. If you talked to most police officers, you think you would find that they have similar views to your own on many issues.
2. Your background is similar to that of most police officers.
3. You can usually understand why police officers, in general, are acting as they are in a particular situation.
4. You generally like most police officers that you encounter.
5. Most police officers would approve of how you live your life.
6. If most officers knew you, they would respect your values.
7. Most police officers would value what you contribute to your community.