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Workshop on Procedural Justice and Legitimacy

Study 1: a modest randomized experiment testing the short-term effects of PJ training

Study 2: observational survey data testing the long-term effects of PJ training
Slide 1  Why are we here?

- When utilizing Procedural Justice and gaining legitimacy, police officers benefit:
  - Safety increases
  - Stress levels lower
  - Fewer complainants
  - Greater cooperation from citizens
  - Voluntary compliance gained
  - Crime is reduced
What are our goals in policing?
What does the public expect from us?
What percentage actually distrust us?
Why are we cynical? Are we too cynical?
What do we expect from the public
No snitching? Low clearance rates?

Could we learn more about how to deal with each other?
Study 1: Modest Randomized Experiment

Setting
Conducted at the Training Academy (1300 W Jackson)
Multiple classes conducted two shifts per day (7am and 3:30pm)
Classrooms capped at 25 trainees; small groups around tables
Three trainers rotate across a series of modules
PowerPoint presentations with lots of embedded video
Lecture, discussions and group exercises

Design Constraints
Implementation had to be passed to managers and trainers
Data collection could not take much time
Officers are very, very cagy about revealing their identity
They distrust Northwestern University, which had to be identified
Randomization had to be simple, intuitive and reliable
Our project is studying the Department’s new initiatives. It is funded independently by private foundations. We want to get realistic feedback on what you are thinking. The results might bring about improvements in the program. We do not ask your name or anything that could identify you, so the information you provide is anonymous. Your participation is completely voluntary, and you can stop at any time. If you want further information about the project, please contact the project director Prof. Wesley Stagner at 647-491-3395.

These questions are about your job and the CPD. Please circle the number that best corresponds to your agreement with the following statements.

1. When dealing with citizens, officers need to explain what is going to happen next, when they are doing the same.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

2. It is important that we remind people they have rights and that we appear to follow them.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

3. Officers should treat citizens as if they can be trusted to do the right thing.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

4. Listening and talking to people in a good way to take charge of situations.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

5. In certain areas of the city, it is more useful for an officer to be aggressive than to be courteous.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

6. It is important to give everyone a good reason why we are stopping them, even if there is no reason.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

7. Officers should take time to listen to citizens complain about their problems.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

8. Officers should at all times treat people they encounter with dignity and respect.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

9. Police have enough trust in the public for them to work together effectively.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

10. Officers need to show an honest interest in what people have to say, even if it is not going to change anything.
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree

11. People should be treated with respect regardless of their attitude.
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree

12. Letting people talk back only encourages them to get angry.
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree

13. Officers have reason to be dismissive of many citizens.
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree

14. It is very important that officers appear neutral in their application of legal rights.
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree

15. If people ask why we are treating them like we are, we should stop and explain.
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree

16. Citizens will never trust the police enough to work together effectively.
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree

17. I received this survey — before the class began — after the end of class.

18. How old are you?
   - 21-29
   - 30-44
   - 45-59
   - 60 or older
   - Don't know
   - Prefer not to say

19. My Bureau — Patrol — Detective — Traffic — Administration/Development
    — Other Field — Organized Crime, Narcotics, Special Events or Ops

   That's it! Thanks a lot!
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Trust
Police have enough trust in the public for them to work together effectively
Officers should treat citizens as if they can be trusted to do the right thing

Participation
Listening and talking to people is a good way to take charge of situations
Officers need to show an honest interest in what people have to say,
   even if is not going to change anything

Neutrality
It is important to give everyone a good reason why we are stopping them,
   even if there is no need.
If people ask why we are treating them as we are, we should stop and explain
When dealing with citizens' concerns, officers need to explain what will happen
   next, when they are done at the scene.
It is very important that officers appear neutral in their application of legal rules

Respect
People should be treated with respect regardless of their attitude
Officers should at all times treat people they encounter with dignity and respect
It is important that we remind people they have rights and that we appear to follow them
67 control and 66 experimental classes

neutrality

respect

participation

\begin{align*}
\text{average class score} & \quad \text{after} & \quad \text{before} \\
3.5 \quad - & \quad - & \quad - \\
3.0 \quad - & \quad - & \quad - \\
2.5 \quad - & \quad - & \quad - \\
2.0 \quad - & \quad - & \quad - \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
d = 1.60 & \quad \eta^2 = .40 \\
d = 1.49 & \quad \eta^2 = .36 \\
d = 1.65 & \quad \eta^2 = .41 \\
d = 1.42 & \quad \eta^2 = .34 \\
\end{align*}
Study 2: Survey of Police Officers and Sergeants

Setting

Randomly selected POs and Sergeants from the duty roster in all 25 districts
Survey introduced at roll calls; promotional materials and posters
Potential Rs notified via local contact officers
CASI interviews in set-aside rooms
Coffee and donuts on hand

Design Constraints

Rs work 24 X 7 interviewed 24 hrs; multiple station visits
Could not be too long 120 closed-end questions
Officers are cagy about identity notification thru staff

Features of Data

N = 714
Response rate complicated
Low item nonresponse; Imputed all missing values
Can weight POs/Sgts to correct proportions by district
Ratings of the Procedural Justice Workshop

How practical was the training for working officers?
- Slightly/good: 20%
- Somewhat/very good: 50%
- Very/excellent: 30%
- Total positive: 75%

How realistic was the training in reflecting the realities of life on the street?
- Slightly/good: 20%
- Somewhat/very good: 50%
- Very/excellent: 30%
- Total positive: 69%

Rate the Workshop overall:
- Slightly/good: 20%
- Somewhat/very good: 50%
- Very/excellent: 30%
- Total positive: 68%
Propensity score matching on recalled participation in training

Factoids

about 63% recalled being trained
not many differences between trained and not-yet trained

Procedure

matches Rs to their ‘nearest neighbor’ on a logistic regression prediction that they received training. Closely matching trained and not-yet-trained Rs are then thrown in the same pool for statistical identification of the average treatment effect. The selection model cannot include factors that could have been affected by treatment.

Here 714 reduced to 474 Rs who were ‘identical’ in my model of selection for treatment.

This breaks the link between the predictors and attendance
respondents matched by propensity scores
standardized coefficients
N=474
RMSEA = .046
1. The (estimated) long-term impact of training was quite small
2. Propensity score matching made a difference

The effect (the unstandardized regression coefficient) of training on Procedural Justice went up by 50% using all of the data (N=714)

The significance of the training coefficient increased greatly, due in part to the larger coefficient and in part to the increased N

3. Can add (some) other variables to the model without affecting the estimated treatment effect
Training credibility and Support for Procedural Justice

Among officers who had been trained
Credibility = practical and realistic
Why small long-term effects?

1. Many barriers to communication of policy from the top

2. No way to monitor officer behavior on the street
   supervisors cannot watch over them
   we don’t know what they do unless they choose to fill out a form
   in relation to volume of contacts only a small number of complaints

3. Hard to effectively discipline problem officers who do surface
   discipline system is in need of repair
   So, limited incentives to get with the program

4. Eight hours of training: is this enough?
   how much is enough?

5. We don’t know the effectiveness of other kinds of police training
   ex: community policing training
   maybe their effects are small too
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