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• Introduction of the Manhattan Area, RCPD, and KSU
• Historical Context - RCPD Initiatives and Operation Impact
• Basic Review of Procedural Justice
• Genesis of Operation ARC
• Critical Elements of Operation ARC
• Operation ARC: Training Course Development and Delivery
• Study Development and Results
LEARNING OBJECTIVES

• What led RCPD/KSU down the path to PJ?
• What is Procedural Justice (PJ)?
• How was PJ applied to a traffic safety initiative called Operation ARC?
• How were officers trained for this initiative?
• What were the preliminary results of the initiative?
The Problem

- You are the Patrol Commander for a 100 officer agency in a college town in the Midwest.
- Your agency has successfully deployed a number of initiatives with public support.
- However a traffic safety initiative based on DDACTS was rejected by the public.
- Since this time the agency has not had a traffic safety initiative. The Department’s oversight board has recently rejected a grant funded seatbelt enforcement campaign.
- Accidents are relatively low, but vary significantly by season, especially injury accidents.
MANHATTAN, KS

- Population 56,308
- Area 19.2 sq miles
- 83.5% white
- Median HH income $43,104
- 26.2% persons in poverty
- State university, military post, level IV research facility. commercial/social hub
• Consolidated 1974
• Law Board oversight
• Accredited (CALEA) 1991
• 205 full-time employees
• 107 sworn officers
• 98 civilian employees
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

- Founded 1863 as a land grant college
- Ag, veterinary, engineering
- NCAA I
- Total Enrollment 24,146
- POP (around 2007)
- PTO
- ILP
  - ROP
  - **Operation Impact**
- CIU
- EBP
  - Hotspots
AREA OF IMPACT
OPERATION IMPACT

• Positive results

• What was to blame?
  • Spin out of control
  • Not advertised correctly
PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

• Voice, Neutrality, Dignity & Respect, Trustworthy Motives

• Process over Outcome

• Perceived legitimacy results in voluntary compliance

• Must treat officers with PJ to get PJ

• Police Legitimacy = Police Effectiveness + PJ

The four principles of procedural justice:

Voice
Neutrality
Respect
Trustworthiness
OPERATION ARC

• Accident Reduction Citations/Centers
  • How to get the public’s Voice
    • Researchers
    • Money
    • Administrative Resistance
BIG APPLE V. LITTLE APPLE

THE ARCHITECTURE OF RURAL LIFE
• Series of focus groups/Interviews
  • Focus on public safety
  • Big 5
    • DUI
    • Speeding (>8-10 mph over, esp. school zones)
    • Tailgating
    • Cell phone use (esp. texting)
    • Running stop signs/red lights
THE DATA

- Locations (20/20, 1-2)
- Behaviors
- Repeat Traffic Offenders
• Top 5 Accident Causations?
TOP 5 ACCIDENT CAUSATIONS

- Inattentive Driving
- Failure to Yield
- Following too Close
- DUI
- Speeding
Top 5 things people think RCPD should focus on:
1. Impaired driving
2. Speeding (esp. school zones)
3. Distracted driving (esp. phones and texting)
4. Failure to stop (stop signs AND red lights)
5. Tailgating (F-T-C)

Top 5 Causes of Accidents:
1. Inattentive Driving
2. Failure to Yield
3. Following Too Close
4. DUI
5. Speeding / Unsafe Lane Changes
• Follow up study by K-State was approved by bosses

• Internally funded with a new budget item
BUILD A TRAINING PROGRAM

• Introduction to PJ and Police Legitimacy
  • Esp. the four elements

• Critical Elements of Operation ARC
  • Review of traffic accident data
  • Review of the Australian Experiment (QCET)
    • Strong focus on scripting (officer’s voice)
      • 90 second Rule
      • Compliance Checks (supervisors)
• Define an ARC Stop
  • Big 5 violation
  • Use their script
    • Sincere (Verbal Judo Issue)
  • Mark the citation/warning as ARC
They decided how many citations to write and what kind (e.g. warnings v. citations).

- Low accident numbers/promise to law board
- They wrote their own scripts
- They decided when to make non-traffic safety stops
Creating Your Own ARC Script

VOICE:

- Voice/Participation are reinforced whenever you mention public expectations.

- The goal is to give the driver “voice” through the explanation of the survey, NOT by creating a roadside debate.
Creating Your Own ARC Script

- TRUSTWORTHY MOTIVES:
  - This is emphasized when you mention that we are trying to reduce accidents and the violation you stopped them for is known to cause accidents.
Creating Your Own ARC Script

- NEUTRALITY:
  - This is emphasized when you mention your supervisor expects/assigned you to make traffic safety stops.
  - Focused on behavior
Creating Your Own ARC Script

- DIGNITY AND RESPECT
  - This is emphasized by your demeanor.
  - Saying something like, “Well, sorry to have met like this, but I do need your driver’s license and…”
Creating Your Own ARC Script

- “I stopped you for speeding…”
- “My supervisor sent me to this location to reduce accidents” (Trustworthy motives, Neutrality)
- “Speeding is one of the major causes of accidents” (Trustworthy motives)
- “We asked the public what they thought we should focus on and they said speeding was an important issue” (Voice)
- “Sorry we had to meet like this, but I need your license and…” (Dignity/Respect)
- Return visit – “My supervisors and the public expect me to write tickets for speeding so that everyone can use the roads safely, so I’ve written you a ticket for…” (Motives, Dignity/Respect, Neutrality)
• Development of script
• Peer review of script (open practice)
• Traffic stops with peers
• Debrief
• 02:25 & 11:00

• 17 0626 ARC Conference Presentation
AXON_Flex_Video_2017-04-16_1805.mp4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qtr1</td>
<td>Qtr2</td>
<td>Qtr3</td>
<td>Qtr4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventable Accidents</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventable Injury Accidents</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Injured in Preventable Accidents</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventable Fatal Accidents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities in Preventable Accidents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preventable Accidents 1st QTR**

- 2014: 220
- 2015: 236
- 2016: 224
- 2017: 187

**Preventable Injury Accidents 1st QTR**

- 2014: 46
- 2015: 55
- 2016: 57
- 2017: 41
### ARC Citations/Warnings and Big 5 Offenses Jan-May 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cite: ARC</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cite: No ARC</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Citations</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warn: ARC</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warn: No ARC</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Warnings</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compliance Rates**

- Cite: ARC Compliance Rate: 47.4%
- Cite: No ARC Compliance Rate: 52.6%
- Warn: ARCH Compliance Rate: 61.4%
- Warn: No ARCH Compliance Rate: 38.6%
STUDY RESULTS

- Dr. Williams
LESSONS LEARNED

• QC measures were created well after training (very complicated)
  • Video review by supervisors
  • No reminders (cheat sheets) after training
  • Officers keenly interested in accident data and study construction.
  • A small number of officers regularly wrote ARC citations and a small group did not.
LEARNING OBJECTIVES

• What led RCPD/KSU down the path to PJ?
• What is Procedural Justice (PJ)?
• How was PJ applied to a traffic safety initiative called Operation ARC?
• How were officers trained for this initiative?
• What were the preliminary results of the initiative?
“Type a quote here.”

–Johnny Appleseed
Operation ARC
A Procedurally Just Traffic Safety Initiative
Capt. Josh Kyle
Sgt. Scott Hajek
Dr. Sue Williams
Dr. Lorenza Locket
John Grube
• Introduction of the Manhattan Area, RCPD, and KSU
• Historical Context - RCPD Initiatives and Operation Impact
• Basic Review of Procedural Justice
• Genesis of Operation ARC
• Critical Elements of Operation ARC
• Operation ARC: Training Course Development and Delivery
• Study Development and Results
LEARNING OBJECTIVES

• What led RCPD/KSU down the path to PJ?
• What is Procedural Justice (PJ)?
• How was PJ applied to a traffic safety initiative called Operation ARC?
• How were officers trained for this initiative?
• What were the preliminary results of the initiative?
You are the Patrol Commander for a 100 officer agency in a college town in the Midwest.

Your agency has successfully deployed a number of initiatives with public support.

However a traffic safety initiative based on DDACTS was rejected by the public.

Since this time the agency has not had a traffic safety initiative. The Department’s oversight board has recently rejected a grant funded seatbelt enforcement campaign.

Accidents are relatively low, but vary significantly by season, especially injury accidents.
MANHATTAN, KS

- Population 56,308
- Area 19.2 sq miles
- 83.5% white
- Median HH income $43,104
- 26.2% persons in poverty
- State university, military post, level IV research facility. commercial/social hub
• Consolidated 1974
• Law Board oversight
• Accredited (CALEA) 1991
• 205 full-time employees
• 107 sworn officers
• 98 civilian employees
• Founded 1863 as a land grant college
• Ag, veterinary, engineering
• NCAA I
• Total Enrollment 24,146
• POP (around 2007)
• PTO
• ILP
  • ROP
  • **Operation Impact**
• CIU
• EBP
  • Hotspots
AREA OF IMPACT
• Positive results

• What was to blame?
  • Spin out of control
  • Not advertised correctly
PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

• Voice, Neutrality, Dignity & Respect, Trustworthy Motives
• Process over Outcome
• Perceived legitimacy results in voluntary compliance
• Must treat officers with PJ to get PJ
• Police Legitimacy = Police Effectiveness + PJ

The four principles of procedural justice:
- Voice
- Neutrality
- Respect
- Trustworthiness
OPERATION ARC

• Accident Reduction Citations/Centers
  • How to get the public’s **Voice**
    • Researchers
    • Money
  • Administrative Resistance
BIG APPLE  V.  LITTLE APPLE

THE ARCHITECTURE OF RURAL LIFE
• Series of focus groups/Interviews
  • Focus on public safety
  • Big 5
    • DUI
    • Speeding (>8-10 mph over, esp. school zones)
    • Tailgating
    • Cell phone use (esp texting)
    • Running stop signs/red lights
• Locations (20/20, 1-2)

• Behaviors

• Repeat Traffic Offenders
Top 5 Accident Causations?
• Inattentive Driving
• Failure to Yield
• Following too Close
• DUI
• Speeding
Top 5 things people think RCPD should focus on:
1. Impaired driving
2. Speeding (esp. school zones)
3. Distracted driving (esp. phones and texting)
4. Failure to stop (stop signs AND red lights)
5. Tailgating (F-T-C)

Top 5 Causes of Accidents:
1. Inattentive Driving
2. Failure to Yield
3. Following Too Close
4. DUI
5. Speeding / Unsafe Lane Changes
• Follow up study by K-State was approved by bosses

• Internally funded with a new budget item
BUILD A TRAINING PROGRAM

- Introduction to PJ and Police Legitimacy
  - Esp. the four elements
- Critical Elements of Operation ARC
  - Review of traffic accident data
  - Review of the Australian Experiment (QCET)
    - Strong focus on scripting (officer’s voice)
      - 90 second Rule
      - Compliance Checks (supervisors)
• Define an ARC Stop
  • Big 5 violation
  • Use their script
    • Sincere (Verbal Judo Issue)
  • Mark the citation/warning as ARC
• They decided how many citations to write and what kind (e.g. warnings v. citations).
  • Low accident numbers/promise to law board
  • They wrote their own scripts
  • They decided when to make non-traffic safety stops
Creating Your Own ARC Script

- **VOICE:**
  - Voice/Participation are reinforced whenever you mention public expectations.
  - The goal is to give the driver “voice” through the explanation of the survey, NOT by creating a roadside debate.
Creating Your Own ARC Script

- TRUSTWORTHY MOTIVES:
  - This is emphasized when you mention that we are trying to reduce accidents and the violation you stopped them for is known to cause accidents.
Creating Your Own ARC Script

- NEUTRALITY:
  - This is emphasized when you mention your supervisor expects/assigned you to make traffic safety stops.
  - Focused on behavior
Creating Your Own ARC Script

- DIGNITY AND RESPECT

  - This is emphasized by your demeanor.
  - Saying something like, “Well, sorry to have met like this, but I do need your driver’s license and…”
Creating Your Own ARC Script

- “I stopped you for speeding…”
- “My supervisor sent me to this location to reduce accidents” (Trustworthy motives, Neutrality)
- “Speeding is one of the major causes of accidents” (Trustworthy motives)
- “We asked the public what they thought we should focus on and they said speeding was an important issue” (Voice)
- “Sorry we had to meet like this, but I need your license and…” (Dignity/Respect)
- Return visit – “My supervisors and the public expect me to write tickets for speeding so that everyone can use the roads safely, so I’ve written you a ticket for…” (Motives, Dignity/Respect, Neutrality)
- Development of script
- Peer review of script (open practice)
- Traffic stops with peers
- Debrief
• 02:25 & 11:00

• 17 0626 ARC Conference Presentation
  AXON_Flex_Video_2017-04-16_1805.mp4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Preventable Accidents</th>
<th>Preventable Injury Accidents</th>
<th>Persons Injured in Preventable Accidents</th>
<th>Preventable Fatal Accidents</th>
<th>Fatalities in Preventable Accidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qtr1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtr2</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtr3</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtr4</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtr1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtr2</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtr3</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtr4</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtr1</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtr2</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtr3</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qtr4</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preventable Accidents 1st QTR**

- **2014**: 220
- **2015**: 236
- **2016**: 224
- **2017**: 137

**Preventable Injury Accidents 1st QTR**

- **2014**: 46
- **2015**: 55
- **2016**: 57
- **2017**: 41
### ARC Citations/Warnings and Big 5 Offenses Jan-May 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cite: ARC</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cite: No ARC</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Citations</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warn: ARC</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warn: No ARC</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Warnings</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Dr. Williams
LESSONS LEARNED

• QC measures were created well after training (very complicated)
  • Video review by supervisors
  • No reminders (cheat sheets) after training
  • Officers keenly interested in accident data and study construction.
  • A small number of officers regularly wrote ARC citations and a small group did not.
LEARNING OBJECTIVES

• What led RCPD/KSU down the path to PJ?
• What is Procedural Justice (PJ)?
• How was PJ applied to a traffic safety initiative called Operation ARC?
• How were officers trained for this initiative?
• What were the preliminary results of the initiative?
“Type a quote here.”

–Johnny Appleseed
ARC: RESEARCH & RESULTS

L. SUSAN WILLIAMS, PI
LORENZA LOCKETT, JOHN GRUBE
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Separate Pre-Post Non-Equivalence: A Quasi-Experimental Design in Procedural Justice

- T-1 Pretest Traffic Stops
- N_{\text{warnings}} (r)

- T
- N_{\text{warnings}} (r)

- T+1 Post-test ARC Traffic Stops
- N_{\text{warnings}} (r)

- X

- PJ officer training

- N_{\text{citations}} (r)
- N_{\text{citations}} (r)

- N_{\text{service}} (r)
- N_{\text{service}} (r)
PRETEST DATA
Pretest Qualitative Focus Groups

- Underrepresented groups (voice)
- Worthwhile policing (trustworthiness)
- Potential bias (neutrality)
- Comportment (respect)
Measurement - Quantitative

- Citizen perception of officer performance
  - Listened; Explained; Demeanor
- Citizen perception of targeting behavior by RCPD
  - Looks1, Looks2, Neighborhood
- Citizen perception of RCPD community contributions
  - Equal; QOL; Dignity & Respect
ARC definitions

- **ARC violations** are based on statutes corresponding with the BIG 5
  - DUI
  - Speeding
  - Failure to stop/yield
  - Inattentive driving
  - Tailgating

- **ARC stops** must meet the following criteria:
  - Occurs after procedural justice training
  - Based on one of the ARC traffic violations (Big 5)
  - Officer follows designated ARC training and script
  - Results in either citation or warning
POST-TEST AND ANALYSIS
OFFICER EXPLAINED

Citations

Pre and Post Scores

Frequency

Explained

1–5 Ordinal Scale
"Not well at all" to "Very well"
OFFICER EXPLAINED

Warnings

Pre and Post Scores

Pre-Intervention

Post-Intervention

Explained

1–5 Ordinal Scale

"Not well at all" to "Very well"
Change: Citizen perception of officer performance, by citations and warnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post Citations</th>
<th>Change Citations</th>
<th>Post Warnings</th>
<th>Change Warnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listened</strong></td>
<td>3.75 n=71</td>
<td>0.658*</td>
<td>4.16* n=111</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explained</strong></td>
<td>4.20 n=71</td>
<td>0.566*</td>
<td>4.53 n=110</td>
<td>0.475*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demeanor</strong></td>
<td>4.07 n=71</td>
<td>0.728**</td>
<td>4.44* n=109</td>
<td>0.388.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change: Citizen perception of targeting behavior, by citations and warnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post Citations</th>
<th>Change Citations</th>
<th>Post Warnings</th>
<th>Change Warnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Looks1</td>
<td>2.30 n=69</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>2.10 n=103</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks2</td>
<td>2.31 n=70</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>2.23 n=103</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>2.74 n=69</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>2.75 n=102</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change: Citizen perception of RCPD Community Contributions, by citations and warnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post Citations</th>
<th>Change Citations</th>
<th>Post Warnings</th>
<th>Change Warnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal</strong></td>
<td>3.58 n=69</td>
<td><strong>0.426</strong></td>
<td>3.65 n=103</td>
<td><strong>0.519</strong>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QOL</strong></td>
<td>3.86 n=69</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>4.23 n=102</td>
<td>0.251**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dignity &amp; Respect</strong></td>
<td>4.04 n=69</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>4.25 n=102</td>
<td><strong>0.537</strong>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MWU results: Change in distribution of officer performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Warnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listened</td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demeanor</td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

- Direct support for procedural justice training and implementation, especially for officer performance
- Support is strongest in situations directly related to training
- Citizens surveyed remain relatively positive in general assessments of police, but ambivalent about intent.
- Partial support for PJ postulate of process versus outcome
Limitations

- Lacks true experimental design elements
- Near exclusion of underrepresented groups
- Lack of non-urban cultural measures and comparative studies
- Lack of direct causal effect measures on citizen behavior
IMPLICATIONS: FOCUS GROUPS

- Involves community and potentially builds trust
- Reveals voices often masked
- “…represents the heart of what some have called community-led policing”
IMPLICATIONS: SCRIPT BUILDING

- Involves officers in proactive communication with community
- Can be incorporated into any police initiative
The Vision

- Citizens working with the police to determine how their community is to be policed, and officers creating ways to convey this message to those they encounter
THANK YOU!

L. SUSAN WILLIAMS
LSWILLI@KSU.EDU
EXAMPLE: MANN-WHITNEY U-TEST
OFFICER EXPLAINED

Citations

Pre and Post Scores

1-5 Ordinal Scale
"Not well at all" to "Very well"

Pre-Intervention
Pre or Post Test
Post-Intervention

Frequency

Hypothesis Test Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The medians of Explained are the same across categories of Pre or Post Test.</td>
<td>Independent-Samples Median Test</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>Reject the null hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The distribution of Explained is the same across categories of Pre or Post Test.</td>
<td>Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>Reject the null hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.
OFFICER EXPLAINED

Warnings
Pre and Post Scores

1-5 Ordinal Scale
"Not well at all" to "Very well"

Hypothesis Test Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The medians of Explained are the same across categories of Pre or Post Test.</td>
<td>Independent-Samples Median Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unable to compute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The distribution of Explained is the same across categories of Pre or Post Test.</td>
<td>Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>Reject the null hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.
PERCEPTION OF ARC EFFECTIVENESS
PERCEPTION OF FUTURE COOPERATION

Post-Test Only – Summary of Categories

Outcome Category

Future Cooperation Likely

1 = "More Likely", 2 = "No Change/Cooperate", 3 = "Less Likely"
PERCEPTION OF OFFICER TRAINING
Post-Test Only - Summary of Categories
Outcome Category

Citation
[Histogram showing frequency distribution]

Warning
[Histogram showing frequency distribution with a peak at 2]

Service
[Histogram showing frequency distribution]

Officer Training Effectiveness
1 = "Good", 2 = "Courteous", 3 = "Average"
4 = "Helpful", 5 = "Poor", 6 = "Other"
PERCEPTION OF ARC: RCPD WANTS MORE CITATIONS

Post-Test Only

Outcome Category

Citation

Warning

Service

Public Perception of RCPD Goals

1–5 Ordinal Scale

"Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree"