SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

Trinkner, R. (in press). Addressing the "black box" of focused deterrence: An examination of the mechanisms of change in Chicago's Project Safe Neighborhoods. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*. Doi: 10.1007/s11292-019-09364-3

District Selection

In 2002, at the start of Chicago's Project Safe Neighborhoods (CPSN) program, the CPSN Taskforce selected two police districts for CPSN activities (see Grunwald & Papachristos, 2017; Papachristos et al., 2007). Both of these districts were located on the west side of the city. These two districts were selected because they had the highest concentrations of homicide and gun violence in Chicago (approximately three times the city average in 2002). These neighborhoods were socially and economically impoverished areas of the city with large proportions of Black residents. To assess the effectiveness of CPSN, the Taskforce selected two similar districts on the south side of Chicago to serve as control areas. Importantly, these districts also had high concentrations of homicide and gun violence (approximately two times the city average in 2002) with similar levels of impoverishment and ethnic minority residents. Given the initial success of the program (Papachristos et al., 2007), in 2005 CPSN efforts expanded to the two (initially) control conditions. A year later, CPSN again expanded its efforts into two more police districts that had similar characteristics for a total of six targeted police districts. Currently, CPSN encompasses almost all of Chicago's high-homicide and gun violence police districts.

Design

As noted in the manuscript, this study used a between groups experimental design whereby different groups of people were assigned to each condition. This design was chosen largely because of logistical issues. First, it was decided early on to make the survey administration procedure part of the forum itself. This was done to increase participation. It was assumed that parolees would be less willing to spend additional time after the forum had commenced to complete a survey and that offering the survey at this time would potentially introduce self-selection effects. Similarly, having participants complete a survey before the forum started would depend on parolees arriving at the forum early enough to complete the survey beforehand, which again would potentially introduce self-selection effects.

Second, with the decision to include the survey within the forum programming it was necessary to ensure that data collection would not consume an inordinate amount of time and reduce the strength of the forum message. In this respect, it was not feasible to utilize a within groups design whereby the survey would be administered both prior to and at the end of the forum for all parolees who agreed to participate. Additionally, it was important to keep the survey anonymous to help allay any possible fears that representatives of the criminal justice system, community members, and social services agents attending the forum would know how individual parolees responded to the questions. A system of identification would have had to been implemented if a within groups design was utilized (which would have also further increased the amount of time spent on data collection during the forum).

Randomization Procedure

At the start of the new year, all forums for that ensuing year are scheduled by the CPSN Taskforce. This list was given to the researcher who randomly assigned each forum to have the survey administered before (control) or after (treatment) using an adaptive randomization procedure. The first-time data was collected in a particular district, a coin flip was used to decide if that forum would be assigned to control or treatment. The second time data was collected in that district, it was automatically assigned to the opposite condition. Subsequent collections were randomly assigned without any regard to prior assignments. This was done to ensure that all districts were represented in both the control and treatment conditions. Once forums were randomly assigned, the assignment list was distributed to a CPSN coordinator who handled survey distribution and data collection. As shown in Supplemental Table 1 below, forums were nearly equally distributed between control and treatment. Similar numbers of parolees attended and participated across the two conditions and all six districts were represented in both control and treatment. Additionally, both the control and treatment conditions had similar response rates of 75% and 78% with a total response rate of 77%.

Supplemental Table 1 – Participant distribution and response rate across condition.

	Control (Pre-Forum)	Treatment (Post-Forum)
Total		
k(forums)	9	10
n(attended)	207	233
n(participated)	155	182
Response rate	75%	78%
Districts represented	6 of 6	6 of 6
Grand Total		
k(forums)	19	
n(attended)	440	
n(participated)	337	
Response rate	77%	

Procedure

The same data collection protocol was used regardless of whether the survey was administered before or after the forum. After being introduced by the forum facilitator, the survey administrator introduced herself and stated the purpose of the research study. All attendees were told that the survey included questions assessing their thoughts on crime, the law, and their neighborhoods. They were told that participation was completely voluntary and that participation (or refusal to participate) would have no bearing on the conditions of their parole. It was stressed that their responses would be completely anonymous and that they should write no identifying information anywhere on the survey. They were also told that the raw surveys would not be viewed by anyone from any of the agencies represented at the forum, but that a summary of the findings would be provided to each agency. They were asked to not talk to any of the people around them while completing the survey. When finished, they were instructed to raise their hand at which point the survey administrator collected the survey, gave the individual their $10 gift card, and thanked them for their participation.

Measures

Procedural justice

1) Legal authorities would treat me fairly if I asked them for help

Risk Perceptions

2) The police would catch me if I commit a crime or break the rules of my parole.
3) I would be punished harshly if the police caught me with a gun.

Legitimacy: Obligation to obey

4) I should obey the rules of my parole even if I disagree with them.
5) I should obey the law, even if I think it is wrong.

Legitimacy: Normative alignment

6) Laws were made to be broken. (R)
7) My ideas of right and wrong are usually the same as the legal system.

Community Norms

8) My ideas of right and wrong are usually the same as other people in my neighborhood.
9) Gun violence harms my neighborhood.

Motivation

10) I want to do whatever it takes to stay out of prison.
11) I am confident I can make the right decisions in order to stay out of prison.

Descriptive Statistics

Supplemental Table 2 – Descriptive statistics for all outcomes without covariate adjustment.

	Control (Pre-Forum)				Treatment (Post-Forum)			
Outcomes	M	SD	Min	Max	M	SD	Min	Max
Procedural justice	2.90	1.17	1.00	5.00	3.33	1.13	1.00	5.00
Risk perceptions	3.92	1.15	1.00	5.00	4.13	.96	1.00	5.00
Legitimacy	3.70	.79	1.50	5.00	3.92	.69	1.75	5.00
Community norms	3.58	.86	1.00	5.00	3.59	.80	1.50	5.00
Motivation	4.55	.78	1.00	5.00	4.55	.76	1.00	5.00

Note: Min and Max represent observed scores.

Cell Equality

Goal: Examine if control variables are equally distributed across condition. For this analysis, race was recoded into Black (0 = non-Black; 1 = Black) given the large amount of homogeneity in the sample.

		Black	
		Non-Black	Black
Condition	Control	n=23	n=125
	Treatment	n=35	n=142
$\chi^2(1)=.99$, $p=.321$			

		PSN Attendance	
		No	Yes
Condition	Control	n=126	n=21
	Treatment	n=155	n=16
$\chi^2(1)=1.87$, $p=.172$			

		Age	
		M	SD
Condition	Control	28.73	7.86
	Treatment	26.80	6.69
$t(326)=2.40$, $p=.017$			

Type I Error Rates, MANOVA, & ANOVA

There has long been argument about the appropriate way to control for type I error rate when using a series of ANOVAs to examine the effect of an independent variable on multiple outcomes. This paper employs a traditional MANOVA-Protection process (see Frane, 2015). Here, a single MANOVA is run using all outcomes of interest. If that MANOVA is significant, then follow-up univariate tests are conducted for each outcome. If the MANOVA is not significant, then all univariate tests are forfeited. However, for this MANOVA the α level is adjusted to control for the per-family type I error rate. This paper followed Frane's (2015) suggested adjustment whereby nominal α is divided by the number of outcomes – 1 (i.e., $\alpha/(m\text{-}1)$, where m = the number of outcomes). Using this formula, α was adjusted to .0125. In the present analysis the follow-up univariate tests were justified given that the MANOVA was significant at $p = .008$. However, it is recognized that not all readers will agree on using the MANOVA-Protection procedure and/or prefer an alternative adjustment method to control for type I error. In this respect, exact p-values are reported on all test statistics to facilitate readers making their own adjustments and subsequent interpretations.

Frane, A. V. (2015). Power and type I error control for univariate comparisons in multivariate two-group designs. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 50*(2), 233-247.