The theme of the project is to learn about the general behavior of the officers who are charged with misconduct and how different factors may affect their behavior. For example, does the rank of officer, department of officer have any effect? Also, we want to analyze the incidents in more depth. For example, what time of the day do incidents usually occur, or what is the average age of victims, how many of the incidents were done by off-duty officers?

In this paper, we have analysed the results of the questions and presented interesting findings of the same. We have also suggested some future lines of investigation.

CP1- Relational Analytics:

1. Officers of which rank had most complaints against them?

| 4 | normalized_count numeric | rank character varying (100) |
|----|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | 94.0000000000000000 | Director Of Caps |
| 2 | 22.0000000000000000 | Assistant Superintendent |
| 3 | 11.4164222873900293 | Field Training Officer |
| 4 | 10.4117647058823529 | Commander |
| 5 | 10.3699570815450644 | Sergeant |
| 6 | 9.7586206896551724 | Chief |
| 7 | 8.9239583333333333 | Lieutenant |
| 8 | 8.7868852459016393 | Deputy Chief |
| 9 | 8.3750000000000000 | First Deputy Superintendent |
| 10 | 8.2422562764916857 | Detective |
| 11 | 7.2173212575111034 | Police Officer |
| 12 | 5.1345565749235474 | Captain |
| 13 | 3.5000000000000000 | Superintendent Of Police |
| 14 | 2.6086956521739130 | Deputy Superintendent |
| 15 | 1.5200000000000000 | Assistant Deputy Superintendent |

Here, the problem that we are investigating is whether the rank of the officer is having any impact on the number of complaints getting generated against them. We have normalized the number of complaints to get a better estimate. That is, we have divided the number of complaints by the number of officers of that particular rank. For example, higher ranked officers would be few but even few complaints amongst higher ranked officers needs to be highlighted.

We can see the number of officers in each rank using the following query:

select count(d_o_2.id) as count_2, d_o_2.rank from data_officer as d_o_2 group by d_o_2.rank

| 4 | count_2 bigint | rank character varying (100) |
|----|----------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | 1 | Director Of Caps |
| 2 | 1 | Assistant Superintendent |
| 3 | 3 | Superintendent'S Chief Of Staff |
| 4 | 6 | Superintendent Of Police |
| 5 | 8 | First Deputy Superintendent |
| 6 | 23 | Deputy Superintendent |
| 7 | 24 | Other |
| 8 | 25 | Assistant Deputy Superintendent |
| 9 | 29 | Chief |
| 10 | 61 | Deputy Chief |
| 11 | 136 | Commander |
| 12 | 327 | Captain |
| 13 | 341 | Field Training Officer |
| 14 | 960 | Lieutenant |
| 15 | 2198 | |
| 16 | 3067 | Detective |
| 17 | 3495 | Sergeant |
| 18 | 22966 | Police Officer |

The intuition here is that, higher ranks are positions of higher responsibility and hence, the complaints against such officers would be comparatively less. However, from the results we can see that higher ranked officers are having significant number of complaints against them. An interesting observation is that even though there is only one Director of Caps and Assistant Superintendent they still have a significant number of complaints against them.

2. Analyzing whether officers who are charged with misconduct use weapons or beat up victims bare handed.

| 4 | count bigint | | w_type text |
|---|------------------------|------|-----------------|
| 1 | | 1030 | Gun |
| 2 | | 4399 | Taser |
| 3 | | 3754 | Chemical Weapon |
| 4 | | 14 | Hand |

Another problem that we're looking into is to find out whether officers who are charged with misconduct use weapons or beat up victims bare handed. Here, we have determined the count for each weapon used. Here, we can see that the maximum count is for Taser, followed by chemical weapon, Gun and Hand. Note: We have combined the use of hands and baton under hands category for simplicity.

As we can see, guns were used in 1030 cases which is still significant. Weapons like Taser are considered "less lethal" along with Chemical Weapons (like tear gas) and hence they have a high number of usage. The usage of bare hands/baton is very limited.

Further we can analyze the cases in which guns were used by seeing how many shots were fired, the area in which maximum gun incidents occur. Another interesting thing to see would be in what kind of scenarios were Tasers and Chemical Weapons were used and even though they are less lethal, was their use justified.

3. How many of the incidents were carried out by off duty officers?

| 4 | count bigint | officer_on_duty boolean |
|---|--------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | 1600 | false |
| 2 | 65419 | true |

We have used the TRR data to find the results. It required the analysis of the working hours of the officer and the time at which the incident took place. Interestingly, only a limited number of allegations were due to off-duty officers. However, the next step would be to look at the severity of these allegations. What we want to check is whether off-duty officers are more prone to taking drastic steps like using guns.

4. Impact of inspecting officer's race on the result of the investigation.

If an officer with allegation and the investigating officer has the same race, does it affect the outcome of the investigation?

| 4 | count bigint | final_outcome character varying (32) |
|----|--------------|---|
| 1 | 543 | 1 Day Suspension |
| 2 | 62 | 10 Day Suspension |
| 3 | 4 | 12 Day Suspension |
| 4 | 1 | 13 Day Suspension |
| 5 | 1 | 14 Day Suspension |
| 6 | 51 | 15 Day Suspension |
| 7 | 2 | 16 Day Suspension |
| 8 | 198 | 2 Day Suspension |
| 9 | 22 | 20 Day Suspension |
| 10 | 1 | 22 Day Suspension |
| 11 | 1 | 23 Day Suspension |
| 12 | 14 | 25 Day Suspension |
| 13 | 1 | 27 Day Suspension |
| 14 | 166 | 3 Day Suspension |
| 15 | 56 | 30 Day Suspension |
| 16 | 1 | 326 Day Suspension |
| 17 | 1 | 35 Day Suspension |
| 18 | 3 | 365 Day Suspension |
| 19 | 17 | 4 Day Suspension |
| 20 | 4 | 45 Day Suspension |
| 21 | 133 | 5 Day Suspension |
| 22 | 4 | 6 Day Suspension |
| 23 | 2 | 60 Day Suspension |
| 24 | 14 | 7 Day Suspension |
| 25 | 1 | 8 Day Suspension |

| 26 | 3 | 90 Day Suspension |
|----|-------|----------------------------|
| 27 | 5 | 99 Day Suspension |
| 28 | 19 | Administrative Termination |
| 29 | 37292 | No Action Taken |
| 30 | 98 | Penalty Not Served |
| 31 | 1 | Reinstated By Court Action |
| 32 | 8 | Reinstated By Police Board |
| 33 | 831 | Reprimand |
| 34 | 233 | Resigned |
| 35 | 31 | Separation |
| 36 | 4 | Suspended For 180 Days |
| 37 | 11 | Suspended Over 30 Days |
| 38 | 2610 | Unknown |
| 39 | 274 | Violation Noted |

| 4 | count bigint | final_outcome character varying (32) |
|----|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | 736 | 1 Day Suspension |
| 2 | 87 | 10 Day Suspension |
| 3 | 4 | 12 Day Suspension |
| 4 | 2 | 13 Day Suspension |
| 5 | 1 | 14 Day Suspension |
| 6 | 72 | 15 Day Suspension |
| 7 | 4 | 16 Day Suspension |
| 8 | 1 | 17 Day Suspension |
| 9 | 307 | 2 Day Suspension |
| 10 | 39 | 20 Day Suspension |
| 11 | 19 | 25 Day Suspension |
| 12 | 2 | 28 Day Suspension |
| 13 | 214 | 3 Day Suspension |
| 14 | 69 | 30 Day Suspension |
| 15 | 4 | 365 Day Suspension |
| 16 | 29 | 4 Day Suspension |
| 17 | 1 | 40 Day Suspension |
| 18 | 8 | 45 Day Suspension |
| 19 | 199 | 5 Day Suspension |
| 20 | 12 | 6 Day Suspension |
| 21 | 5 | 60 Day Suspension |
| 22 | 16 | 7 Day Suspension |
| 23 | 3 | 8 Day Suspension |
| 24 | 1 | 9 Day Suspension |
| 25 | 1 | 90 Day Suspension |

| 26 | 4 | 99 Day Suspension |
|----|-------|----------------------------|
| 27 | 37 | Administrative Termination |
| 28 | 42963 | No Action Taken |
| 29 | 124 | Penalty Not Served |
| 30 | 2 | Reinstated By Court Action |
| 31 | 10 | Reinstated By Police Board |
| 32 | 1077 | Reprimand |
| 33 | 304 | Resigned |
| 34 | 55 | Separation |
| 35 | 2 | Suspended For 180 Days |
| 36 | 27 | Suspended Over 30 Days |
| 37 | 2916 | Unknown |
| 38 | 401 | Violation Noted |

Same Race:

```
select count(tb2.final_outcome), tb2.final_outcome
from
(
       select d_i_a.allegation_id as allegation_id, d_o.race
       from data_officer as d_o,
       data_investigator as d_i,
       data_investigatorallegation as d_i_a
       where d_i.officer_id = d_o.id and d_i.id = d_i_a.investigator_id
) as tb1,
       select d_o2.race as race, d_o_a2.allegation_id as allegation_id,
d_o_a2.final_outcome as final_outcome from
       data_officer as d_o2,
       data_officerallegation as d_o_a2
       where d_o2.id = d_o_a2.officer_id
) as tb2
where tb1.allegation_id = tb2.allegation_id and tb1.race == tb2.race
group by tb2.final_outcome
```

Different race:

```
from data_officer as d_o,
    data_investigator as d_i,
    data_investigatorallegation as d_i_a
    where d_i.officer_id = d_o.id and d_i.id = d_i_a.investigator_id
) as tb1,
(
    select d_o2.race as race, d_o_a2.allegation_id as allegation_id,
d_o_a2.final_outcome as final_outcome from
    data_officer as d_o2,
    data_officerallegation as d_o_a2
    where d_o2.id = d_o_a2.officer_id
) as tb2
where tb1.allegation_id = tb2.allegation_id and tb1.race != tb2.race
group by tb2.final_outcome
```

As we can see in the above two results (Investigating officer's race same as allegated officer and not the same as allegated officer respectively), the number of no action taken were 37292 for same and 42963 for different races. So it seems the race is not an important factor in this.

Normalized result:

For same race - 37292/42723 = 0.872 For different race - 42963/49756 = 0.863