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# Introduction

Acts of crime and extreme violence have been an issue since ancient times, and even today the law forces are trying to address this issue in several ways. One of the ways this is approached is by having law enforcement forces respond to the event in real time – those being the police forces.

With the advanced technology we have nowadays, there are cameras that can records things at high quality, for example: movie cameras, phone cameras, car cameras and so on.

One innovation that followed the abovementioned ideas was the policemen body camera.

The body camera is a wearable audio, video, or photographic recording system used to record events in which law enforcement officers are involved.

The essence of policemen body cameras is to allow the policemen provide solid evidence and details of incidents without having the integrity and accuracy of their report double-checked.

The incorporation of body camera usage among the police forces also works in another way – it gives more assurance to the public that justice is delivered properly, and that the rights of the suspects are not being unnecessarily violated. On top of that, in states where the usage of body cameras is mandatory, it helps preventing any case of abuse-of-power by the law enforcement forces.

In our work, we examine a dataset that contains records of people killed by policemen, which is discussed in the Data section.

Our work focuses on two features of the incidents that exist in the dataset:

1. body\_camera – a feature which says whether the policeman who killed the suspect wore a body camera while the event occurred or not.

Available values: {FALSE, TRUE}, FALSE meaning that the policeman wasn't wearing a body camera, and TRUE meaning that he did wear one.

1. manner\_of\_death – a feature which says whether the suspect was shot to death, or tasered and shot to death.

Available values: {shot, shot and Tasered}

We attempt to grasp the effect of wearing a body camera on the manner in which a suspect is killed.

Formally speaking, our research question is: "Does wearing a body camera affect the level of policemen violence on alleged threats?" where we regard to "policemen violence" as straight away shooting the suspects without attempting to taser them first.

Our thought process behind this is as follows: shooting suspects without attempting to apprehend them by using non-lethal approaches such as a tasering them first is more violent, while attempting to taser the suspects first is not as violent.

Thus, our research question is: Does wearing a body camera makes policemen attempt to apprehend suspects by tasering them first more often than when not wearing a body camera?

The treatment is **wearing a body camera**. The outcome is the **manner of death**.

Our hypothesis is that policemen who wear a body camera are more likely to taser and shoot a suspect instead of immediately shooting them.

# Data

The dataset we explore in this work is a dataset consisting of records of incidents where a suspect was killed by policemen in the US in the years 2015-2020.

The dataset has the following features:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Feature | Meaning | Available values |
| manner\_of\_death | The way the suspect was killed | * shot * shot and Tasered |
| armed | The weapon the suspect was armed with  during the incident | 89 different weapons |
| age | The age of the suspect | Various ages from 6 to 91 |
| gender | The gender of the suspect | 1. Male 2. Female |
| race | The race of the suspect | Asian, White, Hispanic, Black, Other, Native |
| city | The city in which the | 2288 cities in the US |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | incident occurred |  |
| state | The state in which the incident occurred | 51 states of the US |
| signs\_of\_mental\_illness | Whether the suspect showed  signs of mental illness | 1. True 2. False |
| threat\_level | The level of threat the suspect  possessed | 1. attack 2. other 3. undetermined |
| flee | Whether the suspect was trying to get away | 1. not fleeing 2. car 3. foot 4. other |
| body\_camera | Whether the policeman that killed the suspect wore a bodycam | 1. True 2. False |
| Arms\_category | The type of weapon the suspect had | 12 types of weapons |

There are a few more features which we did not use so they're not mentioned here (features such as id, name, etc).

We found no missing data and no erroneous data.

In our code we encode the features into numerical values, where each available value is mapped to some integer (starting from 1).

For the features body\_camera and manner\_of\_death we specifically define:

* + body\_camera: 𝐹𝑎𝑙𝑠𝑒 → 0, 𝑇𝑟𝑢𝑒 → 1
  + manner\_of\_death: ′𝑠ℎ𝑜𝑡′ → 0, ′𝑠ℎ𝑜𝑡 𝑎𝑛𝑑 𝑇𝑎𝑠𝑒𝑟𝑒𝑑′ → 1

# Assumptions

As we mentioned before, we are looking to evaluate the Average Treatment Effect of wearing a body camera on the manner of death of the suspects. In this setting both

treatment and outcome features are binary, while some other features present in the dataset are categorial.

At this point we would like to discuss the assumptions that upload with respect to our dataset:

**SUTVA** – as far as we know, each record in the dataset is a record of an incident where a suspect was killed, which is independent of other records in the dataset, meaning the potential outcomes for any suspect is independent of the treatment other suspects received.

Thus, the SUTVA assumption upholds.

**Consistency** – we didn't observe any erroneous data, which leads us to assume the data is indeed intact and has valid information regarding the manner of death of each suspect.

Thus, the Consistency assumption upholds.

**Ignorability** – we cannot guarantee that the ignorability assumption upholds, as we do not observe all the information regarding the incidents. For example, there's no information regarding the location of the event, the amount of respondent policemen, the number of suspects, the gender of the policemen, etc, information that could prove to be a confounder in our settings. Moreover, even if it says in the dataset that the policeman wore the body camera, there's no guarantee that it was activate on scene. In total, the ignorability assumption does not hold.

**Common support** – operating under the assumption that all states in the US have body cameras at their disposal, the Common support assumption upholds, as the policemen who killed a suspect had the option to wear a body camera. This gives us that

𝑃(𝑇 = 𝑡 | 𝑋 = 𝑥) > 0 ∀𝑡, 𝑥

**Confounders** – We suspect that we have some confounders in our data, those confounders being: {′𝑎𝑟𝑚𝑠\_𝑐𝑎𝑡𝑒𝑔𝑜𝑟𝑦′, ′𝑟𝑎𝑐𝑒′, ′𝑡ℎ𝑟𝑒𝑎𝑡\_𝑙𝑒𝑣𝑒𝑙′}, which can be represented in the following manner:
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In our work we will attempt to estimate the causal effect of wearing a body camera on the manner of death, while avoiding the confounding that may be present in the data.

# Methods

Our goal is to estimate the Average Treatment Effect of a policeman wearing body camera on the manner of death of the suspect who was killed by the that policeman.

For the purpose of estimating the ATE, we employ several methods which attempt to estimate the true causal effect of the former on the latter.

Some of the methods we used require the usage of ML models of our choice. We decided to use Random Forest Classifier, as our data is mostly categorial, and so we thought RFC is an adequate model to employ in such settings.

The methods we used are as follows:

## Naive ATE:

First of all, just for reference, we calculated the ATE in the naive manner: simply calculating the difference in outcome on the treated and control.

Mathematically speaking:

Denote:

𝑇𝑟𝑒𝑎𝑡𝑒𝑑 ≔ {𝑖 𝑠. 𝑡. 𝑡𝑖 = 1}

𝐶𝑜𝑛𝑡𝑟𝑜𝑙 ≔ {𝑖 𝑠. 𝑡. 𝑡𝑖 = 0}

We then calculated the naive ATE as follows:

𝐴̂𝑇𝐸 = 1
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## IPW:

A method to estimate ATE using propensity score.

IPW tries to remove confounding by re-weighting samples using the propensity scores, which creates “new” samples in which treatment is independent of the confounders.

The algorithm:

1. Given a sample (𝑥1, 𝑡1, 𝑦1), … , (𝑥𝑛, 𝑡𝑛, 𝑦𝑛), estimate the propensity score using a

selected machine-learning method.

1. Estimate ATE using the following formula:
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In our project, we estimated 𝑝̂(𝑇 = 𝑡|𝑥) using Random Forest Classifier.

## 1-NN Matching:

A method to estimate ATE based on matching pairs of samples. The algorithm:

1. Given a sample (𝑥1, 𝑡1, 𝑦1), … , (𝑥𝑛, 𝑡𝑛, 𝑦𝑛), calculate the distances between all pairs of samples using a selected distance metric.
2. Using 1-NN, match each sample 𝑖 its nearest neighbor 𝑗(𝑖) from opposite treatment group.
3. Calculate 𝐼𝑇̂𝐸(𝑖) by the following formula:

̂ 𝑦𝑖 − 𝑦𝑗(𝑖) , 𝑡𝑖 = 1

𝐼𝑇𝐸(𝑖) = {
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1. Estimate ATE using the following formula:

𝑛
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In our project, the features used to calculate the distance were all nominal categorical features. Therefore, the distance metric used was hamming distance: for two different strings, the hamming distance between them is the number of character positions in which they differ.

In our case, instead of strings, we have vectors where each entrance represents a feature and contains its value.

This metric works well for nominal categorical data since it ignores the specific values and any order between them.

## S-Learner (Single Learner):

For this method we employ the following mindset: what if the outcome on the treated and the control could be represented through some model which, given a row of data, would determine the outcome on that specific row.

In other words, this approach attempts to fit a model to the data, with the target feature being the outcome feature which we're interested in.

This allows us to estimate outcomes for scenarios we don't have in the real world, for example, we don't know 𝑦0 for suspect who got 𝑡 = 1, we only know 𝑦1.

After fitting a model 𝑀, we proceed to going over all of the data, and predict the outcome using the model, twice for each record, once as treatment and once as

control.

Meaning, for record 𝑥𝑖 we set 𝑡𝑖 = 1 and predict the outcome using the model 𝑀, which we denote as 𝑀(𝑥𝑖, 1), and then we set 𝑡𝑖 = 0 and predict 𝑀(𝑥𝑖, 0).

This is done for all 𝑥𝑖 in the dataset. Then we calculate the ATE in the following way:

𝑛

𝐴̂𝑇𝐸 = 1 ∑ 𝑀(𝑥 , 1) − 𝑀(𝑥 , 0)
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In our project we use a Random Forest Classifier to predict the outcome.

## T-Learner (Two Learner):

For this method we employ a similar mindset to the one employed for the S-learner, where we assume the outcome could be represented as some function of the data, and we predict the complementary scenario which is not present in the data.

The difference from the S-Learner is that the T-Learner creates two different models, one on the data of the treated, to predict the outcome for the treated, and one on the data of the control, to predict the outcome for the control.

We define the two models 𝑀1 and 𝑀0 which are trained on {𝑥𝑖 𝑠. 𝑡. 𝑡𝑖 = 1} and

{𝑥𝑖 𝑠. 𝑡. 𝑡𝑖 = 0} respectively.

We then proceed to estimate the ATE as follows:

𝑛

𝐴̂𝑇𝐸 = 1 ∑ 𝑀 (𝑥 ) − 𝑀 (𝑥 )
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In our project we use a Random Forest Classifier to predict the outcome for both 𝑀1

and 𝑀0.

## Backdoor adjustment:

For this method we use do-calculus. To allow this we employ backdoor adjustment, which says that given the confounders, the expected outcome under the do operator boils down to the expected outcome given the confounders and T.

Formally speaking:

Denote the group of confounders as 𝑐. We then have that:

𝐴̂𝑇𝐸 = 𝐸[𝑦 | 𝑑𝑜(𝑇 = 1)] − 𝐸[𝑦 | 𝑑𝑜(𝑇 = 0)]

= 𝐸𝑐[𝐸[𝑦 | 𝑐, 𝑇 = 1]] − 𝐸𝑐[𝐸[𝑦 | 𝑐, 𝑇 = 0]]

In our data we calculate this assuming the confounders we have in the data are

{′𝑎𝑟𝑚𝑠\_𝑐𝑎𝑡𝑒𝑔𝑜𝑟𝑦′, ′𝑟𝑎𝑐𝑒′, ′𝑡ℎ𝑟𝑒𝑎𝑡\_𝑙𝑒𝑣𝑒𝑙′}, and so the utility over 𝑐 goes over all existing combinations of the available values for these features.

The probabilities required to calculate the abovementioned utilities are estimated from the data.

# Results

Table 1 – ATE results of selected estimation methods:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Estimation method** | **ATE** |
| Naive ATE | 0.0132 |
| IPW | 0.0011 |
| S-Learner | −0.0014 |
| T-Learner | −0.001 |
| Matching | 0.0239 |
| Backdoor adjustment | 0.0012 |

In this table we display the results of the ATE from running the various methods we went over in detail earlier.

Table 2 – Testing various subsets of suspected confounders:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Features used for backdoor adjustment** | **ATE** |
| 'arms\_category' | 0.0046 |
| 'race' | 0.0134 |
| 'threat\_level' | 0.0116 |
| 'race', 'threat\_level' | 0.0125 |
| 'race', 'arms\_category' | −0.0003 |
| 'threat\_level', 'arms\_category' | 0.0062 |
| 'threat\_level', 'race', 'arms\_category' | 0.0012 |

In this table we display the results of running backdoor adjustment with different subsets of features out of the features we suspect to be confounders. (the result of backdoor adjustment which appears in Table 1 is for running it with all 3 suspected confounders)

Table 3 – Model sensitivity:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Estimation method** | **Random Forest Classifier** | **Decision Tree Classifier** |
| IPW | 0.0011 | 0.0012 |
| S-Learner | −0.0014 | −0.0004 |
| T-Learner | −0.001 | −0.001 |

In this table we experiment using Decision Tree Classifier in comparison to Random Forest Classifier in the estimation methods which use ML models.

# Possible Weaknesses

As we have mentioned earlier in the Assumptions - Ignorability section, the ignorability assumption does not hold, which may harm the reliability of our results. Ignorability doesn't hold as we cannot guarantee that there are no hidden confounders. For instance, having a policeman wear a body camera does not necessarily mean it was active on scene, which may sound ridiculous, but we have found information of such cases actually happening.

Moreover, some possible hidden confounders could be the location of the event, the amount of respondent policemen, the number of suspects, the gender of the policemen and so on. All those and more can potentially affect the decision of wearing a body camera, as well as the decision of the approach to apprehend the suspects on scene.

One more potential downfall of our approach lies in the assumption that all states in the US have body cameras at their disposal, which perhaps didn't hold true in our dataset.

The SUTVA assumption may not hold in cases of large incidents where more than one suspect was shot to death as some records in the dataset may be correlated.

# Discussion

In this work we employ several methods in an attempt to estimate the Average Treatment Effect of having a body camera worn by a policeman on the manner of death of a suspect who was killed by that policeman.

Observing the results in Table 1, the naive ATE we got in comparison to rest of the results excluding Matching, is larger.

According to the way we encoded our treatment and outcome variables, this implies that wearing a body camera increases the chances of the respective suspect to be shot and tasered, instead of immediately being shot.

When observing the rest of the results excluding Matching, we actually see that the results mostly imply that there's no causal effect between the former and the latter. From this we may conclude that there is confounding to some extent.

Observing the results in Table 2, wherever we condition on 'arms\_category' the ATE becomes lower, which may imply that 'arms\_category' is a confounder in the dataset, while the other two – 'race' and 'threat\_level' are not as much if at all.

From observing the results in Table 3, which are quite similar for both models, it seems that the methods which use ML models are not sensitive to model selection.

Overall, from our tests it seems that although the naive method implies that there's a causal effect between a policeman wearing a body camera and the manner of death

of a suspect which was apprehended by that policemen, there actually is no causal effect.

The one exception we have is the results of the Matching method we used, but as the rest of the methods agree on the same result, we conclude that there's no causal effect between the former and the latter.

# Appendix

Link to git rep: https://github.com/ayswarya-sundararaman/Causal-inference-analysis