

Data Science Seminar: Checkpoint 4 Findings

The Earnest Pirates

Vinit Todai, Shreyas Lele, Tejul Pandit

Checkpoint 4: Graph Analytics

Introduction -

We aim to analyze and evaluate the relationship between the various available features of police officers to assess if they have a significant impact on the trends observed on sustained allegations. The analysis assesses the role played by the rank of a police officer and the unit he/she belongs to on other officers who are co-accused.

Graph Questions -

1. Amongst officers who belong to a rank that is in the top 10 ranks with the maximum allegation counts, what is the frequency of two officers being co-accused on the same allegation?
 - We filtered the officer data based on the ranks; the officers belong to these ranks as nodes, and the edges represent the relationship between two officers who were co-accused.
2. Amongst officers who belong to a police unit that is in the top 10 ranks with the maximum allegation ratio per officer, what is the frequency of two officers being co-accused on the same allegation?
 - We filtered the officer data based on the unit he belongs to; the officers who belong to these units as nodes, and the edges represent the relationship between two officers who were co-accused.

Results -

1. **Amongst officers who belong to a rank that is in the top 10 ranks with the maximum allegation counts, what is the frequency of two officers being co-accused on the same allegation?**

The subset of ranks selected are as shown in Figure 1. These ranks are obtained by arranging the total number of allegations in descending order and getting top 10 ranks associated.

	rank	total_allegations
1	Police Officer	150977
2	Sergeant of Police	40677
3	Police Officer as Detective	28062
4	Lieutenant of Police	10351
5	Police Officer / Field Training Officer	4466
6	Police Officer Assigned Evidence Technician	2319
7	Captain of Police	2253
8	Commander	1481
9	Police Officer / Mounted Patrol Officer	952
10	Police Officer Assign Youth Off	916

Figure 1(a): Rank of officers used for creating subset

The following figure, Figure 1(b) shows the ranking hierarchies of police officers in Chicago

Title	Insignia
Superintendent of Police	
First Deputy Superintendent of Police	
Chief	
Deputy Chief	
Commander	
Captain	
Lieutenant	
Sergeant	
Field Training Officer	
Police Officer/assigned as: Detective/Youth Officer/Gang Specialist/Police Agent/Major Accident Investigator/ etc	No Insignia
Police Officer	No Insignia

Figure 1(b): Officer Ranking hierarchy

The triangle count defined as the 'count' column in Figure 2(b) shows police officers who are well connected with other police officers. Figure 2(b) shows that officer Raimondo Brown is most connected and co-accused with other officers.

```
tc_cpdb = cpdb2.triangleCount()
tc_cpdb.orderBy('count', ascending=False).show()
tc_cpdb.select("id", "count").show()
```

Figure 2(a): Code for calculating triangle count between nodes

count	id	rank	officer_name	allegation_count
29636	3033	Sergeant of Police	Raimondo Brown	17
29633	6315	Police Officer	Terence Davis	38
29597	3744	Police Officer	Derek Campbell	8
25678	18042	Police Officer	Donald Mc Coy	22
25646	441	Police Officer	Fernando Alonzo	16
22131	21530	Police Officer	Michael Overstreet	56
21846	27349	Police Officer	Charles Stanton	11
21836	5180	Sergeant of Police	Stephen Conner	9
21824	5667	Police Officer	Jerry Crawley	30
21814	16747	Police Officer	Evetta Lundin	7
21812	8844	Police Officer	Thomas Flynn	19
21809	23654	Police Officer	Lloyd Reid	4
21809	14750	Police Officer	William Kissane	23
18570	19856	Police Officer	Ronald Muhammad	11
17717	8138	Lieutenant of Police	Glenn Evans	132
17220	29882	Lieutenant of Police	Fred Waller	49
17066	28273	Sergeant of Police	James Taylor	36
17014	5577	Sergeant of Police	Michael Cox	20
17012	28459	Sergeant of Police	Curtis Thomas	36
16982	32074	Police Officer as...	Ronald Jenkins	46

only showing top 20 rows

Figure 2(b): Officers placed in the descending order of triangle count

Thus, Figure 2(b) shows that Raimondo Brown, who is Sergeant of Police, is involved in misconduct on a much larger scale with a huge number of other officers, which could potentially imply that he could be misusing his authority.

The page rank gives an idea regarding how likely a police officer is involved in a co-accused allegation. Figure 3(a) highlights that officer Robert Spiegel, who has the highest pagerank, is most influential amongst all the police officers who are co-accused.

Similar to the triangle count, Figure 3(a) shows that it is not necessary that the police officer should be involved in a higher number of allegations for having a higher page rank. Thus, it shows that officer Robert Spiegel is involved in allegations where a higher number of officers are involved.

```
pr_cpdb = cpdb2.pageRank(resetProbability=0.15, tol=0.01)
#look at the pagerank score for every vertex
pr_cpdb.vertices.orderBy('pagerank', ascending=False).show()
pr_cpdb.edges.show()
```

id	rank	officer_name	allegation_count	pagerank
32350	Police Officer	Robert Spiegel	20	59.94255110579391
32351	Police Officer	Boonserm Srisuth	25	58.47588273428055
32419	Police Officer	Eric Wier	18	55.54706144219321
32284	Police Officer	Mark Reno	76	55.05553771973534
32384	Police Officer	Edwin Utreras	47	52.46541790094154
32337	Police Officer as...	Louis Silva	21	51.72556067035757
32413	Police Officer	Carl Weatherspoon	69	50.3834356160415
32289	Police Officer	John Rivera	44	49.31297984845296
32074	Police Officer as...	Ronald Jenkins	46	47.94275095359477
32375	Lieutenant of Police	James Triantafillo	31	45.85995467646986
32324	Police Officer	Kathleen Schmidt	15	41.26315879539915
32406	Police Officer	Reginald Ward	17	40.7491314934534
32383	Police Officer	Armando Ugarte	47	39.858307108258586
31906	Police Officer	James Davis	76	38.38390375443792
32378	Police Officer	Mark Trost	29	37.91554514385917
32355	Police Officer	Laurence Stiles	19	37.352703853575974
32341	Police Officer as...	Robert Slechter	12	36.72613447343105
32280	Police Officer	Eddie Randle	32	36.34386614017926
32339	Police Officer	Keith Sinks	20	34.26975822289742
32237	Police Officer	Louis Ortoneda	52	33.881065019348554

only showing top 20 rows

Figure 3(a): Code for calculating pagerank with corresponding tabular representation ordered in descending order of pagerank score

The weight or importance of each edge connecting the source node with the destination node is shown in Figure 3(b).

src	dst	relationship	weight
1	800	1	0.14285714285714285
1	10302	1	0.14285714285714285
1	16856	1	0.14285714285714285
1	24596	1	0.14285714285714285
2	2575	1	0.045454545454545456
2	5714	1	0.045454545454545456
2	9271	1	0.045454545454545456
2	11686	1	0.045454545454545456
2	13744	1	0.045454545454545456
2	29491	1	0.045454545454545456
2	32243	1	0.045454545454545456
2	32402	1	0.045454545454545456
4	4380	1	0.25
4	13208	1	0.25
4	13917	1	0.25
4	15095	2	0.25
5	137	1	0.02857142857142857
5	1256	1	0.02857142857142857
5	5044	1	0.02857142857142857
5	5731	1	0.02857142857142857

only showing top 20 rows

Figure 3(b): Weight/ importance on each source destination edge

This figure depicts how likely the src (the source police officer id) and the dst (the destination police officer id) are probably going to be involved in an allegation, which is depicted by the weight column.

2. Amongst officers who belong to a police unit that is in the top 10 ranks with the maximum allegation ratio per officer, what is the frequency of two officers being co-accused on the same allegation?

The subset of police units selected are as shown in Figure 4. These police units are obtained by arranging the total number of allegations_ratio_per_unit column which is a ratio of count of total allegations to count of total officers in a police unit in descending order and getting top 10 units associated.

	police_unit	count_allegations	total_officers	allegation_ratio_per_unit
1	97	91	3	30.33
2	173	664	27	24.59
3	175	452	19	23.78
4	113	22	1	22
5	104	22	1	22
6	180	393	19	20.68
7	174	536	26	20.61
8	266	525	26	20.19
9	165	120	6	20
10	156	76	4	19

Figure 4: Police unit data used for creating subset

The triangle count defined as the 'count' column in Figure 5(a) shows that the police officers who are co-accused are involved in allegations which are linked with a large number of officers who are from the same units, or nearby units. Figure 5(a) depicts that officer John Mc Gee from police unit 174 is most well connected with other co-accused officers. Thus, even if the police officer has a lower allegation count against him, he is clustered with a large number of alleged police officers from the same unit.

```
tc_cpdb = cpdb2.triangleCount()
tc_cpdb.orderBy('count', ascending=False).show()
tc_cpdb.select("id", "count").show()
```


count	id	last_unit_id	officer_name	allegation_count
7	18176	174	John Mc Gee	34
7	3395	173	Adam Burns	16
7	1172	174	Damen Balesteri	58
6	30537	174	Tracy Whitehead	19
6	10558	266	Anthony Granat	21
6	27385	174	Bill Starling	29
5	11641	174	Craig Hatch	7
5	12220	173	Courtney Hill	72
4	27439	173	Robert Stegmiller	62
4	2671	173	Sean Brandon	40
4	10663	174	Andre Green	36
4	23600	173	Brian Reed	23
3	2588	174	Jason Bradford	16
3	6221	174	Herbert Darey	25
3	867	174	Reginald Arrington	23
3	24324	174	Brandon Rodekohr	16
3	25191	173	David Salgado	31
3	7982	173	Kenneth Epich	45
3	29613	173	Marco Villarreal	10
2	24521	175	Carlos Rojas	71

only showing top 20 rows

Figure 5(a): Officers placed in the descending order of triangle count

We can see in the first row that officers from unit id 174 are more likely to be involved in allegations in a group on a much larger scale, followed by unit id 173.

Following figure, Figure 6(a) gives an idea about the pagerank for the officers. It is seen that the pagerank is similar for the officers immaterial of the allegation_count.

```
pr_cpdb = cpdb2.pageRank(resetProbability=0.15, tol=0.01)
#look at the pagerank score for every vertex
pr_cpdb.vertices.orderBy('pagerank', ascending=False).show()
pr_cpdb.edges.show()
```

id	last_unit_id	officer_name	allegation_count	pagerank
31996	175	German Gomez	12	1.305863820393211
25191	173	David Salgado	31	1.1865471624739725
27935	165	Matthew Swain	61	1.1847111268651542
32406	173	Reginald Ward	17	1.1645157563285098
24521	175	Carlos Rojas	71	1.1580852338143208
27439	173	Robert Stegmiller	62	1.1577471014734335
30320	180	Robert Weisskopf	23	1.1524574235387521
29445	173	Luis Vega	53	1.1440847317012035
30537	174	Tracy Whitehead	19	1.1299951650932252
23600	173	Brian Reed	23	1.121360147183769
30387	173	Mark Wesselhoff	12	1.119362425837314
18176	174	John Mc Gee	34	1.1001864159642845
32310	174	Bradley Ruzak	26	1.0931619943906823
28335	180	Jesse Terrazas	60	1.069512583185627
32235	174	Kevin Oneill	16	1.0671639477854686
28734	175	Daniel Torres	9	1.0658958202979916
27385	174	Bill Starling	29	1.0620978011392457
10558	266	Anthony Granat	21	1.058339206340742
19834	174	Todd Mueller	27	1.057729659160206
32400	175	Adam Wallace	16	1.0402479378562848

only showing top 20 rows

Figure 6(a) : Code for calculating pagerank with corresponding tabular representation ordered in descending order of pagerank score

src	dst	relationship	weight
1825	18588	1	0.04
3395	4936	1	0.021739130434782608
672	17251	1	0.045454545454545456
1932	13598	1	0.004504504504504...
1932	27686	1	0.004504504504504...
2671	12932	1	0.014705882352941176
3395	5131	1	0.021739130434782608
3395	23913	1	0.021739130434782608
6451	32287	1	0.012345679012345678
867	22423	2	0.030303030303030304
1932	31176	1	0.004504504504504...
5571	18462	1	0.022727272727272728
672	1177	1	0.045454545454545456
847	18266	1	0.07142857142857142
1932	4993	1	0.004504504504504...
1932	12247	1	0.004504504504504...
1932	24716	1	0.004504504504504...
5406	24596	2	0.016666666666666666
5494	6009	1	0.07142857142857142
3743	27229	2	0.02564102564102564

only showing top 20 rows

Figure 6(b): Weight/ importance on each source destination edge

This figure 6(b) depicts how likely the src (the source police officer id) and the dst (the destination police officer id) are probably going to be involved in an allegation, which is depicted by the weight column.

Conclusion -

Graph analytics helps in identifying the police officers who are most influential and are most well connected with other police officers. This can provide an early insight into the behaviour of an officer and how likely they are to influence other police officers.