

August 15, 2018.

## **Reducing Bias in Citizens' Perception of Crime Rates: Evidence from a Field Experiment on Burglary Prevalence**

Martin Vinæs Larsen, Aarhus University

Asmus Leth Olsen,<sup>1</sup> University of Copenhagen

**Abstract:** Citizens are, on average, too pessimistic when assessing the trajectory of current crime trends. In this study, we examine whether we can correct this perceptual bias with respect to burglaries. Using a field experiment coupled with a large panel survey (n=4,895), we explore whether a public information campaign can reduce misperceptions about the prevalence of burglaries. Embedding the correct information about burglary rates in a direct mail campaign, we find that it is possible to substantially reduce citizens' misperceptions. Importantly, the effects are not short lived: they are detectable several weeks after the mailer was sent, but they are temporary and eventually the perceptual bias re-emerges. Our results suggest that if citizens were continually supplied with correct information about crime rates they would be less pessimistic. Reducing bias in citizens' perception of crime rates might therefore be a matter of adjusting the supply of (dis)information about crime.

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author, [ajlo@ifs.ku.dk](mailto:ajlo@ifs.ku.dk). The authors would like to thank TrygFonden for funding this research as part of the project "Raising Awareness without Raising Fears" (ID: 119942). The authors would also like to thank Cecilie Weischer for her diligent work as a research assistant on the project. For ideas and suggestions regarding the design of the study the authors would like to thank Martin Bisgaard and Jens Olav Dahlgaard.

In recent decades, crime has fallen markedly in most western countries (Pinker, 2012). Despite this, most citizens think that crime is on the rise. Across the past 30 years numerous surveys have documented that a large majority of Americans think that crime is increasing when it is, in fact, decreasing (Gramlich, 2016, 2017; Gallup, 2017). This is not a uniquely American phenomenon, as we see similar perceptual biases in, for instance, United Kingdom (Office for National Statistics, 2017), Italy (Mastrorocco et al., 2016), and Denmark (Fuglsang, 2017). This tendency to overestimate crime rates can potentially lead to adverse societal outcomes. Studies have shown that perceptions of crime are related to mental health (Dustmann and Fasani, 2016), social trust (Gainey et al., 2011) and economic outcomes (Buonanno et al., 2013). In politics, this bias makes it difficult for citizens to hold politicians accountable for their ability to provide public safety. If citizens do not recognize that crime rates are decreasing, politicians have no incentive to focus on crime rates, and politicians who are effective at reducing crime will be reelected at the same rate as politicians who are not (Mansbridge, 2009).

This article explores whether there is a role for public information campaigns in reducing misperceptions about crime. We believe this might be the case because previous literature suggests that the supply of information about crime is insufficient and biased. The media tends to cover crime episodically and not thematically (Iyengar, 1994, chap. 4), which means that the type of information to which citizens are typically exposed relates to specific cases of crime and not the broader context (e.g., information about the prevalence of crime). The news media also has a well-documented negativity bias (Soroka, 2006), so they will typically not cover reductions in the crime rate but rather vivid instances of rare crimes (Soroka and McAdams, 2015). Finally, the media's focus on current events distorts coverage of long-term trends.

Even so, it is not obvious that citizens will let go of their biased perceptions if a public information campaign presents them with accurate information about crime rates. Motivated reasoning suggests that citizens might resist correct information about crime rates if their misperceptions were borne out of strong affective ties to a political party (e.g., the leader of this party might insist that crime is not decreasing) or stereotypical beliefs about outgroups (e.g., that a wave of immigration is driving up crime rates) (Lodge and Taber, 2013). Beyond this, people might have good reason to resist information if their everyday experience contradicts it

(Hjorth, 2017), and, just like the media, individuals are myopic and tend to (over)emphasize negative information (Healy and Lenz, 2014).

To study the potential of public information campaigns in reducing misperceptions, we conduct a field experiment coupled with a two-wave panel survey. Specifically, we embed information on burglary rates in a leaflet about how to avoid burglaries and mail the leaflet to the panelists between the two survey waves. In order to explore the temporal dynamics of the leaflets' effect, we randomly assign participants to timing of re-interview. We find that it is possible to substantially reduce citizens' misperception of crime rates. The effect is not short lived – it is detectable several weeks after the mailer was sent, but it is temporary, and eventually the perceptual bias re-emerges.

Besides giving us an insight into whether public information campaigns can be used to reduce citizens' misperceptions about crime, our study provides an important context for existing studies, which have found that it is typically easy to correct citizens' misperceptions about a wide range of issues in a survey experimental setting (Guess and Coppock, 2016; Nyhan et al., 2017; Wood and Porter, 2018; Nyhan and Reifler, 2010). Our findings suggest that while it is also possible to correct beliefs outside of a serene survey setting using a scalable intervention, the effect of the corrections are temporary. As such, permanently correcting citizens' misperceptions about crime, and other issues, might not simply be a matter of supplying them with correct information at one point in time, but rather of supplying such information on a continual basis.


## **EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**

To explore the effect of public information campaigns about crime on citizens' misperceptions, we designed a field experiment with survey outcomes (Broockman et al., 2017), recruiting 6,481 participants from the survey company Epinion's Danish web panel. The participants had to be over 30 years of age and had to live in a single family home, so that it made sense for them to receive a leaflet about how to avoid burglaries. In addition to this, the participants had to agree to give their address and to be contacted for a follow-up study. As participants were being recruited, they were given a short survey about their attitudes towards various social issues, including specific questions about their perception of crime rates.

Two weeks after the final participant had been recruited, all participants were mailed a leaflet. Forty-three percent of participants were in the treatment group. This group received a four-page leaflet about how to avoid burglaries that included statistical information about burglary rates. We embedded the statistical information in a leaflet with other information about burglaries in order to add to the realism of the treatment, and to see whether participants would notice the statistical information in the presence of other information. The remaining participants received either a leaflet about how to avoid burglaries with no information on burglary rates (43 percent) or a placebo-leaflet on an unrelated topic (14 percent). We implemented these two different control conditions in order to identify any independent learning effect of receiving a leaflet about burglaries (as opposed to a leaflet on another topic). However, as can be seen in Appendix G, no such effect materialized, and therefore we collapse the two control conditions in the analysis. We used complete random assignment to assign leaflets to participants. All leaflets were sent out by the organization TrygFonden (a foundation that aims make Denmark safer; see more at [www.trygfonden.dk/english/](http://www.trygfonden.dk/english/)). To avoid experimenter demand effects, participants were not told, and the leaflets gave no indication, that there was any relation between the survey and the leaflets. See Appendix A for details about the leaflets.

One week after sending out the leaflets, participants were invited to a post-treatment survey. A random sample of 350 participants were invited each day for 18 days, and, on the 19th day the remaining 181 participants were invited. Invitation and participation were closely aligned, with 60 percent of participants completing the survey within one day of the invitation and 90 percent within 5 days. To ensure that all treatment conditions were evenly distributed across timing of invitation to the post-treatment survey, we block-randomized by which leaflet the participant received, randomly assigning participants to invitation dates within each block. Seventy-five percent of the recruited participants took part in the post-treatment survey ( $n=4,895$ ). In Appendix B, we show that a number of pre-treatment participant characteristics are balanced across experimental conditions. We also examined unbalanced attrition, identifying no imbalance across the experimental conditions, and only a slight increase in attrition across assignment to re-invitation.

The statistical information consisted of the three data visualizations presented in Figure




**Figure 1:** Overview of the Experimental Design

2. They were all displayed on the same page of the leaflet. They were: (1) a downward trending curve diagram of the number of burglaries in Denmark from 2011 to 2016, (2) a “risk characterization theater” (Strauss, 2008) illustrating the proportion of households that were burglarized in the last 5 years (9 pct.), and (3) a color-coded map of Danish municipalities indicating whether each municipality was in the bottom, middle, or top tercile with respect to burglaries per household. We included different types of information, so that we would be able to gauge the robustness of and variation in any potential effects. To maximize the effectiveness of the treatments, they were designed by an advertising bureau that specializes in data visualizations.

We measure participants’ perception of crime rates using the following three questions: (1) “Have there been fewer or more burglaries in 2016 compared to 2011?”; (2) “Think of the continuous period from 2011 to 2016 as a whole. What percentage of Danish homes were burglarized in this period?”; and (3) “Please compare your own municipality to the rest of Denmark. In your municipality, have there been fewer or more burglaries per household in 2016?”. Answers were given in percentages for question 2 (participants could write down any integer between zero and 100). For questions 1 and 3 participants could report either “fewer”, “about the same”, or “more”. The three questions match the three different data visualizations presented in the leaflets. The questions were asked in both survey waves, and they were the only questions in the two surveys that asked participants to assess the prevalence of burglaries. Appendix B presents descriptive statistics. In our analysis, we recode all the dependent variables so that they indicate whether participants answered correctly or not. For question 2, we will also look at what happens if one accepts all responses within 2 pp as correct.

For question 3, we will split our analysis depending on the burglary rate in the participant's municipality (i.e., whether it is in the bottom, middle or top tercile), as the correct response is contingent on this.



**Figure 2:** The three data visualizations. Left (translated): The number of burglaries has decreased from 2011 to 2016! In total, there were 231,706 burglaries in Denmark between 2011 and 2016. Middle: 9% of all Danish homes have been burglarized in the period between 2011 and 2016. Right: Is your house in danger? Red municipalities have way more burglaries per household than the average municipality. The yellow municipalities are close to the average. Green municipalities have way fewer burglaries than the average municipality.

## RESULTS


In Figure 3, we observe the proportion of correct responses for the three different questions about burglary prevalence among participants who received a leaflet with statistical information and for participants who received a different leaflet. To study how these proportions develop over time, we group post-treatment responses based on when participants were randomly invited to take part in the second survey, constructing three groups of similar size: 1–2 weeks ( $n=1,652$ ), 2–3 weeks ( $n=1,579$ ), and 3–4 weeks ( $n=1,664$ ) after the leaflet was sent out. Across all three questions, we find that the number of correct responses increases in response to receiving a leaflet with statistical information, but also that the effect wanes over time. In Appendix F, we redo this analysis using logit models.

In panel A, we observe the effect of the treatment on participants' ability to correctly state that the burglary rate is lower in 2016 than it was in 2011. Prior to the intervention only 41 percent ( $CI=39.7\text{--}42.5$ ) are able to respond correctly with no significant pre-treatment difference ( $p=0.887$ ). At 1–2 weeks after the intervention we observe a sizable treatment effect of

around 15 percentage points (pp) ( $p < 0.001$ ), with a clear majority among those assigned to the statistics leaflet correctly reporting the burglary trend. After 2–3 weeks the treatment effect narrows to about 6 pp ( $p < 0.05$ ) and, after 3–4 weeks, the difference is no longer statistically or substantively significant with a 3 pp difference ( $p = 0.157$ ). Comparisons across time are complicated by the fact that attrition was slightly larger for those invited later; however, we believe the identified decrease in effect size is nonetheless credible. A key reason for this is that the drop in effect size is considerably larger than what can be explained by the slight increase in attrition identified in Appendix B. Moreover, if attrition was driving the trend in effects, we should see larger effects among those invited later, as marginal participants – who are arguably less engaged and therefore less likely to be affected by the treatment – drop out of the study.

In panel B we observe the effect of the treatment on participants' ability to correctly state that the national burglary rate was 9 percent. Prior to the intervention only 0.5 percent were able to provide the exact correct answer ( $CI = 0.35\text{--}0.7$ ). At 1–2 weeks after the intervention there is some indication of an improvement in the intervention group by about 0.8 pp ( $p < 0.1$ ) and, after 2–3 weeks, by 1.2 pp ( $p < 0.05$ ). However, as for the trend results, the effect can no longer be identified after 3–4 weeks ( $p = 0.751$ ). If we extend the range of correct responses to be within  $\pm 2$  pp of the true value we find a similar pattern. In the first weeks after the intervention, the treatment group is about 5 pp more likely to provide a correct response ( $p < 0.05$ ), but the effect cannot be detected after 2–3 weeks ( $p = 0.344$ ), or 3–4 weeks ( $p = 0.213$ ).

In panel C we observe the effect of the intervention on participants' ability to correctly state the relative burglary rate at the municipal level. Since the correct response depends on where participants live, we divide our results by whether the participant's home municipality has a burglary rate below ( $n = 1,276$ ), around ( $n = 2,211$ ), or above average ( $n = 1,408$ ). For those residing in municipalities with a burglary rate below average we can identify sizable treatment effects. After 1–2 weeks those in the treatment group are 18 pp better at correctly identifying the relative burglary rate of their municipality ( $p < 0.001$ ). After 2–3 weeks the difference is 10 pp ( $p < 0.05$ ) and finally ends up at 4 pp ( $p = 0.348$ ). A somewhat similar pattern, although with smaller effects, can be identified for participants who live in municipalities with an above average burglary rate: after 1–2 weeks it is 8 pp ( $p < 0.1$ ), after 2–3 weeks it is 0.4 pp ( $p = 0.935$ ),



**Figure 3:** Dots represent the percentage of correct responses for treatment and control groups across time for each of the three dependent variables. Lines represent 95 percent confidence intervals. A, correct response to question about the trend in burglaries (i.e., lower since 2011). B, correct response to question about level of burglaries (9% rate). C, correct response to question about relative level of burglaries in the participant's home municipality; results divided based on whether participants live in municipality with an above, below or an average burglary rate. In Appendix E we plot the average treatment effects. In Appendix C we reproduce this figure using knowledge about unemployment as a placebo test instead of the levels. N=4,895.



and after 3–4 weeks it is 2 pp ( $p=0.698$ ). For those residing in a municipality with an average burglary rate, we do not find any consistent effects. For this limited subset, there seems to be an imbalance between the treatment and the control group prior to the intervention (6 pp,  $p<0.01$ ).

## DISCUSSION

We can substantially reduce citizens' perceptual biases when it comes to assessing crime rates using a simple, scalable intervention: a leaflet with correct information presented as a set of attractive data visualizations. Using a field experiment, we showed that misperceptions were reduced, temporarily, among at least 15 percent of those who received this information. It is important to note this is an intent-to-treat effect, in that it is the effect of being mailed the leaflet rather than the effect of reading it. We asked participants near the end of the post-treatment survey whether they had received a leaflet from the Trygfonden, with 46 percent stating that they had. This might seem high, however, it is relatively rare to receive mailers of this type in Denmark. If only half the participants actually read the leaflet, then the effect of receiving the correct information among those who read the leaflet is closer to 30 pp (see Appendix E).

Our study also points to some limitations in our ability to correct misinformation in the mass public. First, while the intervention reduced misperceptions of relative and absolute levels of crime, it was considerably more effective with respect to the trend. Since the information on the trend in burglaries was not displayed more prominently than the rest of the statistical information (see Appendix A), this is surprising. One explanation might be that comparative assessments tend to carry more psychological weight (Olsen, 2017), another might be that, against our intent, the visualization was somehow clearer or more stark. Irrespective of the explanation, this seems to suggest that some misperceptions are more amenable to correction.

Second, while the effects we identify were not short lived, they were temporary – lasting a couple of weeks and declining in this period. This suggests that as other considerations, such as news stories or first-hand observations, become top of mind, the effect of the correction wanes. Given what we know about opinion formation, this makes sense (Zaller, 1992): if one wants to permanently correct citizens' misperception of crime rates (or other phenomena), our study suggests that the broader information environment, including the media, will need to continually provide correct information. As mentioned in the introduction, this is not

currently observable in the media. This notion is supported by additional analyses presented in Appendix D, which reveal that among participants who are very interested in local affairs, and might therefore be more likely to consume local news, the effect of the leaflet decays rapidly, whereas the effect is lasting among those who are not interested in local affairs. This might reflect that those who are more politically aware are more likely to resist new information (Zaller, 1992; Lodge and Taber, 2013, 131). However, it could also suggest that permanently reducing bias in citizens' perception of crime rates is primarily a matter of adjusting the supply of (dis)information about crime.

## References

- Broockman, D. E., Kalla, J. L., and Sekhon, J. S. (2017). The design of field experiments with survey outcomes: A framework for selecting more efficient, robust, and ethical designs. *Political Analysis*, 25(4):435–464.
- Buonanno, P., Montolio, D., and Raya-Vílchez, J. M. (2013). Housing prices and crime perception. *Empirical Economics*, 45:305–321.
- Dustmann, C. and Fasani, F. (2016). The effect of local area crime on mental health. *The Economic Journal*, 126(593):978–1017.
- Fuglsang, T. (2017). Danskernes opfattelse af kriminalitet. *Justitsministeriets Forskningskontor [Department of Justice, Research office]*.
- Gainey, R., Alper, M., and Chappell, A. T. (2011). Fear of crime revisited. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36(2):120–137.
- Gallup (2017). Crime. <http://bit.ly/2n2aSzO>. Accessed: 2017-01-03.
- Gramlich, J. (2016). Voters perceptions of crime continue to conflict with reality. <http://pewrsr.ch/2fZxegQ>. Accessed: 2017-01-03.
- Gramlich, J. (2017). 5 facts about crime in the U.S. <http://pewrsr.ch/2lBTnXd>. Accessed: 2017-01-03.
- Guess, A. and Coppock, A. (2016). The exception, not the rule? The rarely polarizing effect of challenging information. <http://bit.ly/2nu9VjO>, Accessed: 2017-01-03.
- Healy, A. and Lenz, G. S. (2014). Substituting the end for the whole: Why voters respond primarily to the election-year economy. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(1):31–47.

- Hjorth, F. (2017). The influence of local ethnic diversity on group-centric crime attitudes. *British Journal of Political Science*, Early View.
- Iyengar, S. (1994). *Is anyone responsible?* University of Chicago Press.
- Lodge, M. and Taber, C. S. (2013). *The rationalizing voter*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mansbridge, J. (2009). A “selection model” of political representation. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 17(4):369–398.
- Mastorocco, N., Minale, L., et al. (2016). Information and crime perceptions: Evidence from a natural experiment. *CReAM Discussion Paper Series*, 1601.
- Nyhan, B., Porter, E., Reifler, J., and Wood, T. (2017). Taking corrections literally but not seriously? the effects of information on factual beliefs and candidate favorability. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2995128>, Accessed: 2017-01-03.
- Nyhan, B. and Reifler, J. (2010). When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions. *Political Behavior*, 32(2):303–330.
- Office for National Statistics (2017). Public perceptions of crime in England and Wales: year ending March 2016. National Statistics Report.
- Olsen, A. L. (2017). Compared to what? how social and historical reference points affect citizens’ performance evaluations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 27(4):562–580.
- Pinker, S. (2012). *The better angels of our nature: Why violence has declined*. Penguin Books.
- Soroka, S. and McAdams, S. (2015). News, politics, and negativity. *Political Communication*, 32(1):1–22.
- Soroka, S. N. (2006). Good news and bad news: Asymmetric responses to economic information. *Journal of Politics*, 68(2):372–385.
- Strauss, S. (2008). Picture this: a new way of seeing risk. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 178(11):1512.
- Wood, T. and Porter, E. (2018). The elusive backfire effect: Mass attitudes’ steadfast factual adherence. *Political Behavior*, Early View.
- Zaller, J. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. Cambridge university press.