

Online Appendix for
“The Black-White Recognition Gap in Award
Nominations”

A Additional Tables and Figures

Table A1: Department Awards

1	<i>Superintendent's Award of Valor</i> for an act of outstanding bravery or heroism by which the member has demonstrated in great degree the characteristics of selflessness, personal courage, and devotion to duty.
2	<i>Superintendent's Award of Merit</i> for an outstanding accomplishment that has resulted in improved administration, improved operations, or substantial savings in manpower or operational costs, wherein the member has gone far beyond the requirements of their normal assignment.
3	<i>Police Blue Star Award</i> is granted to any sworn member who has been seriously, critically, or fatally injured while in the performance of police duty.
4	<i>Police Blue Shield Award</i> is granted to any sworn member who, as a result of accidental causes, has been seriously, critically, or fatally injured while in the performance of police duty.
5	<i>Superintendent's Award of Tactical Excellence</i> for exceptional tactical skills or verbal approaches and techniques to mitigate any deadly force situation resulting in the saving or sustaining of a human life.
6	<i>Arnold Mireles Special Partnership Award</i> for making a significant impact upon the quality of life within their community by identifying and resolving problems.
7	<i>Special Commendation</i> for making a significant impact on public safety or crime prevention.
8	<i>Lifesaving Award</i> for a successful effort in saving a human life that involved exceptional courage or performance.
9	<i>Police Officer of the Month</i> for performance of duty during a specific month was characterized by such exceptional professional skill that it merits recognition by the entire Department.
10	<i>Chicago Police Leadership Award</i> for exemplary service, dedication, and leadership.
11	<i>Department Commendation</i> for an outstanding act or achievement that brings great credit to the Department and involves performance above and beyond that required by the member's basic assignment.
12	<i>Problem Solving Award</i> for an exemplary effort to identify, analyze, and successfully respond to causes, conditions, and problems that may lead to crime and neighborhood disorder.
13	<i>Joint Operations Award</i> for efforts and participation in a broad multi-agency joint operation/event, spanning several days or more, significantly contributing to the overall successes of the operation.
14	<i>Unit Meritorious Performance Award</i> for exhibiting exceptional professional skill and conduct during a coordinated action.
15	<i>Traffic Stop of the Month Award</i> for excellence in conducting professional traffic stops that result in quality arrests.
16	<i>Top Gun Arrest Award</i> for exceptional commitment to the recovery of illegal firearms.
17	<i>Special Service Award</i> for contributing to any event that has a significant impact upon the historical direction and operations of the Department.
18	<i>Honorable Mention Certificate</i> for demonstrating outstanding performance above and beyond that required by the member's assignment.

Source: Chicago Police Department Special Order S01-01-01 "Description and Eligibility for Department Awards", retrieved from <http://directives.chicagopolice.org/directives/>

Table A2: CPD Use of Force Options and Member Response

Use of Force Options	Our Classification
<i>Force Mitigation Efforts</i> Member Presence Zone of Safety Verbal Direction/Control Techniques Movement to Avoid Attack Specialized Units Tactical Positioning Additional Unit Members None Other	Mitigation
<i>Control Tactics</i> Escort Holds Wristlock Armbar Control Instrument Pressure Sensitive Areas Emergency Handcuffing Other	Control tactics
<i>Response without Weapons</i> Open Hand Strike Take down Elbow strike Close hand strike/Punch Knee strike Kicks Other	No Weapon
<i>Response with Weapons</i> OC/Chemical Weapon OC/Chemical Weapon w/Authorization LRAD w/Authorization	Non-Lethal Weapon
Taser	Taser
Canine	Canine
Baton/Expandable baton Impact munitions	Baton
Revolver Rifle Semi-auto pistol Shotgun	Firearm
Other	Other Use of Force

Source: Chicago Police Department TRR Form

Table A3: Evaluation Quarter and Due Dates by Start Month

Quarter	Anniversary Date Month of the Member	The Quarter the Member Will Be Evaluated	Due Date of the Evaluation
1st	January, February, March	4th	30 January
2nd	April, May, June	1st	30 April
3rd	July, August, September	2nd	30 July
4th	October, November, December	3rd	30 October

Source: Chicago Police Department, Career Development Directive, Employee Resource E05-01, Section IX, B. Retrieved from <http://directives.chicagopolice.org/directives/data/a7a56e3d-12887ea9-ce512-887e-c3dce7cd73e28d57.html?ownapi=1>

Table A4: Impact of Arrest Record on Nomination Likelihood by Officer Race, With Officer Fixed-Effects


	Outcome Variable: Nominated		
Estimates for:	White Officer (1)	Black-White Gap (2)	Hispanic-White Gap (3)
Panel A: White Supervisors			
1 arrest	0.00629*** (0.00143)	-0.00495** (0.00206)	-0.00118 (0.00254)
2 arrests	0.00927*** (0.00202)	-0.00543* (0.00296)	0.00138 (0.00350)
3 arrests	0.0128*** (0.00274)	-0.00736* (0.00418)	0.00243 (0.00474)
4 arrests	0.0154*** (0.00342)	-0.00430 (0.00588)	-0.00156 (0.00591)
5 or more arrests	0.0326*** (0.00308)	-0.0154*** (0.00531)	-0.00830 (0.00509)
Observations	171,094		
Panel B: Black Supervisors			
1 arrest	-0.000415 (0.00367)	0.00285 (0.00414)	0.00215 (0.00760)
2 arrests	0.00562 (0.00528)	-0.00393 (0.00593)	-0.000198 (0.0108)
3 arrests	0.00573 (0.00721)	0.00438 (0.00848)	0.00756 (0.0149)
4 arrests	0.00254 (0.0104)	-0.00861 (0.0119)	0.00880 (0.0189)
5 or more arrests	0.00949 (0.00898)	0.0274** (0.0127)	-0.000599 (0.0155)
Observations	29,413		
Mean Pr(Nom) for White Officers	-0.0045		

Source: CPD data.


Notes: This table reports estimates for the impact of an officer's arrest record on the probability of nomination by white supervisors (Panel A) and by black supervisors (Panel B). Each panel is a single OLS regression with estimates for white officers in column 1, the black-white difference in column 2, and the Hispanic-white difference in column 3. All estimates control for month and year FE, officer FE, officer birth year, tenure, lagged complaints, unit FE, share of black supervisees, lagged crime rate, lagged violent crime rate. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Figure A1: Black-White Nomination Gap by Supervisor Characteristics


(a) Share of Black Supervisees



(b) Supervisor Tenure



(c) Number of Supervisees



Notes: White Supervisors. Estimates control for officer birth year, officer tenure, lagged arrests, lagged complaints, supervisor fixed effects, district, overall crime rate, violent crime rate, number of supervisees, and share of black supervisees, as well as year and month fixed effects. Wings depict 95% confidence intervals by robust standard errors.

B Online Experiment

The experiment was conducted on Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) in July 2020. It was pre-registered in the AEA RCT Registry, AEARCTR-0005929. We recruited 411 MTurk workers (hereafter “workers”) who were compensated \$1.20 for completing a survey experiment. Table A5 reports summary statistics on all 411 workers. Figure A2 plots the distribution of workers’ states of residence.

We included three data quality checks to identify bots and to ensure workers paid attention during the survey. For the analysis, we decided to include workers who passed at least two of the three data quality checks. This restriction reduces our final analysis sample to 407 workers.


To avoid deception in our survey, we used real officer profiles but used officer initials to preserve officers’ identities. Workers were informed that the profiles belonged to real officers but were not told which agency they were from. Further, we informed workers that their nominations would be relayed to the police department. This was to achieve incentive compatibility.

Table A5: Summary Statistics

	N	%
Race		
Black	48	11.7%
Hispanic	66	16.1%
White	263	64.0%
Other	21	5.1%
Prefer not to answer	10	2.4%
Missing	3	0.7%
Female	166	40.4%
Age		
18-25	53	12.9%
26-35	189	46.0%
36-45	78	19.0%
46-55	55	13.4%
56+	35	8.5%
Missing	1	0.2%
Is English your first language?		
Yes	401	97.6%
No	5	1.2%
Missing	5	1.2%
Length of Residency in US		
< 1 yr	6	1.5%
More than 1 yr but less than 3 yrs	21	5.1%
More than 3 yrs but less than 6 yrs	16	3.9%
More than 6 yrs	365	88.8%
Missing	3	0.7%
Number of Surveys (MTurk Workers)	411	

Source: MTurk survey data.

Figure A2: Distribution of MTurk Worker State of Residence



Source: MTurk survey data.